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Abstract

The Cabe\textsuperscript{1} language of Benin is part of the larger Ede language continuum. The Ede languages are spoken in the southern part of West Africa stretching from western Nigeria across Benin to the eastern part of central Togo. Among the Ede varieties, two have thus far undergone language development on a larger scale: Yoruba both in Nigeria and Benin, and Ife in Togo. A survey of the Cabe communities was conducted to assess whether and to what extent existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba and Ife could extend to the Cabe communities and to determine the nature and extent of SIL’s possible involvement among these communities.

Through the administration of community and individual interviews, as well as the elicitation of word and phrase lists, the survey researchers collected data concerning: tested and reported levels of dialect intercomprehension; language vitality, language attitudes toward both written and oral forms of Cabe, Yoruba and Ife; reported proficiency and attitudes regarding French; and literacy levels.

Overall, the results show high levels of comprehension of Yoruba while comprehension of Ife is low. There are no indications of language shift, and attitudes toward Cabe development appear to be positive. Language attitudes toward Yoruba by native Cabe speakers are also positive.

1. Introduction

This paper reports on a sociolinguistic survey conducted among the Cabe speech communities of Benin (Borgou and Zou provinces). The Cabe speech variety belongs to the Ede language continuum (Defoid language group) which is situated in the southeastern part of West Africa, in southwestern Nigeria, central Benin, and in the eastern part of central Togo.

Among the Ede varieties, two have thus far undergone language development on a larger scale: Yoruba both in Nigeria and Benin, and Ife in Togo. To assess whether and to what extent existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba and Ife could extend to the remaining Ede communities, or whether additional language-based development programs in some of the remaining communities would be beneficial and to determine the nature and extent of SIL’s possible involvement among these communities, a sociolinguistic study of the Ede communities of Benin and Togo was launched in the early 1990s.

\textsuperscript{1} In general, all language names are spelled using the English alphabet. For a complete listing of alternative spellings see Volume 1, Appendix B.
The sociolinguistics survey reported here is part of this larger study and was carried out in three stages between April 1992 and February 1993 by various researchers of CENALA (Centre National de Linguistique Appliquée) and the Togo-Benin branch of SIL International.

After presenting, in Section 2, pertinent background information on the Nago area, Section 3 briefly discusses the research questions, followed in Section 4 by a description of the applied methodology. In Section 5, the results from the survey are presented, followed, in Section 6, by a set of conclusions. The report closes with a set of appendices and a list of references.2

2. Background information

In the following sections, pertinent background information is presented in regard to the language situation, history of migration, population, existing regional literacy programs, and the religious situation. Some of the data were gathered during community interviews.3

2.1 Language situation

2.1.1 Language classification

Capo (1989), building on Akinkugbe’s (1978) and Williamson’s (1989) work, proposes the following classification for Cabe:

Niger-Congo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, (New) Benue-Congo, Defoid, Yoruboid, Edekeri:

- Ede, Southwest Ede, Cabe

Alternative names and spellings are:4

- Tsábe, Sábé, Şabê (Capo 1989:281)
- Ede-Cabé (CENALA 1990)
- Caabe, Ede Cabe (Grimes 1996:167)

No dialects are listed either by Capo (1989) or in the Ethnologue (Grimes 1996).

2.1.2 Language area

The Cabe area is located in the rural districts both of Savè and Ouèssè in the Zou province and of Tchaourou in the Borgou province in Benin. It stretches approximately 100 km from Tchaourou in the north to Savè in the south, with most villages located along highway RNIE 2 (Route Nationale Inter-Etats) and, therefore, easily accessible.

2 The author wishes to express her gratitude to D. H. Hatfield of SIL Togo-Benin for the editing of this report, and to J. A. Durieux of SIL Africa-Area for his input on Section 4.
3 More general background information on the Ede language continuum and its communities can be found in Volume 1, Section 1.
4 The French spelling in use is “Cabè.”
Northwards, the Cabe people have as their neighbors the Bariba people. To the east, the Cabe language area borders the Nigerian Yoruba language area, with highway RNIE 5 and several smaller roads and footpaths connecting it with the Cabe area. To the south, the Cabe area neighbors the Idaca area, while the western border is formed by the Ouémé river, as well as major forests.

Other ethnic groups also live among the Cabe people, among which Bariba speakers seem to be in the majority. Fon and Maxi speakers are also present, as well as Dendi speakers. (See Appendix A for a map of the area.)

### 2.2 History of migration

The Cabe people migrated from Nigeria westward into Benin. Originally, according to Aguidi (1997, personal communication), they came from Ile-Ife in Nigeria (Oyo State). From here they moved to Shaki (Oyo State), northeast of Savè, from where they derive their name, and then further west into today’s Benin.

### 2.3 Population

During the 1992 Benin Census (Ministère du Plan 1993), population data were elicited giving totals both by ethnic group, as well as by political community. The total by ethnic group numbers the Cabe population as 20,206 (9,582 males, 10,624 females)\(^5\) (Ministère du Plan 1994:47).

The population given by political community is considerably higher with a total of 71,173 (35,367 males, 35,806 females) for those villages and towns which, according to interviewed Cabe elders, belong to the Cabe language area (Ministère du Plan 1993:16, 32, 33; see also Appendix A for a map of the area). However, this total also includes villages with a reportedly ethnically mixed population. The total population for those villages with reportedly no mixed population is 29,783 (15,008 males, 14,775 females).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the total Cabe population is somewhere between 30,000 and 70,000.\(^6\)

### 2.4 Non-formal education

In 1992, six national languages were selected by the government of Benin for non-formal adult education (Direction de l’Alphabétisation 1992): Aja, Bariba, Dendi, Ditammari, Fon and Yoruba.

---

\(^5\) It is noted here, that during the census, individuals were asked to which ethnic group they belong and not which language they speak as their first language. Thus, interviewees identified with their father’s ethnic group, even though they might not speak his language nor live in his language area.

\(^6\) The *Ethnologue* (Grimes 1996:167) lists the Cabe population as 80,000, an estimate based on Vanderaa (1991:7) who notes that all population figures for ethnic groups in his report are for 1990, applying appropriate growth rates to older figures for ethnic groups (vi, Notes).
It was apparently assumed that all Ede communities in Benin would be able to benefit from the Yoruba language development program and literacy efforts, given that it is linguistically close to these varieties and the language of wider of communication for those communities. (For more information on Yoruba language development, see Volume 1, Section 1.7.1.)

As far as non-formal education in the Cabe language area is concerned, no interviews were held with literacy officials. However, individuals interviewed were asked about their personal experiences and attitudes regarding literacy.

2.5 Religious situation

Traditionally, the Cabe people are Animists (Vanderea 1991). However, there are Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in the area, and representatives of various churches were interviewed during the course of the survey (see Section 4.2.2). As regards Protestant missions and churches, Vanderea (p. 4–7) reports that SIM, United Methodists and African Indigenous Churches have founded a total of 35 churches with 4,700 members. Except for those churches surveyed, though, no specifics are known either in regard to the actual number of churches, their location and total membership, or the year when the various churches started their work.

3. Research questions

The purpose of this survey was twofold: (1) to assess whether and to what extent existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba and Ife could extend to the Cabe communities, or whether an additional language-based development program in Cabe would be beneficial, and (2) to gather data that would help determine the nature and extent of SIL’s possible involvement among these communities.

For the current study, the evaluation of a need for separate literature was to be based on criteria established by Marmor (1997). More specifically, the evaluation of literature development needs was to be based on the factors of dialect intercomprehension, language vitality, and language attitudes with emphasis given to the following topics:7

1. Dialect intercomprehension

   − What are the geographical boundaries of the Cabe speech variety, which dialects of Cabe, if any, exist, and what is the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community?
   − What is the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife?
   − What are the Yoruba and Ife comprehension levels throughout the Cabe communities?8

---

7 Although these criteria were not available in 1993 when the survey was conducted, these guidelines will help in drawing conclusions based on comprehension testing among the Cabe communities.
8 Marmor (1997:2f) presents the following guidelines by which to draw conclusions from comprehension testing results, along with the suggested type of SIL involvement in language development efforts (see also Volume 1, Section 3):
   a) High intercomprehension is defined by an overall test average of “over 90% by all segments of the population” (under 45 years of age). In this case, it is assumed that there is no need for separate literature.
2. Language vitality
   - What are the language use patterns in various social domains, both public and private?
   - Is the pattern of language use stable, or is language shift occurring or impending?

3. Language attitudes
   - What are attitudes toward Cabe and its development, with special attention given to language development work already in progress?
   - What are attitudes toward the oral and written forms both of Yoruba and Ife?

