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1 Abstract

In 1979, a language survey was conducted among the Safaliba (Gur) language community of Ghana’s Northern Region to test the level of Wali and Vagla comprehension. In 1995, a follow-up survey was conducted during which the present day sociolinguistic situation was examined giving special attention to assessing the comprehension of Gonja, since Gonja is the district language. The purpose of this survey was to help administrators of the Ghana Institute of Linguistics, Literacy and Bible Translation (GILLBT) determine whether or not GILLBT would pursue a language development programme in Safaliba, or whether these communities should be linked to literacy efforts in a language other than Safaliba. This paper presents the findings from this current study.

Through the use of sociolinguistic questionnaires administered to community leaders and individuals, and by testing for comprehension, the survey collected data concerning tested levels of comprehension as well as reported levels of multilingualism, language learning environments, language use in various domains, language attitudes toward both written and oral forms, and education and literacy levels in three Safaliba communities. Special attention was given to possible indicators of language shift.

The results are given for each of the above mentioned categories as well as their implications for final conclusions. Overall, the results show low levels of tested comprehension, low reported bilingualism, and little use of Gonja. There were no indicators of imminent language shift.
2 Introduction

This paper reports on a sociolinguistic survey done among the Safaliba people in Ghana’s Northern Region. It was a follow-up study to a 1979 survey in which the need for Safaliba language development was investigated (Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand 1979). In that study Wali and Vagla comprehension was tested in one Safaliba village and the results showed low comprehension. The researchers concluded that the Safaliba could not understand Wali and Vagla well enough to use the Scriptures in these languages.

The goal of the current survey was to examine the present-day sociolinguistic situation in the Safaliba area, sixteen years after the first survey. The purpose of the survey was to help administrators of GILLBT decide whether or not to pursue a Safaliba language development project, or whether these communities should be linked to literacy efforts in a language other than Safaliba.

The survey was carried out between September 20-23 and October 16-20, 1995 by Samuel Ntumy and Ebenezer Boafo (GILLBT members), and Angela Kluge and Barbara Tompkins (members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Togo/Benin).

In the following sections pertinent background information will be presented. Some of the data was gathered during community interviews. [See section 5.1.]

2.1 Language situation

2.1.1 Language classification

Safaliba is classified as a Gur language belonging to the Central subgroup. Further classification is as follows:


Other languages with this same Northwestern Oti-Volta classification are Wali, Dagaari, Prafra, and Moore.

The *Ethnologue* (Grimes 1992:270) lists the lexical relationship between Safaliba and Dagaari with 79%, based on word lists elicited in 1966 (Swadesh et al. 1966). Another word list, a full Swadesh-200 list, and some grammatical and cultural items were collected in 1976 by T. Naden (GILLBT) (Naden 1976).¹

Currently, work on a comparative dictionary for the Western Oti-Volta languages, including Safaliba, is under way by Naden (personal communication, Dec. 30, 1995).

2.1.2 Dialect situation

According to community leaders interviewed in this current study, the Safaliba language is the same from village to village. Thus, it can be concluded that there are no perceptively different dialects.

¹This data is at present in T. Naden’s Mooré/Dagbanni project collection. Copies should be filed in GILLBT’s TSD files.
2.1.3 Map and description of the area

2.1.3.1 Location

The Safaliba live in an area of approximately 60 sq km, situated west and southwest of Bole in the Northern Region. To the north, the Safaliba area borders the Dagaari language group. Vagla and Wali are also north of Safaliba but are not immediate neighbors. To the south and east, the Safaliba border the Gonja language group, which is reported to be the main trade language in this area (Grimes 1992:264; Barker 1995:97). [See appendix A for a map of the area.]

2.1.3.2 Safaliba village information

In the following information alternative names for the villages are given in brackets. The population figures are 1995 estimates derived from 1984 Census data (Boateng 1984) using a 2.3% annual growth rate.