There were some additional questions, most of which are directly related to the priority and strategy criteria outlined previously and which provide updated information for the area. These questions are:

   - What is the size of the group?
   - Which infrastructures already exist?
   - What is the education situation and literacy rate in the area?
   - What is the religious situation?

Although bilingualism in French was not of major concern for this survey, some data were collected in order to have relevant and updated information about the level of reported proficiency and attitudes regarding French.

4. Methodology

In the following sections, various aspects of the applied methodology will be discussed: techniques, implementation, analysis and applied terminology.9

4.1 Techniques

In order to arrive at answers to the research questions mentioned previously, a variety of techniques were chosen:

1. Dialect intercomprehension was assessed through:
   - Lexical similarity comparisons between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife;
   - Recorded Text Testing (RTT) assessing comprehension levels both of Yoruba and Ife.
   - Interviews with community elders regarding the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community;

b) Mixed intercomprehension is defined by a situation in which “no segment of the population scores below 80%, but some segments score below 90%.” In this case the need for separate literature depends upon language attitudes and/or the possibility of a second dialect acquisition program.

c) Low intercomprehension is defined as an “overall average below 70%.” In this case, there is a need for separate literature, or if attitudes permit, a strong second dialect acquisition program.

9 A general description of the methodology as applied for the larger Ede language continuum survey can be found in Volume 1, Section 4).
− Self-assessed (reported) active and passive proficiency, both direct and indirect (e.g. understanding of radio programming in the other language), obtained through individual interviews;
− Interviews with church elders regarding comprehension of Yoruba in the church context.

2. Language vitality as investigated through reported:
− Language use in various domains, both public and private;
− Language use of children and the youth for evidence of intergenerational shift.

3. Language attitudes were examined through reported data regarding:
− Attitudes toward Cabe and its development, with special attention given to language development work already in progress;
− Attitudes toward the oral and written forms both of Yoruba and Ife.

Reported data were used to assess the peripheral factors mentioned previously, reported proficiency in and attitudes toward French, and literacy levels:

− French proficiency and attitudes toward French were summariily investigated by interviewing individuals about their own and their children’s French abilities and their attitudes toward oral proficiency;
− Literacy levels were investigated through interviews with literacy workers and individuals.

The techniques mentioned above were carried out by use of the following tools:

1. Community interviews:
− Community questionnaires investigating: geographical boundaries of Cabe, existence of different dialects of Cabe, nature of the linguistic differences among these dialects, degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe language community, language vitality, and attitudes toward literacy in Cabe, Yoruba and Ife;
− Church questionnaires exploring levels of comprehension and language use in the church context, ownership, use and understanding of written religious materials in Yoruba, and attitudes toward Bible translation.

2. Individual interviews:
− Recorded Text Testing (RTT) assessing comprehension levels of both Yoruba and Ife. Personal narratives both in Yoruba and Ife were recorded, as well as two Bible passages translated into Yoruba: Acts 10:1–23 from the revised 1987 New Testament translation (Bible Society of Nigeria 1987) and Luke 19:11–27 from the 1960 Bible translation (Bible Society of Nigeria 1960). A questionnaire was administered alongside the test inquiring into the subjects’ comprehension of the tested texts and their general comprehension of the tested variety, as well as the subjects’ reading and writing abilities and attitudes toward literacy;
− Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaires (ISQs) examining: language proficiency; language use with various interlocutors in different social situations; attitudes toward
Cabe and its development, as well as toward Yoruba, Ife and French; and literacy in these languages.

3. Word and phrase lists:
   – Standardized word and phrase lists collected in Cabe, Yoruba and Ife.\(^\text{10}\)

### 4.2 Implementation

The survey was conducted in three stages:

1. In April 1992, K. D. Odoun of CENALA elicited word and phrase lists in Savè and Tchaourou. (Igué et al. 1993)
2. In November 1992, D. Fisher of SIL Togo-Benin, accompanied by a Beninese research assistant, R. Aguidi,\(^\text{11}\) conducted preliminary interviews with chiefs and elders, and administered six ISQs in Challa-Ogoyi.
3. In January/February 1993, D. H. Hatfield, A. Kluge and D. Fisher (all of SIL Togo-Benin), and S. K. Ntumy of the Ghana Institute of Linguistics, Literacy and Bible Translation (GILLBT), assisted by Aguidi, conducted the third stage of the survey. During this stage, community and individual interviews (including comprehension testing) were conducted and data previously gathered were verified.

In the following sections, more specific information regarding the applied methodology for the third stage will be given concerning procedures, survey locations and subject selection.

#### 4.2.1 Procedures

As mentioned above, a variety of techniques were chosen to investigate the research questions: community and individual interviews, and elicitation of word and phrase lists.

With regard to the administration of questionnaires during individual interviews, it should be noted that some of the questions were omitted if during the course of the interview they were deemed not applicable to a particular subject. This will account for some of the results being based on numbers less than the total number of subjects.

For all interviews, whenever necessary, responses were translated into French by Aguidi, the research assistant, who accompanied the researchers for the entire duration of the field trip. Aguidi did not receive any formal interpreter training for the community and individual interviews. However, he was involved in the test design of various RTT texts, and thus acquired an understanding of the nature of RTT testing.

\(^{10}\) No results from phrase list analysis are included in this report. A complete listing of elicited phrases is presented in Volume 1, Appendix O).

\(^{11}\) Aguidi, an L1 Ica speaker, has a master’s degree in linguistics from the Université Nationale du Bénin (Département d’Études Linguistiques et de Tradition Orale). During stage two of the current study, Aguidi was still a linguistics student at the Université Nationale du Bénin.
4.2.2 Survey locations

Both for community and individual interviews, an attempt was made to choose a representative sample of the surveyed Cabe communities. It was assumed that subjects from more accessible or larger villages might have a higher proficiency in Yoruba or Ife due to more contact with L1 speakers of these speech forms. Therefore, both more accessible or larger villages, as well as more remote or smaller villages were selected in order to compare the gathered data across locations. The following locations were chosen for the administration of community and individual interviews:

- Community questionnaires were administered in two villages: Tchaourou, a more accessible and larger village along highway RNIE 2, and Challa-Ogoyi, a more remote and smaller village.
- Church questionnaires were administered in Tchaourou and Challa-Ogoyi both in the Roman Catholic and the Union des Eglises Evangélique du Bénin (Union of Evangelical Churches of Benin, UEEB) churches.
- Individual interviews were carried out in five Cabe villages. RTT testing was conducted in Kaboua and Kemon, both more remote and smaller villages, and in Goutodo, a more accessible village along highway RNIE 2, while ISQs were administered in Challa-Ogoyi and in Kilibo, the latter a more accessible and larger village along the main road.
- Wordlists were double-checked in two villages of the Cabe language area: in Challa-Ogoyi, a southern village, and in Tchaourou, a northern village.

4.2.3 Subject selection

Community interviews were taken from the gathered village elders as a group, and consensus answers were recorded rather than individual responses. For church interviews, individual answers for the different churches represented were recorded. RTTs and ISQs were administered individually, and individual answers were recorded. The wordlists were checked with groups of long-term resident L1 Cabe speakers, thus allowing for the discussion of variants, near-synonyms and synonyms. In this manner, group decisions were made about which form to include in the lists, thus increasing reliability.

No effort was undertaken to obtain random samples for the RTTs and ISQs, but stratification with respect to location, gender and age was a major aim. Secondarily, inclusion of subjects of various education levels, religions and occupations was endeavored by asking the village elders to try to provide candidates with different backgrounds in these respects. As a result, sample proportions by location, gender, age, education level, religious affiliation and occupation do not necessarily correspond to like ratios of the populations sampled.

The remainder of this section provides more detailed information as to the composition of the survey samples with regard to gender, age, language contact and education.

4.2.3.1 Gender and age by location

In all, 48 subjects from five villages were interviewed, 27 subjects during RTT testing and 21 subjects during the administration of ISQs.
Table 1: Sample by village and social group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>RTT</th>
<th>ISQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goutodo</td>
<td>Kaboua</td>
<td>Kemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SoGrp = Social Group, M = male, F = female, Y = younger (15-25 years), O = older (30-45 years)]

4.2.3.2 Language contact factors

Factors considered to influence the level of proficiency in Yoruba and Ife are residence in and travel to Yoruba- or Ife- speaking areas. Therefore, subjects were asked about their residence and travel patterns, partly to acquire insight into the extent of such residence and travel, but mainly to screen out subjects with extensive exposure to either language. A third factor considered to influence proficiency levels is religious affiliation, based on the assumption that through the use of Yoruba in the church context, Christians might show higher levels of proficiency than non-Christians.

1. Residence patterns

Even though an attempt was made to choose subjects who had not lived in the Yoruba (e.g. Nigeria or Porto-Novo) or Ife language area (e.g. Atakpamé) for longer than one year, it was not always possible to exclude those subjects.

However, overall only a minority of subjects (9/48 – 19%) reported temporary residence (at least one year) in the Yoruba language area. With regard to gender, a higher percentage of male versus female subjects (7/26 – 27% vs 2/22 – 9%) reported such residence while there is no difference in percentage between younger and older subjects (5/26 – 19% vs 4/23 – 17%).

None of the 48 subjects reported temporary residence in the Ife language area.

2. Travel patterns

Overall, there appears to be little contact with Yoruba or Ife speakers through travel.

More than half of the subjects reported never traveling to the Yoruba language area (24/40 – 60%), and about one-third (12/40 – 30%) reported rare travel (<4-6 times / year). Only 4/40 subjects (10%), all males, reported frequent travel (4-6 times / year), among them only one RTT subject. Therefore, Yoruba RTT scores will be analyzed only across “rare” and “no travel.”

---

12 In Challa-Ogoyi subjects were not asked in regard to their travel patterns.
As to the Ife language area, only 1/25 subjects reported frequent travel and 1/25 subjects reported rare travel, while 23/25 subjects (92%) reportedly never travel to the Ife area. None of the RTT subjects reported travel to the Ife area; therefore, Ife RTT scores will not be compared across travel patterns.

4.2.3.3 Education

More than half of the subjects\(^\text{13}\) (23/39 – 59%) reported some level of formal education, among them a higher percentage of male versus female subjects (16/21 – 76% vs 7/18 – 35%), and of younger versus older subjects (17/22 – 77% vs 6/17 – 35%).

4.2.3.4 Religious affiliation

The majority of subjects (41/48 – 85%) reported being Christians (of the Christians, Roman Catholic: 35/43 – 81%, Protestant:\(^\text{14}\) 6/43 – 14%), while 7/48 subjects (15%) reported being Muslims. Among ISQ subjects, only one subject was Muslim while the remaining subjects were Christians. Therefore, ISQ results will not be analyzed in regard to religious affiliation.

4.3 Analysis

All data from the RTTs and ISQs were analyzed without any efforts to compensate for the lack of randomness in the samples.

Statistical significance of differences between RTT scores for different subsamples was consistently established through the Mann-Whitney U test as described by Bergman (1990:14f), with threshold levels of 95% and 98% being applied.

As a measure for the average, the arithmetic mean was used for RTT scores and, in general, the mode for questions.

4.4 Terminology

“Residence Contact:” The term residence contact (res. contact) refers to temporary residence (at least one year) in the Yoruba or Ife language area.

“Significance:” The term significance (sign.), when used without qualification in this report, refers to statistical rather than substantive significance.

“Significant Difference:” Whenever a difference is described as significant without qualification, >98% statistical significance is meant. A difference described as “not significant” refers to <95% statistical significance.

\(^{13}\) In Challa-Ogoyi subjects were not asked whether they had received any formal education.

\(^{14}\) Both Methodist and UEEB church members.
“Marginally significant” refers to a statistical significance between 95% and 98% and is indicated as 95%< – <98%.

“Social Group:” A social group is a subsample defined by gender and age category, i.e. one of younger men, older men, younger women or older women.

“Total:” Totals for RTT scores are based on individual raw scores and not on the chart totals.

“Travel Patterns:” “Frequent travel” refers to travel at least 4–6 times / year to the Yoruba or Ife language area, while “rare travel” is defined as travel <4–6 times / year.

5. Results

In the following sections, the results from community and individual interviews will be presented according to the following topics: dialect intercomprehension, language vitality, language attitudes, bilingualism and attitudes regarding French, and literacy.

5.1 Dialect intercomprehension

With regard to dialect intercomprehension, three factors were examined: (1) the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community, (2) the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife, and (3) the level of comprehension of both Yoruba and Ife throughout the Cabe communities.

5.1.1 Internal comprehension

In this section the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community is examined.

Neither Capo (1989) nor the Ethnologue (Grimes 1996:167) list any dialects of Cabe. However, Cabe elders both from Challa-Ogoyi and from Tchaourou stated that the Cabe people distinguish two varieties of their language, a northern and a southern one; neither variety has a separate name. Therefore, throughout this report both varieties will be referred to as “Cabe-North” and “Cabe-South.” According to community elders in Tchaourou, “Cabe-North” extends south as far as Konkoto (south of Papané), while elders in Challa-Ogoyi gave Toui as an approximate limit. (See Appendix A for a map of the area).

Differences between both varieties are, reportedly, mainly phonological without causing any problems in comprehension. According to the interviewed elders, the differences are due to the fact that speakers from other languages, e.g. Anii, Bariba and Dendi have exercised some influence on the Cabe language in the northern parts of the area, since the northern villages are closer to these language groups. Such influence was reportedly not exercised on the Cabe language in the southern parts. Therefore, according to the interviewed elders in Tchaourou, Cabe-South is regarded as being the purer variety.

15 The interviewed elders referred to Anii as “Bassila.”
5.1.2 Lexical similarity to Yoruba and Ife

In order to establish the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife, both a Cabe-North and a Cabe-South wordlist were elicited and compared with a Yoruba wordlist elicited in Porto-Novo and an Ife wordlist from Tchetti. As regards Cabe-North, a wordlist was elicited and double-checked in Tchaourou, whereas for Cabe-South a wordlist was elicited in Savè and double-checked in Challa-Ogoyi. The lists were analyzed according to prescribed methodology (see Volume 1, Section 4.1.3) in order to determine the degree of lexical similarity between these varieties.

The following results show the percent and variance matrixes. The percent matrix reports the number of lexically similar items as a percentage of the basic vocabulary, while the variance matrix shows the range of error for each count (Wimbish 1989:59)

Table 2: Lexical similarity between Ede varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent matrix</th>
<th>Variance matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabe (Tchaourou)</td>
<td>Cabe (Tchaourou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Cabe (Challa-Ogoyi)</td>
<td>3.3 Cabe (Challa-Ogoyi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 76 Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
<td>5.5 5.5 Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 64 73 Ife (Tchetti)</td>
<td>6.1 6.2 5.7 Ife (Tchetti)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the wordlist analysis show that the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and Yoruba is >80% at the upper confidence limit of the calculations. Between Cabe and Ife the degree of lexical similarity is lower with 70–73% (at the upper confidence limit of the calculation).

For further interpretation of results, “Language Assessment Criteria” (International Language Assessment Conference 1990:2) gives the following recommendations:

[When the wordlist analysis results] indicate a lexical similarity between two speech forms of less than about 70% (at the upper confidence limit of the calculation), this generally indicates that these are different languages. ... If the similarity is more than 70%, dialect intelligibility testing is needed to determine how well people can understand the other speech form.

In view of these guidelines, the results of the wordlist analysis do not seem to indicate, from a linguistic point of view, that Cabe is a different language, either from Yoruba or Ife. Therefore,

---

16 Both lists were originally elicited during the first stage of the survey, in April 1992.
17 See Volume 1, Appendix L for a complete listing of elicited data sorted by gloss and Volume 1, Appendix M for computed percentage and variance matrixes for lexical similarity between all elicited Ede wordlists.
18 Upper confidence limit = percentage + range of error (variance).
19 For the computations in Table 2 and 3, morphemes that are apparently affixed to the form used in another variety are ignored if they occur always in the same position. Including all morphemes in the analysis results in an overall, lower degree of lexical similarity as shown in Table 6 (see Appendix B). (See Volume 1, Appendix K for further details regarding the criteria applied for similarity groupings, Appendix L for a complete listing of elicited data sorted by gloss, and Appendix M for computed percent and variance matrixes for lexical similarity for all elicited Ede wordlists.)
20 These criteria were “approved for general use as administrative guidelines by the Area Directors and Vice Presidents” of SIL based on a statement adopted by participants of the International Language Assessment Conference in Horsleys Green, England in 1989. (International Language Assessment Conference 1990:1).
as pointed out previously, comprehension testing was needed in order to determine how well the Cabe people are able to understand Yoruba and Ife.

As far as Cabe from Challa-Ogoyi and Cabe from Tchaourou are concerned, the results show a degree of lexical similarity between these varieties of 96.3% at the upper confidence limit. These results appear to indicate the existence of a southern and a northern variety of Cabe.

5.1.3 Comprehension of Yoruba

The level of comprehension of Yoruba throughout the Cabe communities will be discussed both from tested and reported data.

5.1.3.1 Tested comprehension

To ascertain the level of Yoruba comprehension, testing was conducted of a story about a personal experience told in Yoruba, and two Yoruba Bible passages. The following sections refer to the RTT results and relevant answers to the accompanying questionnaire. The results listed below show the percentage of correct answers to the comprehension questions. (See Appendix C for a complete listing of raw scores.)