**Mandari [Mandara]:**
- 11 km west of Bole
- biggest Safaliba town with an estimated 1,770 inhabitants
- the village is located on top of a low hill
- dirt and rock road is passable though there are some difficult areas
- water source is a pump
- primary school and JSS, eight students at SSS in Bole (five boys, three girls)
- literacy classes in Gonja by Non-Formal Education (NFED) and in Vagla by GILLBT
- Assemblies of God Church and Roman Catholic Church
- mosque

**Gbenfu [Buanfo]:**
- 12 km south of Bole
- an estimated population of 380
- dirt road will have some muddy patches during rainy season
- water source is a pump
- primary school, three students at SSS in Bole (one boy, two girls)
- literacy classes in Gonja by NFED
- Christ Appointed Church
- mosque

**Manfuli:**
- 8 km south of Bole on the Bole-Gbenfu road
- an estimated population of 220
- dirt road will have some muddy patches during rainy season
- water source is a pump
- no formal or informal education
- no mosque or churches
- center of animism

**Tanyiri [Tankpe]:**
- 3 km southwest of Bole
- an estimated population of fifty-five
- no direct access by road; dirt road is passable only half of the way
- no school
- literacy classes in Gonja by NFED
- no mosque or churches
2.2 History of migration

According to Mr. Ewura Chapman Bakari, a Gonja teacher in Bole, the Safaliba came originally from Côte d’Ivoire (Bonduku), close to the Ghanaian border (date of their migration is unknown). They settled first in Mandari. From there some migrated to Gbenfu and Tanyiri. Those who left Mandari were given the title “loo” ‘cool hearted, soft, taking things easy’.

After some time (date is unknown), Gonja people arrived in the area. The Safaliba surrendered to the Gonja, knowing that the latter had already conquered the Vagla people. Because of their submission, the Safaliba were allowed to retain their own chieftaincy alongside the Gonja chiefs. In addition, the Gonja did not impose any conditions on the Safaliba, as they had done after having conquered the Vagla. Thus, though the Gonja officially owned the land, and the Safaliba cultivated it, the latter did not have to pay any taxes on their harvest. The Safaliba also continued settling their own cases for their own people. Thus, a peaceful relationship between the Safaliba and Gonja people was established.

Among the Safaliba villages, Manfuli seems to hold a particular position. According to community elders in Manfuli, the ancestors of the Manfuli people, i.e., their mother, came from Mankuma near Sawla. Therefore the Manfuli people are also called Mankuma people. According to Mr. Alhassam Abdala, the son of the Iman in Mandari, the Manfuli people are therefore not pure Safalibas but originally Gonjas, speaking “deep Gonja”, even though today they also speak Safaliba. The elders in Manfuli objected to that opinion and stated that, even though their ancestors came from Mankuma, they are pure Safalibas.

2.3 Population

In the 1984 General Census (Boateng 1984) the Safaliba living in Gbenfu, Mandari, Manfuli, and Tanyiri were numbered at 1,743. Using this 1984 figure and factoring in a 2.3% annual growth rate would make the current population an estimated 2,413.

There are also Safaliba living in Bole; their number is unknown.

2.4 Presence of other ethnic groups

None of the villages visited are isolated from contact with other ethnic groups. Although quite few in number, Gonja people have become part of every Safaliba community. There are also some Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari in the area but even fewer in number. As reported in community interviews, there are evidently no restrictions concerning intermarriage, and marriages between Safaliba and Gonja are quite common.

2.5 Authority structure

The Safaliba are under the Gonja Bolewura in Bole who is under the Gonja Paramount Chief in Damongo. In every Safaliba village there are two chiefs, a Gonja chief and a Safaliba chief.
2.6 Regional language use

Gonja is the district language in the area for both Formal and Non-Formal Education. However, even though Gonja is the district language and official school subject, it is not taught in all schools. According to Mr. Samuel T. Damanga, headmaster of the primary school in Mandari, it is not taught in the primary school or in the Junior Secondary School (JSS), due to lack of teachers. No information was available as to whether or not Gonja is taught in the only other primary school in the Safaliba area, in Gbenfu.

There are no radio broadcasts in Gonja, only in Dagaari: news, information programmes, and educational programmes. Other broadcasts are in either Twi or English.

2.7 Education

2.7.1 Formal education

In the Safaliba villages there are two primary schools and one JSS.

Mandari has one primary school and one JSS. The primary school is staffed with three teachers: one Safaliba, one Gonja, and one Dagaari speaker. Currently 135 students (80 boys and 55 girls) are enrolled. According to Mr. Damanga, the headmaster, a yearly average of thirty students graduates from P6 and a yearly average of fifteen to twenty students completes JSS. No further information for the JSS concerning number of teachers and enrollment of students was available. Another primary school in the Safaliba area is located in Gbenfu. No information as to its staff and enrollment was available. In Manfuli no schools are to be found.