5.1.3.1.1 Narrative

Table 3: RTT scores for Yoruba narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goutodo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboua</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SoGrp = social group; n = number of subjects; %corr = % of correct answers; STD = Standard Deviation weighted in percentage to the n-1]

The average score of 98% is high, indicating high levels of comprehension. More than three-quarters of the subjects (22/27 – 81%) scored at least 95%, while only 5/27 subjects (19%), four of them from Kemon, scored less: 91%. The low standard deviation of 3.65 indicates that there is little variation of comprehension levels across subjects: the range is 91–100%.
There is no significant difference across location, gender, age, language contact or education. Following the RTT, subjects were asked to identify the origin of the narrator of the story. The majority of subjects (14/18 – 78%) correctly identified the narrator as a Yoruba speaker from either Nigeria (13 subjects) or Porto-Novo (one subject). Kétou was given as place of origin by 2/18 subjects and one subject thought the narrator was a Cabe speaker. When asked whether the narrator spoke Yoruba well, the vast majority of subjects (25/28 – 89%) answered affirmatively.

In regard to comprehension of the narrative, subjects were asked if they understood “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing) of the narrative. Almost all subjects (26/27 – 98%) reported having understood “all,” while one subject understood “most.” These data indicate that subjects estimated their level of comprehension correctly.

When asked if the various social groups in the village would understand the story, almost all subjects (25/26 – 96%) anticipated comprehension. Only one subject thought that younger people would not understand the story.


Table 4: RTT scores for Yoruba – Acts 10:1–23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goutodo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboua</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82-91</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77-95</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77-95</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score of 90% is high, indicating high levels of comprehension with two-thirds of the subjects (18/27 – 67%) scoring >90%, while four subjects (4/27 – 15%) scored <80%. The

21 Average scores across gender, age, language contact and education are as follows:
- men versus women: 98% vs 98%, STD: 3.79 vs 3.63, Sign.: <95%;
- young versus old: 98% vs 97%, STD: 3.39 vs 3.68, Sign.: <95%;
- res. contact versus no res. contact: 95% vs 98%, STD: 4.45 vs 3.34, Sign.: <95%;
- rare versus no travel: 96% vs 98%, STD: 4.98 vs 3.41, Sign.: <95%;
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 99% vs 96%, STD: 2.78 vs 4.46, Sign.: <95%.
- Christians versus non-Christians: 98% vs 95%, STD: 3.04 vs 4.98, Sign.: <95%.
A moderate standard deviation of 8.85 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively: the range is 73–100%.

There is no significant difference across location, gender, age, language contact or education.\(^{22}\)

Also, following this RTT, subjects were asked how well they understood the text: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). The vast majority of subjects (23/27 – 85\%) reported having understood “all,” with an overall average test score of 92\%. Among the remaining subjects, two subjects with scores of 95\% and 73\% understood “most,” and two subjects with scores of 82\% and 73\% understood “a little.” These data appear to indicate that subjects estimated their own level of comprehension quite accurately.

5.1.3.1.3 1960 Bible Passage – Luke 19:11–27

Table 5: RTT scores for Yoruba – Luke 19:11–27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goutodo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50-95</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboua</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59-95</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45-100</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45-100</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45-95</td>
<td>18.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73-95</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55-73</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45-100</td>
<td>16.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score of 74\% is rather low, indicating low levels of comprehension for this text. Only 7/27 subjects (26\%) scored >90\% (five of them male subjects, and five of them younger subjects), while two-thirds of the subjects (17/27 – 63\%) scored <80\%. The high standard deviation of 16.04 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects vary extensively: the range is 45–100%.

\(^{22}\) Average scores across gender, age, language contact and education are as follows:

- men versus women: 91\% vs 90\%, STD: 9.17 vs 8.85, Sign.: <95\%;
- young versus old: 93\% vs 88\%, STD: 9.04 vs 7.83, Sign.: <95\%;
- res. contact versus no res. contact: 96\% vs 89\%, STD: 3.80 vs 9.16, Sign.: <95\%;
- rare versus no travel: 92\% vs 90\%, STD: 6.74 vs 9.52, Sign.: <95\%;
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 94\% vs 98\%, STD: 7.92 vs 8.47, Sign.: <95\%;
- Christians versus non-Christians: 91\% vs 89\%, STD: 8.68 vs 10.23, Sign.: <95\%;
Again, there is no significant difference across location, gender, age, language contact or education.\textsuperscript{23}

Also following this Bible passage, subjects were asked how well they understood the text: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). The comparison of the self-reported comprehension performance with the actual comprehension scores indicates that subjects overestimated their own test performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“all”:</td>
<td>20/25 (80%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“most”:</td>
<td>4/26 (16%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a little”:</td>
<td>1/25 (4%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.3.2 Reported proficiency

With regard to reported proficiency of Yoruba, subjects were asked if they understand and speak Yoruba, and more specifically about higher-level language functions.

The majority of subjects reported passive abilities in Yoruba. General understanding ability was reported by 44/45 subjects (98%), and 42/48 subjects (88%) reported ability to always understand everything when they hear Yoruba people speaking. In addition, ISQ subjects were asked if they listen to radio broadcasts in Yoruba, and if so, whether they understand everything they hear. All subjects (21/21) who reported listening to radio broadcasts in Yoruba, stated that they understand everything.

A considerably lower percentage of subjects reported productive abilities in Yoruba. General speaking ability was reported by 35/46 subjects (76%), and about half of the subjects (28/48 – 58%) reported ability to always say everything they want to say in Yoruba.

Compared across location, the data do not indicate any link between geographical location, i.e. accessibility, and reported proficiency in Yoruba. In regard to social group, language contact and education, the responses to some questions indicate that there is no apparent difference across subjects. However, the responses to other questions indicate higher percentages for Yoruba proficiency for male versus female subjects, younger versus older subjects, subjects with contact due to residence and travel patterns\textsuperscript{24} versus subjects without such contact, and educated versus uneducated subjects. Further it is noted, that, overall a considerably higher percentage of ISQ subjects versus RTT subjects reported proficiency in Yoruba. (See Appendix D for details.)

\textsuperscript{23} Average scores across gender, age, language contact and education are as follows:
- men versus women: 75% vs 73%, STD: 17.84 vs 14.22, Sign.: <95%;
- young versus old: 79% vs 69%, STD: 16.95 vs 13.55, Sign.: <95%;
- res. contact versus no res. contact: 78% vs 73%, STD: 14.87 vs 16.47, Sign.: <95%;
- rare versus no travel: 82% vs 72%, STD: 22.03 vs 14.36, Sign.: <95%;
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 79% vs 71%, STD: 17.07 vs 13.07, Sign.: <95%.
- Christians versus non-Christians: 77% vs 64%, STD: 15.24 vs 15.48, Sign.: <95%.

\textsuperscript{24} It is noted that only a small number of subjects with contact due to residence and travel patterns were interviewed. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the data are representative of the whole language community.
Subjects were also asked about second language (L2) abilities of children. When asked about the age at which children in their villages are able to understand Yoruba, the majority of subjects (18/21 – 86%) stated that children between the ages of 5–12 years are able to understand Yoruba, while 3/22 subjects (9%) stated that children must be older than 12 years. One subject did not give a precise age, but reported that children are able to understand Yoruba when they mingle with Yoruba-speaking children. Productive abilities of their own children were reported only by 1/12 subjects. However, the subject explained later that his child learned Yoruba as a young adult at the age of 18 years.

In regard to comprehension of Yoruba in the church context, the representatives of four surveyed churches stated that their congregations understand well enough the Bible readings in Yoruba from the 1960 translation. In addition, the representatives of the Protestant church of Tchaourou stated that they have no difficulties in expressing biblical doctrines or concepts in Yoruba. As regards children’s comprehension of Yoruba, representatives of all four churches stated that children do not understand Yoruba. Only one representative of the UEEB church of Tchaourou, an L1 Yoruba speaker, stated that the children understand Yoruba.

5.1.3.3 Summary

In regard to tested comprehension of spoken Yoruba, the average score of 98% for the narrative is high indicating high levels of comprehension for the whole text. At the same time, the low standard deviation of 3.65 shows that there is little variation of comprehension levels across subjects. Thus, it can be concluded that the average level of comprehension of Yoruba among the Cabe people is also high, if the subjects are representative of the community.