The only Senior Secondary School (SSS) in the area is located in Bole, with currently eleven students from the Safaliba area: eight from Mandari (five boys, three girls) and three from Gbenfu (one boy and two girls).

2.7.2 Literacy programmes and available written material

The following information is according to interviews with NFED literacy coordinators in Bole (Sept. 20, 1995) and literacy facilitators in the Safaliba area, and according to an interview with Amy Ridall and Nancy Ball, Wali literacy coordinators with the Baptist Mid-Mission in Wa (Sept. 9, 1995) as well as according to the Ethnologue (Grimes 1992:266-271).

2.7.2.1 Gonja

According to Mr. Donald Meele, NFED logistics officer in Bole, and Mr. Abudu Dari, NFED media officer, the Government approved of a Gonja literacy programme in 1992. Before 1992, Non-Governmental Organizations, such as the Catholic Mission, Community Development Programmes, Evangelical Churches of Ghana, and GILLBT did literacy work in Gonja in the area.

The NFED Gonja literacy programme is organized in two stages. In the first stage, a two-year cycle, classes are held four times a week. During that time one primer with twenty-eight themes is used. In the follow-up stage students meet on their own. They are provided with library books, including story books which are published in both Gonja and English in order to encourage them to learn English. In this stage tutoring sessions are optional.
Currently, NFED organizes seven Gonja classes in Mandari, Gbenfu, and Tanyiri.

(1) NFED in Gbenfu

According to Mr. Steven Mohama Sole, Gonja literacy facilitator in Gbenfu, the Gonja literacy programme in Gbenfu started in 1994. The language of instruction is Gonja, because the Safaliba students reportedly do not have any problems with understanding Gonja, since what is taught “is simple”. However, according to the literacy facilitator, there are some adults in Gbenfu who cannot speak Gonja. Reportedly only those who have lived among the Gonja or who have been to school in the Gonja area, can understand and speak it to some extent.

Presently there are two classes in Gbenfu, one class in Stage I, which started in 1995, and one class in Stage II, started in 1994. In Stage I currently eleven male students are enrolled, of which usually only four are present during classes. Among the eleven students are ten Safaliba and one Gonja speaker. In Stage II currently twenty-five students (fifteen males and ten females) are enrolled, of which usually thirteen are present (eight males and five females). Except for one Gonja speaker, all students are Safaliba.

According to the literacy facilitator, one reason why not all registered students attend classes is a practical problem that students face: there are not enough lanterns for the learners, and people feel reluctant to walk in the darkness to the class.

(2) NFED in Mandari

The Gonja literacy programme in Mandari started in January 1995. According to one of the Gonja literacy facilitators, Mr. Dari Kiipo, a Safaliba speaker, there are currently four classes in Stage I with a total of 106 students (58 males, 48 females), of which usually 81 are present during classes (44 males, 37 females). Among the 106 students are 97 Safaliba speakers and nine Gonja speakers. Classes take place four times a week.

(3) NFED in Tanyiri

NFED started Gonja literacy classes in Tanyiri in 1994. Currently one class with a total of twenty-one students (ten males, eleven females) takes place five times a week in the evening. Among the students are nineteen Safaliba and three Gonja speakers. The facilitator is Mr. James Amankwa Bakari, a Gonja teacher in Bole.

(4) Written material available

- One primer with twenty-eight themes
- Post primers: eight
- Gonja story books
- presently NFED is in the process of collecting stories and letters in Gonja for publication.
2.7.2.2 Wali

Baptist Mid-Mission (BMM) has an extensive literacy programme reaching the Wa area in the Upper West Region. Currently there is no Wali literacy programme in the Safaliba area.

Written material available: [See appendix B for additional information on Wali material.]

- Old Testament (work in progress) by BMM
- Primers: seven
- Post primers: eight
- Sunday School materials

2.7.2.3 Vagla

In 1975, GILLBT started a Vagla literacy programme in Bole, which spread to Mandari in 1993. At that time no Gonja literacy classes were organized in the Safaliba area. Thus, Vagla classes were the only opportunity for adults to become literate. According to the Vagla literacy facilitator in Mandari, Mr. Mohama Kolige, a Safaliba speaker, most students switched to Gonja classes after Gonja classes had started in 1995, reportedly because they did not speak Vagla well and preferred Gonja to Vagla. Currently one Vagla class takes place in Mandari five times a week with seven students (six males and one female).

There are no Vagla classes in any of the other Safaliba villages. NFED currently also offers Vagla classes in Bole.

Written material available:

- New Testament (1977) by GILLBT
- Beginners primers 1 and 2
- Storybooks
- Health books

2.7.2.4 Dagaari

NFED organizes Dagaari classes in Bole for Dagaari people. The dialect used in the primers is Jirapa. There are no Safaliba attending Dagaari classes.

Written material available:

  Dialect: Jirapa
  Both the Catholics and the Baptist Mid-Mission are doing translation work in Dagaari. However, it is not known whether or not they are working in the same dialect.
- Primers: five (GILLBT/Ghana Educational System)
2.8 Religious situation

Traditionally, the Safaliba people are Animists. In 1979 it was reported that the Safaliba had had apparently no contact at all with Christianity. “There does not seem to be any church in the area. Perhaps there has been little or no evangelism there” (Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand 1979:1). Regarding the presence of Islam in the area, there was no mention in the report.

The findings during this most recent survey show a change in this situation. Islam seems to have taken root in Bole, the next major town, and there are two mosques in Gbenfu and Mandari. There is also a small Christian presence with three churches in the area: a Roman Catholic Church and an Assemblies of God Church in Mandari, and a Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu. However, Christians are in the minority. The second largest group seems to be formed by Muslims, while the majority of the Safaliba people are Animists.

The religious center for Animism is Manfuli. Here is the seat of the shrine which is also a religious center for the Gonja people in the whole area. This can be seen in the fact that when the Gonja Paramount Chief in Damongo dies, reportedly nobody has the right to announce his death unless Manfuli people come to Damongo and “open the door”. Therefore the Manfuli people are called “loso” (meaning related to the shrine).

3 Previous Sociolinguistic Research

In 1979, a sociolinguistic survey was conducted in the Safaliba language area by Patricia Herbert, Linda Lloyd, and Natalie Sand (GILLET members). The purpose of this survey was to assess language development and translation needs in the Safaliba language.

During the survey, comprehension testing in Wali and Vagla was conducted in Mandari. After the administration of a short practice narrative in Safaliba, a passage from the Vagla and Wali Scriptures (Mk 7:31-37) was played followed by ten questions in Safaliba. For the comprehension testing, ten subjects from various age groups, male and female, were selected. The comprehension test results were:

- Wali: 65.5%
- Vagla: 68.0%

In explaining the results Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand commented that the same Scripture passage was used for both Vagla and Wali, so that the Wali test results may be better than they should be (Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand 1979:2).

Concerning the fact that comprehension questions followed the Scripture passages, the researchers commented: “These tests were intended to measure comprehension and not memory, so it would have been better to have the questions interpolated into the text right after the relevant information, rather than all at the end. We tried to overcome this problem by repeating the text passage, or parts of it, wherever desired” (Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand 1979:2).

Based on the above comprehension test results, it was concluded in 1979 that “according to the test results, a translation is necessary. According to our own personal observations it would be sought and received with gratitude, and it is needed for the growth of a church” (Herbert, Lloyd, and Sand 1979:2).
Commenting on the findings from the 1979 study:

1. The comprehension testing results were not totally clear, and the researchers could not be sure that the comprehension results were accurate, due to the fact that:

   (a) subjects listened to the same passage twice, first in Vagla, then in Wali. This, as the researchers concluded, resulted most likely in higher test results in Wali.

   (b) the testing procedure, with the questions following the texts, most likely tested memory in addition to comprehension. Though the researchers tried to overcome this problem, this procedure resulted probably in a loss of consistency in the administration of the test, affecting the final test results.

2. Only ten subjects from one village were tested for Wali and Vagla comprehension. This is a fairly small sample on which to base decisions about second language (L2) comprehension across a community.

4 1995 Survey Research Questions

Given that sixteen years have passed since the first Safaliba survey, the present survey was done to reassess the Safaliba sociolinguistic situation. Before the specific research questions are discussed, some comments on GILLBT’s approach to the Safaliba community will be reported.