As far as tested comprehension of both Bible passages is concerned, the average scores differ considerably between the 1987 translation passage (Acts 10:1–23) and the 1960 translation passage (Luke 19:11–27): the high average score of 90% and moderate standard deviation of 8.85 indicate that comprehension of the 1987 translation passage is high, and that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively, while the low average of 74% and high standard deviation of 16.04 indicate that comprehension of the 1960 translation passage is low with extensive variation across subjects. It is assumed that this difference is due to the different language registers employed in the two translations. The 1960 translation is, according to B. Elegbe (1993, personal communication), former member of the Alliance Biblique au Bénin (Bible Society of Benin) in Cotonou, marked by a rather antiquated register of language. The 1987 translation is close to Yoruba as spoken in Nigeria today and, therefore, easier to understand.\(^{25}\)

There are no significant differences across either location, gender, age, language contact or education for any one of the tested texts.

The high average scores for the narrative and the passage from the 1987 New Testament translation are paralleled by the results for reported dialect comprehension, with high percentages of subjects reporting passive abilities including higher-level language functions; percentages for productive abilities are considerably lower.

\(^{25}\text{For more details regarding both translations see Volume 1, Section 1.7.1.}\)
Compared across social group and language contact, reported data, overall, do not indicate a clear link between proficiency in Yoruba and any of these factors. In regard to the differences across interview types, the overall lower percentages for RTT subjects could be due to the fact that the RTT questionnaire was administered after the testing. It is likely that listening to the texts first increased the subjects’ overall awareness of their own language abilities, thus giving a more realistic picture of the subjects’ proficiency.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, the majority of subjects stated that children between the ages of 5–12 years are able to understand Yoruba, while none of the subjects reported that their children speak Yoruba.

In regard to comprehension of Yoruba in the church context, the representatives of four surveyed churches stated that their congregations understand well enough the Bible readings in Yoruba from the 1960 translation and that they themselves have no difficulties in expressing biblical doctrines or concepts in Yoruba. As regards children’s comprehension of Yoruba, almost all representatives reported that children do not understand Yoruba.

5.1.4 Comprehension of Ife

The level of dialect comprehension of Ife throughout the Cabe communities will be discussed both from tested and reported data.

5.1.4.1 Tested comprehension

Testing of an Ife narrative was to be conducted to ascertain the level of comprehension and was commenced in three Cabe villages. However, after the majority of subjects showed extreme difficulties in following and understanding the story, indicating very low levels of comprehension, testing was discontinued in all three villages in order not to discourage subjects.

1. Kemon:

   The narrative was administered to six subjects with only two of them trying to answer all 12 questions. Most subjects (7/9) did not even try to answer approximately 30% of the questions, expressing that they did not understand the text at all. The majority of answers given were incorrect.

   Given their poor test performance, subjects were very discouraged and, therefore, testing of the Ife narrative was discontinued. It was further decided that testing in Goutodo and Kaboua would also be discontinued if subjects showed very low comprehension in order not to discourage them.

2. Goutodo:

   Testing was conducted only with five subjects with all of them stating that they did not to understand the text at all. Therefore, in order not to discourage them they were administered only 3–6 questions to verify their non-comprehension. However, only two subjects tried to answer some of the questions. The remaining subjects made no attempts at
all to answer, stating that they did not understand any of the story. Thus, after five subjects the administration of the test was discontinued.

3. Kaboua:

Only three subjects listened to the first part of the Ife narrative, and one subject listened to the whole story. Again, subjects either did not answer the questions at all, claiming non-comprehension, or they gave incorrect answers. Thus, after four subjects, testing in Ife was discontinued.

Given that RTT testing of the Ife narrative had to be discontinued, the RTT questionnaire was administered only to a few subjects.

Following the RTT, subjects were asked whether the narrator’s manner of speaking was “très” (very) or “un peu” (a little) different from Cabe. The majority of subjects (9/12 – 75%) stated that his speech form was “very” different from Cabe, while 3/12 subjects (25%) stated that it was only “a little” different.

When asked to identify the origin of the narrator of the story, none of the 13 subjects identified the narrator correctly as an Ife speaker. The majority of subjects (9/13 – 69%) thought he was an Idaca speaker from Dassa, while 4/13 subjects (31%) thought he was an Ica speaker, with two subjects specifying he was from Bantè. The geographical location of the Ica, Idaca and Ife language areas is most likely the reason why subjects identified the narrator’s language as either an Idaca or an Ica speaker.26

Regarding their comprehension of the narrative, subjects were asked if they understood “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing) of the story. Two-thirds of the subjects (8/12 – 67%) reported having understood “a little” and 3/12 subjects (25%) understood “very little” while only one subject understood “most.” A comparison of the self-reported comprehension performance with the actual poor test performance of subjects indicates that subjects over-estimated their own test performance.

When asked if the various social groups in the village would understand the story, only 4/11 subjects (36%) anticipated comprehension, with three of them anticipating comprehension for men, while one subject anticipated comprehension for younger women.

5.1.4.2 Reported proficiency

With regard to reported proficiency of Ife, subjects were asked if they understand and speak Ife. As regards passive abilities, ISQ subjects were asked if they understand Ife, while RTT subjects were asked how well they understand Ife speakers when talking to them: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). About two-thirds of the subjects (20/31 – 65%) reported ability to understand Ife: 11/19 (58%) ISQ, and 9/12 (75%) RTT27 subjects. Among RTT subjects, 2/12 (17%) reported that they understand “most,” while

---

26 Geographically, the Cabe area is separated from the Ife area by the Idaca area, located southwest of the Cabe area. The major road leading to the Ife area passes through the Idaca area. The Ica area is located north of the Beninese Ife area.

27 Only RTT subjects reporting that they understand “all,” “most,” or “a little” are included.
7/12 (58%) subjects understand “a little.” The remaining two RTT subjects understand only “very little” (two subjects) or “nothing” (one subject).

Compared across social group, the data show slightly higher percentages of male versus female subjects (11/16 – 69% vs 8/14 – 57%) and higher percentages of older versus younger subjects (12/16 – 75% vs 7/14 – 50%) reporting comprehension.

As for productive abilities, only 1/28 subjects reported ability to speak Ife.

Regarding L2 abilities of children, ISQ subjects were asked about the age at which children in their villages are able to understand Ife speakers. The majority of subjects (8/12 – 67%) gave ages of 8–12 years, while 2/12 subjects (17%) said that children must be older than 15 years; 2/12 subjects could not indicate any precise age. None of the 12/21 subjects with children reported that their children speak Ife.

5.1.4.3 Summary

Due to lack of comprehension, RTT testing of an Ife narrative had to be discontinued in all three surveyed Cabe communities, indicating very low levels of comprehension of Ife among the Cabe people, if the subjects are representative of the community.

The results from the RTT testing do not appear to be in agreement with reported data: about two-thirds of the subjects stated that they understand Ife. Speaking ability in Ife was only reported by 1/28 subjects.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, two-thirds of the subjects stated that children between the ages of 8–12 years are able to understand Ife, while none of the subjects reported that their children speak Ife.

5.1.5 Summary of dialect intercomprehension

To investigate dialect intercomprehension, three factors were examined: (1) the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community, (2) the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife, and (3) the level of comprehension of both Yoruba and Ife throughout the Cabe communities.

With regard to internal comprehension, community elders reported the existence of two varieties: a northern and a southern variety, with the latter being regarded the purer variety. However, neither variety has a separate name and differences between them are reportedly mainly phonological without causing any problems in comprehension.

As far as lexical similarity is concerned, the results appear to confirm the existence of a northern and a southern variety of Cabe. As regards the degree of lexical similarity to Yoruba and Ife, the results show, at the upper confidence limit, a lexical similarity of >80% between Cabe and Yoruba and of 70–73% between Cabe and Ife, indicating that Cabe speakers may be able to understand Yoruba and Ife. However, it was necessary to verify the lexico-statistical results through further comprehension testing.
Concerning levels of comprehension of Yoruba, the results for tested data show high average scores and low or moderate standard deviations for the narrative (98%, STD of 3.65) and the Bible passage from the 1987 translation (90%, STD of 8.85) indicating that the general level of comprehension of Yoruba among the Cabe people is high. In regard to the considerably lower average score of 74% (STD of 16.04) for the Bible passage from the 1960 translation, it is assumed that this result is due to the antiquated language of this translation. There are no significant differences across either location, gender or age for any one of the tested texts.

The high RTT results are paralleled by reported data with rather high percentages of subjects reporting passive language abilities in Yoruba while lower percentages reported productive abilities. In regard to L2 abilities of children, more than three-quarters of the subjects stated that children between the ages of 5–12 years are able to understand Yoruba. Concerning reported comprehension of Yoruba in the church context, the representatives of four surveyed churches stated that their congregations understand well enough the Bible readings in Yoruba. At the same time, however, almost all representative reported that children do not understand Yoruba.