In 1989 Ring wrote *Assessing the Task of GILLBT* in which he described GILLBT’s strategy for sociolinguistic surveys, linguistic analysis, literacy promotion, and translation (Ring 1989). At that point he recommended, based on the 1979 survey results, a thorough analysis of the community: “This should include the number of speakers, their integration with other language speakers in their living environment, current school attendance, use of Gonja (the district language), and the influence of Islam. ... it would not be advisable to begin development of Safaliba without good documentation of the need ... A minimal linguistic study for the University should be done in any event” (Ring 1989:4).

Ring revised this paper in *Updating the Task Assessment of GILLBT - 1994* (Ring 1994). In this paper he indicated that: (1) Wali bilingualism (essentially “comprehension”) testing is needed in the Safaliba area, (2) language vitality should be assessed, and (3) the level of community interest for language development is unknown and should be investigated.

Ring also proposed criteria for making this decision (Ring 1994:2). He stated that in language communities where no bilingualism testing had been done, and no request for GILLBT assistance had been received, “a GILLBT-initiated Needs Assessment Survey of the language community should be carried out using a stratified age sample with language use and language contact questionnaires. Following such a survey, if low levels of bilingualism (i.e., less than 80% average comprehension of a local second language (L2) having Scripture) are identified in a segment of the population which has no access to L2 acquisition (e.g., adults or children living in a predominantly L1 language environment) ... a translation need suitable for full scale GILLBT involvement should be established, even if there is NO community interest.” Ring suggested that the age segments be 20-30 and 30-50 years. In the survey report on the Central Volta Region, Ring (1995) also mentions the importance of examining the viability of the language.
Ring (1994) went on to say that if a high level of bilingualism is identified in a language community, GILLBT involvement would still be appropriate if formal community sponsorship is expressed.

Based on these criteria and based on discussions with Ring (Hatfield 1994a), a preliminary proposal for Ghanaian sociolinguistic surveys was written in September 1994 (Hatfield 1994b).

This preliminary proposal was updated in September 1995 (Kluge and Tompkins 1995). Based on further background research and discussions with GILLBT administration, the scope of the research was widened and the assessment of comprehension of Gonja as the district language was included. Thus, the Safaliba language development needs were to be determined by investigating the following areas:

(1) bilingualism in Gonja, Wali, and Vagla (essentially “comprehension”), first from reported data and later from tested data if necessary,

(2) language contact to investigate the access to Gonja, Wali, and Vagla acquisition,

(3) use of Safaliba, Gonja, Wali, and Vagla in various speech domains to determine whether or not Safaliba is a viable language,

(4) attitudes toward community involvement in a language development programme, and

(5) information on population, education levels, literacy, and religious environment.

Some information was also to be gathered on:

(6) reported Dagaari proficiency and use, since Dagaari is related to Safaliba.

5 Survey Methodology

The field survey was designed to be conducted in two stages, the first to gather reported data and the second to do comprehension testing. The first stage consisted of interviews with community leaders as well as individual sociolinguistic questionnaires. The results from this stage were discussed with the GILLBT administration in order to decide how to proceed. Based on the data of the first stage, indicating that the use of Wali or Vagla would not be an option for a literacy programme in the Safaliba area, but that Gonja might be, GILLBT administration decided at a meeting held October 9, 1995 that L2 comprehension testing should be conducted in Gonja, but not in Wali or Vagla.

The types of data collected for the survey were:

Interviews with community leaders: chiefs and elders, district officers, school teachers, and religious leaders.

Interviews with individuals: comprehension tests and individual sociolinguistic questionnaires.

These will now be described in more detail.
5.1 Interviews with community leaders

This section describes the purpose and procedures for the interviews held with various community leaders.

5.1.1 Chiefs and elders

The purpose of the interviews with chiefs and elders was to obtain the views of native speakers as to the geographical boundaries of the Safaliba language, use of Safaliba and Gonja, Wali, and Vagla in various domains, comprehension of Gonja, Wali, and Vagla in the community, language attitudes, community literacy programmes, and population patterns. Some questions were also asked concerning use of and attitudes towards Dagaari.

Since the Safaliba are under the Gonja Paramount Chief in Damongo and the Gonja Bolewura in Bole, the survey team visited both the Paramount Chief in Damongo and the Bolewura in Bole to inform them of the work before entering the language area.

The community interviews were administered in the villages of Gbenfu, Mandari, and Manfuli. Since each Safaliba village has both a Gonja chief who is linked to the Bole palace, and a Safaliba chief, the questions were posed to a group of both Safaliba and Gonja elders who gave an answer after discussing it among themselves and reaching a consensus. In Manfuli a large number of the community gathered to listen to what was going on. Several questions were addressed to the crowd with responses given by a show of hands.

The questionnaire items were used in their set order or, sometimes, following the topic of conversation. The responses were recorded either on the questionnaires or in note form. A map was used in conjunction with the questionnaire to aid in determining patterns of languages used in the area. [See appendix C.]

5.1.2 District officers

5.1.2.1 District Chief Executive

A visit was made to the District Chief Executive at the District Office in Bole to inform him about the mission of the survey team in the Safaliba area of the Bole District.

5.1.2.2 Non-Formal-Education Officers

Interviews were conducted with Mr. C. T. Kumbal, District Directorate of Education in Bole; Mr. Meele, NFED Logistics Officer; and Mr. Dari, NFED Media Officer in Bole. In addition, local literacy facilitators were interviewed: Mr. Sole, Gonja literacy facilitator in Gbenfu; Mr. Kiipo, Gonja literacy facilitator in Mandari; and Mr. Koliga, Vagla literacy facilitator in Mandari.

The purpose of these interviews was to ascertain the number of literacy classes in the Safaliba area, total class populations, attitudes to literacy classes, and the general performance of literacy participants in Gonja and Vagla.
5.1.3 School teachers

There are two primary schools and one JSS in the Safaliba area. However, the survey was conducted while the schools were closed for holiday. Therefore, it was only possible to interview one teacher: Mr. Damanga, headmaster of the primary school in Mandari, a Safaliba speaker.

The purpose of this interview was to obtain information on the number of schools in the area, school enrollment, the ratio of Safaliba to other-tongue teachers, general education levels, language use, and the language proficiency of the students. [see appendix D.]

5.1.4 Religious leaders

Interviews were conducted with Mr. Jonathan D. Natuma at the Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu, Mr. Isaac Nayire at the Assemblies of God Church, as well as Mr. Damanga at the Roman Catholic Church in Mandari. A representative of the Muslim congregation, Mr. Abdala, the son of the Iman in Mandari, was also interviewed.

The purpose of these interviews was to determine which languages are used in the church and mosque context and to find out the attitudes of religious leaders and congregations towards Safaliba versus other local languages. [See appendix E.]

5.2 Individual interviews

This section describes the purpose and procedures for the individual interviews conducted in the Safaliba community. The individual interviews were done in two parts:

1. the comprehension test, and
2. the individual sociolinguistic questionnaire.

In this section these parts will be described as well as: test points, selection of subjects, description of the sample, and selection of interpreters.

5.2.1 Comprehension test

5.2.1.1 Rationale

The purpose of the comprehension test was to assess comprehension levels of a Gonja narrative and selected Gonja Scripture portions in the Safaliba language community.

As a means of testing passive bilingual ability, a comprehension test can be used as a pilot test of L2 proficiency in a community, with the comprehension scores giving a cut-off point. It can be said that those subjects who score near or at 100% are at least level 2+ or above according to the ILR (Inter-Agency Language Round Table) scale. Thus, if due to a low level of comprehension, respondents score low, it can be concluded that the level of productive ability is also low. On the other hand, a high level of productive ability cannot be deduced from high scores. In the case of high scores it
might become necessary to consider further testing, if there is a need to
assess productive ability (Hatfield 1992; Lewis 1992).

The approach for the comprehension test was based on Ring’s comprehension test
used in the Central Volta Region surveys using Scripture passages to be
paraphrased (1981, 1995). In this current study, testees were required to
paraphrase short sections of a Gonja narrative and Scripture passages they
heard from a tape to test how much of the content they understood. Before the
actual test section, each subject listened to an introduction which explained
the test, followed by a short narrative in Safaliba which allowed the subject
to become familiar with the test procedure.