Regarding comprehension of Ife, testing of an Ife narrative had to be discontinued due to reported lack of comprehension. This situation indicates that comprehension levels of Ife throughout the Cabe area are low, if the subjects are representative of the community. The results from the RTT testing do not appear to be in agreement with reported data with about two-thirds of the subjects stating that they understand Ife. Regarding L2 abilities for children, two-thirds of the subjects stated that children between the ages of 8–12 years are able to understand Ife.

### 5.2 Language vitality

Language vitality of Cabe was investigated through reported data with regard to language use patterns in various social domains, both public and private, as well as with regard to intergenerational shift.

#### 5.2.1 Language use in private domains

Interviewed subjects were asked which language(s) they use with various interlocutors in private domains.

Almost all subjects reported use of Cabe with parents (46/47 – 98%), spouse (38/39 – 97%) and children (11/12). Of the remaining subjects, one subject reported speaking Yoruba with his Yoruba L1 father, while another one reported speaking Gun with her Gun L1 mother and spouse, and with her children.28

Regarding language use outside the home domain, all ISQ subjects (21/21) reported almost exclusive use of Cabe with their Cabe friends, neighbors, elders, at work or on the farm. Only a few subjects, all of them from Kilibo, reported additional use of French with friends (4/21 – 19%), neighbors (2/21 – 10%), elders (1/21), and at work or on the farm (4/21 – 19%). When RTT subjects were asked whether they ever use Yoruba with their Cabe friends, the majority of

28 Another subject, excluded from the total, reported the use of French, English and some Dendi at home. However, this information seems unusual, since both of his parents and his spouse are L1 Cabe speakers.
subjects (11/15 – 73%) reported exclusive use of Cabe. The remaining four subjects, all of them younger, reported use of Yoruba explaining that they speak it for pleasure.

In regard to language use by children, all 20 subjects reported that in their villages children use Cabe while playing with other children. Only one younger female reported additional use of French by children when playing.

Concerning language use by the youth, interviewed subjects were asked how well, in their opinion, the youth speak Cabe. Overall, two-thirds of ISQ subjects (14/21 – 67%) thought that the young people do not speak Cabe correctly. In Kilibo subjects were asked whether young people still speak Cabe “comme il faut” (as they should) while in Challa-Ogoyi subjects were asked if the young people speak Cabe “de moins en moins” (less and less).

In Kilibo, half of the subjects (6/13 – 46%) reported that the young people, especially those who have been to school, do not speak Cabe “as they should” but that they mix Cabe with French. In addition, it was explained that some young people do not pronounce the words correctly, thus spoiling the language. All subjects considered this situation a negative development. In Challa-Ogoyi, all subjects (8/8) reported that the young people speak Cabe “less and less,” stating that the young people mix their language with French. While two young male subjects regarded this as a positive development, two older females stated the necessity of expressing oneself well in one’s first language. The remaining subjects passed no judgment on this issue.

5.2.2 Language use in public domains

During the administration of ISQs, subjects were also asked which language(s) they use with various interlocutors in more public domains.

In regard to language use in the markets, all subjects (21/21) reported use of Cabe in the local market, with additional use of Yoruba reported by 2/21 subjects (10%) and of French by 1/21 subjects. In the regional market, 14/19 subjects (74%) use Cabe, while 5/19 subjects (26%) use Yoruba and 7/19 (27%) use French, in addition to or instead of Cabe. The increased use of Yoruba in the regional market is most likely due to the fact that here more Yoruba speakers from Nigeria can be found.

In offices of the sous-préfecture, half of the subjects (11/21 – 52%), six of them from Kilibo, use Cabe, while 12/21 subjects (57%) use French, in addition to or instead of Cabe.

5.2.3 Language use with non-Cabe speakers

During the individual interviews, subjects were also asked which language(s) they use in their interactions with non-Cabe speakers.

With Yoruba speakers, more than half of the subjects use Yoruba (17/31 – 55%). Among the remaining subjects, 3/20 ISQ subjects (15%) mix Yoruba and Cabe, while 6/20 ISQ subjects (30%), all of them from Challa-Ogoyi, reported exclusive use of Cabe. Compared across

---

29 ISQ subjects were asked which language they use with Yoruba speakers: 11/20 subjects (55%) gave Yoruba; RTT subjects were asked whether they ever use Yoruba with Yoruba speakers: 6/11 (55%) responded affirmatively.
location, Kilibo, a more accessible village along the major road, shows a higher percentage regarding use of Yoruba (9/12 – 75%) than Challa-Ogoyi (3/12 – 25%), a more remote and smaller village. However, the sample sizes are too small to draw valid conclusions from these findings.

For interactions with speakers of other Ede varieties, the vast majority of subjects reported use of Cabe with Ica speakers (18/20 – 90%) and with Idaca speakers (12/13 – 92%). The remaining subjects, all of them younger, reported use of French. Also as regards communication with Ife speakers, most of the subjects (19/23 – 83%) reported use of Cabe. Among the remaining subjects, two reported use of French, and one use of Yoruba, while another one stated he would need an interpreter when communicating with Ife speakers.

5.2.4 Language use in the church context

Representatives of four different churches were interviewed with regard to language use in the church context.

In the four churches, Cabe, Yoruba and French are used to varying degrees by the various churches. Use of Cabe both during and outside the service/mass appears to be predominant in Challa-Ogoyi. In contrast, in Tchaourou use of Cabe appears to be limited to meetings outside the service/mass while Yoruba is the preferred language for activities during the service/mass. This situation is reportedly due to the fact that because of the mixed population of the town not all church members understand Cabe well enough. In the four surveyed churches the Bible is always read in Yoruba and simultaneous translations into Cabe are regarded as unnecessary. Concerning available Bible translations, all representatives stated that they were unaware of the existence of the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation.

5.2.5 Summary of language vitality

Cabe is the preferred language of the Cabe people and is being used in all domains.

In private domains, Cabe is used almost exclusively within and without the home domain. Also in more public domains and in interactions with non-Cabe speakers, Cabe is widely used; however, Yoruba and French are also used in addition to or instead of Cabe. Concerning intergenerational change, the reported data indicate that Cabe is also the preferred language of children. With regard to the youth, however, people maintained that some young people are not speaking Cabe well and that they are mixing in French vocabulary.

In the church context, Cabe, Yoruba and French are used to varying degrees by the various churches. Overall, use of Cabe appears to be predominant for activities outside the service/mass.

---

30 No information regarding language use with Idaca speakers was obtained in Challa-Ogoyi.
31 a) Among ISQ subjects, nine subjects from Kilibo did not respond to the question, expressing that they never have contact with Ife speakers.
   b) RTT subjects were not asked directly which language they use for interactions with Ife speakers: after the administration of the Ife narrative they were asked which language they use when talking to speakers from “là-bas” (over there), i.e. with people who speak the language of the narrator. Given that the majority of subjects did not identify the origin of the narrator correctly (see Section 5.1.4.1), it is likely that subjects responding to this question did in actual fact not refer to Ife.
During the service/mass some churches use Cabe while others, especially those with non-Cabe members, use Yoruba. As far as Yoruba Bible translations are concerned, it was reported that the 1960 translation of the Bible is used while the 1987 translation of the New Testament is unknown.

5.3 Language attitudes

During both community and individual interviews, language attitudes toward Cabe and its potential development were investigated, as well as attitudes toward the oral and written forms both of Yoruba and Ife.

5.3.1 Attitudes toward Cabe and its development

With regard to Cabe development, ISQ subjects in Challa-Ogoyi and Kilibo were asked if they thought it would be a “good thing” for the Cabe people to be literate in Cabe. All subjects (21/21) responded affirmatively, stating that a literacy program in Cabe would promote progress and the preservation of their language and culture. One younger male from Kilibo stated that he thought the Cabe people were somewhat “en retard” (behind) because their language was not developed. He reported further having done some writing in Cabe and teaching Cabe speakers to read and write Cabe and Yoruba. Subjects in Kilibo were also asked if they would want to enroll in a Cabe literacy class if one were established in their village. All subjects (7/7) responded affirmatively expressing their desire to be literate in their language.

At the same time, while reporting positive attitudes toward the development of Cabe, some subjects mentioned that they personally prefer Yoruba for reading and writing. One older male doubted the success of a Cabe language development project due to the small number of Cabe speakers and its potentially limited use to other Ede speech communities. Further, an older female expressed concern that Cabe speakers already literate in Yoruba would not be interested in becoming literate in Cabe.

In regard to the choice of a potential reference variety, elders in Tchaourou stated that the southern variety is regarded as the purer variety and, therefore, more suitable for development than the northern variety where speakers of other languages have exercised some influence on the language.

To probe more indirectly with regard to the choice of a reference dialect, ISQ subjects in Challa-Ogoyi and Kilibo were asked where the best place was to learn Cabe. All subjects (20/20) named their own villages; in addition, two subjects from Kilibo mentioned Savè, in the southern part of the language area.

5.3.2 Attitudes toward Yoruba and Ife

During individual interviews, ISQ subjects were asked questions related to their attitudes toward spoken Yoruba. All 21 subjects professed positive attitudes about the ability to speak and understand Yoruba, since it is the regional language of wider communication and thus important for communication and work. In addition, it was stated that the Cabe and Yoruba people are the
same and that Yoruba is like Cabe. Thus, speaking Yoruba enables them to live together as one people. At the same time, however, it was also claimed that the Cabe and Yoruba people belong to ethnically distinct groups and that their speech forms differ.

When subjects in Kilibo were asked if they would like to be literate in Yoruba or Ife, 3/3 subjects responded affirmatively with regard to Yoruba and 5/6 (83%) with regard to Ife. The remaining subject who responded negatively to Ife explained that she does not have any contact with Ife speakers. Therefore, she would prefer Yoruba for written purposes given that there are no Cabe literacy classes.

In Kilibo, two men who organized the administration of the individual interviews complained that the government had sent Fon speakers to teach literacy classes in Kilibo. According to both organizers, the Cabe people would accept Yoruba speakers to organize Yoruba literacy classes, but not Fon speakers nor speakers of other languages to organize literacy classes in their languages.

5.3.3 Attitudes in the church context

During interviews with church representatives, several questions were asked to explore attitudes toward Cabe and its development, as well as attitudes toward oral and written Yoruba in the church context.

When asked whether the use of Cabe in the church context is appropriate, the representatives of the UEEB church of Challa-Ogoyi responded affirmatively, while those of the UEEB church of Tchaourou responded negatively. The latter explained that the congregation understands Yoruba and that there are some church members who do not understand Cabe. At the same time, however, they stated that their congregation would prefer the use of Cabe in church over the use of Yoruba or French. This view was shared by the representatives of the other churches. In addition, the UEEB church of Tchaourou reported that their youth group had already expressed a desire to exclusively use Cabe during their meetings.

Regarding Cabe language development, all representatives reported that their congregations had already communicated interest in Bible translation and the development of religious materials in Cabe, as well as interest in Cabe literacy. However, regarding literacy, the congregations had also expressed willingness to attend literacy classes in Yoruba.

The representatives themselves also expressed interest in language development and Cabe Bible translation, explaining that a translation in their own speech form was preferable. As regards past development efforts, the representatives of the UEEB church of Challa-Ogoyi and the Catholic church of Tchaourou stated that their congregations had already sought assistance for the promotion of a literacy program; however, it remains unclear whether this assistance was sought for a literacy program in Cabe or in Yoruba. The representatives of the UEEB church of Tchaourou reported that from 1963 to 1965 their church had begun Cabe Bible translation, but

---

32 The majority stated further that they would also like to be literate in Ica (5/7 – 71%) or Idaca (6/7 – 86%).
33 This issue was not raised with the Catholic church of Challa-Ogoyi.
34 The question itself was somewhat ambiguous since the language was not specified: “Has your church ever asked someone to come and do a translation of the Bible / a literacy program?” (“Votre église a-t-elle jamais demandé à quelqu’un de venir et faire une traduction de la Bible / un program d’alphabétisation?”)
the undertaking had proved to be too difficult. Only the representatives of the Catholic church of Challa-Ogoyi reported no efforts at all; they stated though that their priest encourages them to promote Cabe language development. When asked whether their congregations had already produced some materials, representatives of all four churches responded affirmatively; however, it remains unclear whether these materials were in Cabe or in Yoruba.

Concerning the potential involvement of their churches in a multi-denominational translation project, all representatives thought that they would receive permission to be involved in such a project.

The church representatives were also interviewed regarding the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation. As previously mentioned, the representatives stated that this translation was unknown to them. When copies of passages from the letter of Jude and from the book of Luke were distributed, all representatives expressed interest in using this New Testament in their church, explaining it was easy to read and to understand. When asked to compare this translation with the 1960 translation, the representatives of the UEEB church of Tchaourou and the Catholic church of Challa-Ogoyi stated that due to its modern language and the tone markings, the 1987 translation is easier both to understand and to read. The representatives of the remaining two churches wanted to study and compare the 1987 translation first before passing any judgment.

5.3.4 Summary of language attitudes

Overall, attitudes toward Cabe and its development, as well as toward Yoruba and Ife, appear to be positive.

As for the development of Cabe, all subjects professed positive attitudes, stating that a literacy program in Cabe would promote progress and the preservation of their language and culture; it is noted though that many subjects prefer Yoruba for reading and writing. As far as the choice of a potential reference dialect for language development is concerned, elders stated that the southern variety where the purest Cabe is spoken should be chosen. Concerning spoken Cabe, the majority of subjects thought that the young people do not speak Cabe correctly.

In the church context, expressed attitudes toward Cabe language development and Bible translation were positive; representatives reported that their congregations had already expressed an interest in Cabe Bible translation and literacy. However, past efforts at Cabe Bible translation appear to have been very limited. Concerning the potential involvement of their churches in a multi-denominational translation project, all representatives thought that they would receive permission to be involved in such a project.

Attitudes toward both the oral and written forms of Yoruba appear to be positive with subjects stating that the Yoruba and Cabe people are the same, and that Yoruba is like Cabe. However, subjects also claimed that the Cabe and Yoruba people belong to ethnically distinct groups and that their speech forms differ.

Also, within the church context, attitudes toward written Yoruba appear to be positive, but no efforts at Yoruba literacy within the church context were reported. As far as the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation is concerned, all representatives expressed interest, explaining that it was easy both to read and to understand.
5.4 Bilingualism and attitudes regarding French

As previously stated, the investigation of bilingualism and attitudes regarding French was not a primary concern of this survey and questions concerning French only appeared on the individual sociolinguistic questionnaire.

All interviewed subjects stated that they both speak and understand French (15/15). In addition, all subjects (21/21) professed positive attitudes regarding the ability to speak and understand French.

Subjects with children were also asked about the L2 abilities of their children. Of those subjects who reported having children, 12/20 (60%) reported that their children speak French, explaining that their children started learning it when they enrolled in school.

5.5 Literacy

Both RTT and ISQ subjects were asked if they were able to read and write in Yoruba, while only ISQ subjects were asked about their reading and writing abilities in French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yoruba</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30/48 (63%)</td>
<td>15/21 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24/47 (51%)</td>
<td>15/21 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the majority of subjects reported being literate both in Yoruba and in French with higher percentages in French.

Across social group, higher percentages of male versus female subjects and of younger versus older subjects reported being literate in Yoruba and in French.\(^{35}\) In terms of education, all subjects reporting being literate in French also reported some level of formal education. However, reading ability in Yoruba was claimed by a considerable percentage of uneducated subjects (5/15 – 33%).

ISQ subjects were also asked whether they had ever tried to write Cabe. About half of the subjects (10/21 – 48%) answered affirmatively, among them 8/8 subjects from Challa-Ogoyi versus 2/13 subjects from Kilibo (15%).\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{35}\) Male versus female subjects:

- **Yoruba:**
  - Reading: 20/25 – 80% vs 10/21 – 48%
  - Writing: 17/25 – 68% vs 7/21 – 33%
- **French:**
  - Reading and writing: 9/11 – 82% vs 6/10 – 60%

\(^{36}\) Information regarding formal education was obtained in Kilibo but not in Challa-Ogoyi. Both subjects from Kilibo reporting efforts to write in Cabe are educated.
6. Conclusions

The purpose of this survey was to assess whether and to what extent existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba and Ife could extend to the Cabe communities, or whether an additional language-based development program in Cabe would be beneficial, and to gather data that would help determine the nature and extent of SIL’s possible involvement among these communities. The following areas were investigated:

1. Level of dialect intercomprehension;
2. Language vitality of Cabe;
3. Language attitudes toward Cabe, Yoruba and Ife.

In addition, there are the peripheral factors about which data were gathered during the survey: reported proficiency and attitudes regarding French, as well as education and literacy levels. These data have been previously presented and will not be discussed in further detail.

6.1 Dialect intercomprehension

With regard to dialect intercomprehension, three factors were examined: (1) the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community, (2) the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife, and (3) the level of comprehension of both Yoruba and Ife throughout the Cabe communities.

First, with regard to the degree of internal comprehension within the Cabe speech community, community elders reported the existence of two varieties, a northern and a southern variety. Differences between the varieties are reported to be mainly phonological without causing any comprehension problems.