5.2.1.2 Test preparation

The personal narrative in Gonja was given by a mother tongue (L1) speaker of
Gonja, Mr. Edward Mahama Salifu from the Tamale Institute of Cross-Cultural
Studies. He also read the Scripture passages for tape-recording.

In choosing the Scripture passages the aim was to get a comprehension test
made up of narrative, expository, and hortatory parts which provided varying
degrees of difficulty, thus requiring deeper levels of comprehension.

The Scripture passages chosen for the test were Acts 21:30-36; I Peter 4:7-8;
and I Timothy 6:8. The passages were broken into ten sections: seven parts for
the narrative, two for the expository and one for the hortatory.

The text preparation was done by Mr. Salifu, who gave the narrative. He first
wrote a word-for-word translation as well as a back translation of the
foregoing texts in English. The texts were then divided into test segments by
breaking the connected discourse into natural chunks of one or two sentences
each. For the recording a five second pause was inserted between each segment.
Thus, the narrative was broken into twelve segments and the Scripture passages
into ten. [See appendix F for a complete transcription and interlinear
translation of the test texts.]

Both texts were pretested on four L1 Gonja speakers who live in Tamale. The
testees were asked to repeat what they had heard on the tape. The answers were
translated into English by an interpreter and written down by the researchers.

For the preparation of the final Gonja test tape, a short story was narrated
by Mr. Ewura Bakari, a Safaliba speaker from Bole, and was recorded and
prepared as described above. Before incorporating this practice text into the
final test tape, the text was tested on five L1 Safaliba speakers to determine
whether or not it was suitable. During the testing this text served as a
practice text. It was used to screen all testees in order to ensure their
understanding of the testing method.

For the actual testing three test tapes were prepared. The first was comprised
of an introduction statement in Safaliba, explaining the test procedure: “I am
going to play a tape to you. Listen carefully. When I play the tape a little,
I will stop it, and you will tell me all that you’ve heard. Are you ready?
Let’s start!” The introduction was followed by the practice text in Safaliba.

---

2In the first survey in the Central Volta Region, Ring counted five parts for
the narrative (Matt. 8:28-34), three parts for the expository (Matt. 5:43-
45), and two parts for the hortatory (Rom. 6:13,14) texts (Ring 1981). In
the second survey, Ring used the same texts, but counted seven parts for
the narrative section, two for the expository, and one for the hortatory
(Ring 1995). Therefore the second version of the testing is less stringent.
The second tape was comprised of the Gonja narrative, and the third of the Scripture passages.

5.2.1.3 Scoring procedure

Based on the compilation of the responses given by the L1 Gonja speakers during the preliminary testing of the Gonja narrative and Scripture passages, a base-line scoring system was devised for future scoring with Gonja L2 speakers. Each response was first compared to the original narrative and Scripture passage, and then compared to the other responses to determine the level of exactness which could be expected from an L1 speaker of Gonja. Therefore, if a portion of the original passage was not included in the responses given by L1 Gonja speakers, it was not included in the base-line answer. These model answers served as the standard to which all responses of testees were to be compared. [See appendix G for the base-line answers.]

After the final base-line answer was determined, each test section was divided into segments which would constitute either full or partial credit. A correct response was worth one point for each section which gave a possible total score of twelve points for the narrative and of ten points for the Scripture passages. Each response that was exactly like the base-line answer was immediately marked with full credit. Any variation from the base-line was written down, evaluated separately and marked with a fraction of the correct score between one and zero. For the final scoring for each subject, each script was rechecked by a second surveyor to check for scoring reliability.

5.2.1.4 Testing procedure

During the actual testing the order of both Gonja tapes was rotated from subject to subject so that the order of texts varied in order not to get biased test results due to fatigue. The testees listened to each section once. If they were unable to repeat correctly what they had heard on the tape, the section was played a second time. Whenever the testee’s response was unclear, the researcher could probe for more input from the testee. If the testees stated that they did not understand the texts at all, at least five segments of the first administered text and three segments of the second text were played. If noncomprehension was confirmed, the testing was discontinued in order not to discourage testees.