The second factor to be considered is the degree of lexical similarity between Cabe and both Yoruba and Ife. The results show, at the upper confidence limit, a lexical similarity of >80% between Cabe and Yoruba and of 70–73% between Cabe and Ife, indicating that, in accordance with previously established guidelines for wordlist analysis, Cabe speakers may be able to understand Yoruba and Ife. Further the results appear to confirm the existence of a northern and a southern variety of Cabe.

Finally, in regard to the third factor concerning comprehension, the RTT results show average scores of 98% for the tested Yoruba narrative (STD of 3.65), and of 90% for the Bible passage in modern Yoruba (STD of 8.85).37 As regards Ife, comprehension testing of a narrative had to be discontinued due to lack of comprehension. Applying Marmor’s (1997:2f) above-mentioned guidelines38 by which to draw conclusions from comprehension testing results, the overall average of Yoruba comprehension can be defined as “high,” whereas Ife comprehension can be defined as “inadequate.” Marmor specifies further that this classification refers to all segments of the population. The RTT results of the three Yoruba texts do not indicate any significant differences across location, gender or age.

37 As far as the lower average score of 74% (STD of 16.04) for the Bible passage from the 1960 translation is concerned, it is assumed that this rather low average score is due to the antiquated language of this translation.
38 For more details, see Footnote 8 in Section 3.
Given these findings, it appears that the Cabe communities could benefit from existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba, but not from those in Ife, and that there is no need\textsuperscript{39} for SIL to be involved in a language development effort for Cabe.

### 6.2 Language vitality

Based on reported data gathered during community and individual interviews, it appears that Cabe continues to be used in all public and private domains across social groupings. With regard to the youth, however, interviewees evaluated that some young people are not speaking Cabe well and that they are mixing in French vocabulary. Given the overall rather low levels of formal education and, thus, presumably rather low levels of French proficiency, it does not appear likely that the reported mixing of Cabe with French should be taken as an indication of possible language shift and endangerment. Rather, these expressions could be taken as revealing positive attitudes toward Cabe in that interviewees feel that there is a right way to speak Cabe and that their language should be valued. Thus, in the opinion of the author it can be concluded that, overall, there are no indications of occurring or impending language shift toward any of the local L2s or French.

In the church context, Cabe appears to be used predominantly in churches with mainly Cabe-speaking congregations, while Yoruba appears to be the preferred language in churches with non-Cabe members. For the Bible readings the 1960 Yoruba translation is used with simultaneous translations into Cabe being regarded as unnecessary, while the 1987 translation of the Yoruba New Testament is unknown.

### 6.3 Language attitudes

Overall, the attitudes of the Cabe communities toward their language and its development appear to be positive. Concerning the choice of a reference dialect for language development, the southern variety seems to be preferable. Positive attitudes toward Cabe language development and especially Bible translation were also expressed by interviewed church representatives who thought that they would receive permission to be involved in a multi-denominational translation project. However, community-initiated attempts at Cabe language development both within and without the church context seem to be very limited.

Attitudes toward Yoruba also appear to be positive, with subjects stating that the Yoruba and Cabe people are the same and that Yoruba is like Cabe. However, subjects also claimed that the Cabe and Yoruba people belong to ethnically distinct groups and that their speech forms differ.

Within the church domain, attitudes toward written Yoruba also appear to be positive. However, no efforts at Yoruba literacy were reported. As far as the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation is concerned, all representatives expressed interest in its use explaining that it was easy both to read and to understand.

\textsuperscript{39} “Need refers here to the point of view of SIL \textit{vis-a-vis} the allocation of its resources” (Marmor 1997:2).
6.4 Summary

To restate the final conclusions, the data on dialect intercomprehension and language attitudes indicate that the Cabe communities could be linked to existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba but not to those in Ife, and that, therefore, there is no need for SIL to pursue a language development program in Cabe. However, due to positive attitudes toward language development and Bible translation, a community-based language development program appears possible.
Appendices

Appendix A. Maps of the Cabe language area

The following maps are based on the information given by chiefs and elders in the Cabe language area:

100% Cabe  Cabe + other language  Non-Cabe

A.1. Cabe-North
A.2. Cabe-South
Appendix B. Lexical similarity

For this computation, morphemes that are apparently affixed to the form used in another variety are included in the analysis. 40

Table 6: Lexical similarity between Ede varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent matrix</th>
<th>Variance matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabe (Tchaourou)</td>
<td>Cabe (Tchaourou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabe (Challa-Ogoyi)</td>
<td>Cabe (Challa-Ogoyi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
<td>Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife (Tchetti)</td>
<td>Ife (Tchetti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 See Volume 1, Appendix K for further details regarding the criteria applied for similarity groupings, Appendix L for a complete listing of elicited data sorted by gloss and Appendix M for computed percent and variance matrices for lexical similarity for all elicited Ede wordlists.
Appendix C. RTT results: Raw scores

C.1. Yoruba narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ#</th>
<th>#CORR</th>
<th>#TOT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goutodo:</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboua:</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemon:</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:

SUBJ# = subject number, #CORR = number of correct answers, #TOT = number of total possible correct answers.
## C.2. Yoruba Bible passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#CORR</td>
<td>#TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goutodo:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 17</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaboua:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 24</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 28</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 21</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 27</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 22</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kemon:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Proficiency in Yoruba: Reported data in detail

D.1. Comparison across questionnaire types

ISQ subjects versus RTT subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HghCmp</th>
<th>GenPrf</th>
<th>HghPrf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISQ</td>
<td>19/21</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>18/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT</td>
<td>23/27</td>
<td>14/25</td>
<td>10/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenPrf</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghPrf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.2. Comparison across location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HghCmp</th>
<th>GenPrf</th>
<th>HghPrf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challa-Ogoyi</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goutodo</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaboua</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemon</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilibo</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenPrf</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghPrf</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3. Comparison across social group

D.3.1. Gender

Male versus female subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HghCmp</th>
<th>GenPrf</th>
<th>HghPrf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>20/25</td>
<td>16/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenPrf</td>
<td>26/22</td>
<td>15/20</td>
<td>12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghPrf</td>
<td>12/22</td>
<td>12/22</td>
<td>12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenPrf</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HghPrf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 a) ISQ subjects from Challa-Ogoyi were asked whether they speak and understand Porto-Novo Yoruba. Three subjects reported that they could not speak it, but that they could understand it. However, when asked whether they can always say everything they want to say in Yoruba, two of these subjects answered affirmatively, while one subject answered negatively. At the same time all three of them reported reading and writing ability in Yoruba. Similarly, two older female RTT subjects from Goutodo responded negatively to both general speaking ability and ability to always say everything they want to say in Yoruba. However, both subjects explained that they were able to say everything they want to say in the Yoruba of the Bible. According to Aguidi, the Beninese research assistant, this inconsistency is most likely due to the fact that Porto-Novo Yoruba is regarded as the prestige variety; therefore, subjects may have reported inability to speak it even though they are proficient in it due to their own unwillingness to claim that they speak the prestige variety (see Volume 1, Section 4.4.1). Therefore, it was decided to change the responses of the three subjects mentioned above to “yes” in regard to general speaking ability and also to change the negative responses of the two RTT subjects from Goutodo to “yes” in regard to their ability to always say everything they want to say in Yoruba.

b) Among RTT subjects, four younger subjects reported speaking Yoruba a little or with difficulty. Their answers were classified as “yes” since it is unknown how well the other subjects who answered only “yes” speak Yoruba.

42 Ability to always understand everything when the subject hears Yoruba people speaking.
43 General speaking ability.
44 Ability to always say everything the subject wants to say in Yoruba.
D.3.2. Age

Younger versus older subjects:

HghCmp: 23/26 – 88% vs 19/22 – 86%
GenPrf: 22/26 – 85% vs 13/18 – 72%
HghPrf: 17/26 – 65% vs 11/22 – 50%

D.4. Comparison across language contact

D.4.1. Residence patterns

Subjects reporting temporary residence versus those with no residence in the Yoruba language area:

HghCmp: 9/9 – 100% vs 30/37 – 81%
GenPrf: 7/9 – 78% vs 28/37 – 76%
HghPrf: 6/9 – 67% vs 21/38 – 55%

D.4.2. Travel patterns

Subjects frequently traveling versus rarely traveling versus not traveling to the Yoruba language area:

HghCmp: 4/4 – 100% vs 11/12 – 92% vs 18/24 – 75%
GenPrf: 4/4 – 100% vs 20/22 – 91% vs 13/22 – 59%
HghPrf: 4/4 – 100% vs 8/12 – 67% vs 9/23 – 39%

D.5. Comparison across education

Educated versus non-educated subjects:

HghCmp: 20/23 – 87% vs 13/16 – 81%
GenPrf: 18/23 – 78% vs 11/25 – 73%
HghPrf: 14/23 – 61% vs 7/16 – 44%
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