5.2.1.5 Post-comprehension-test questionnaire

A post-comprehension-test questionnaire (CPT-QST) was administered alongside the test. The initial questions were used to screen potential subjects by making sure they fell within the social categories requested, as described in section 5.2.4. The second section of the questionnaire served as a self-evaluation by the testee of his comprehension of the texts. In a third section questions were asked regarding the testees’ general proficiency in Gonja, the language learning environment, patterns of language use, language attitudes, and reading and writing abilities. [See appendix H.]
5.2.2 Individual sociolinguistic questionnaire

The purpose of the individual sociolinguistic questionnaires (IDV-QST) was to determine speech forms which an individual speaks or understands, and their estimated level of proficiency; speech forms used with various interlocutors in different social situations; attitudes towards the Safaliba, Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari languages; and literacy in these languages. [See appendix I.]

The sociolinguistic questionnaire was administered to each of the subjects by a member of the survey team with the aid of an interpreter. Some of the questions were omitted, especially those pertaining to Vagla and Dagaari, 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. The initial questions were used to screen potential subjects by making sure they fell within the social categories requested, as described in section 5.2.4.

5.2.3 Test points

Individual interviews (both comprehension tests and individual sociolinguistic questionnaires) were conducted in the three major Safaliba villages: Gbenfu (GBE), Mandari (MAD), and Manfuli (MAF). It was concluded that since these are the largest villages and situated at differing distances and directions from Bole, they would provide a good sampling of the Safaliba community.

5.2.4 Selection of subjects

Visits were made to the traditional leaders of Gbenfu, Mandari, and Manfuli to explain the work, arrange a time for the interviews, and to request help with the selection of subjects. In most instances the leaders chose someone from the community to coordinate the selection process. During the actual interviews it was also possible for the survey team members to indicate potential subjects from those who had gathered. These selections were made according to the following predetermined social categories:

From each of the three villages, sixteen subjects were requested for the comprehension testing (CPT) and twelve different subjects for the individual sociolinguistic questionnaires (IDV-QST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPT</th>
<th>IDV-QST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 younger males, age 15-25 (MY)</td>
<td>3 younger males, age 15-25 (MY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 older males, age 30-45 (MO)</td>
<td>3 older males, age 30-45 (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 younger females, age 15-25 (FY)</td>
<td>3 younger females, age 15-25 (FY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 older females, age 30-45 (FO)</td>
<td>3 older females, age 30-45 (FO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the actual administration of the individual interviews it was not always possible to get subjects according to these categories. [See section 5.2.5.]
In addition it was requested that:

(1) preferably subjects should be 100% Safaliba (both father or mother Safaliba) or at least 50% Safaliba (at least father or mother Safaliba), and be L1 Safaliba speakers,

(2) they should not have lived outside the Safaliba area for more than one year, and

(3) they could be either educated or noneducated, religious, or having no religious affiliation.

5.2.5 Description of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gbenfu</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mandari</th>
<th></th>
<th>Manfuli</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>IDV-QST</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>IDV-QST</td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>IDV-QST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total sample: 82

Figure 1: Actual test subjects by village and social group.

5.2.5.1 Education level

Overall, the education level among subjects was low. Only 17/82 (21%) reported having attended school, with only 9/82 (11%) having attained the level of JSS 1 or its equivalent. Education was slightly more among younger subjects versus older (11/44 (25%) vs 6/38 (16%)) and among females versus males (11/43 (26%) vs 6/39 (15%)). In Gbenfu no younger males (0/7) and in Mandari no older females (0/6) had any formal education.

Compared by villages, the lowest percentage of subjects with some level of formal education came from Gbenfu, the most remote Safaliba village (3/28 (11%)). In Manfuli, where currently there is no school, 6/26 subjects (23%) reported having attended school, and in Mandari, the largest Safaliba village, 8/28 (29%).

5.2.5.2 Religious affiliation

The majority of subjects reported being Animists (56/82 (68%)), while 15/82 (18%) reported being Muslims, and 11/82 (13%) being Christians.

---

4Sixteen of the eighty-two (16/82) subjects have a non-Safaliba parent, fourteen of them are L1 Gonja speakers.
As a note, the percentage of subjects reportedly having attended school is highest among Christians (4/11 (36%)), while only 3/15 (20%) Muslims and 10/56 (18%) Animists reported some level of formal education.

5.2.6 Selection of interpreters

Since none of the members of the survey team spoke Safaliba it was necessary to enlist members of the Safaliba community to act as interpreters. In Bole three L1 Safaliba speakers who are bilingual in Gonja and speak English well, were willing to serve as interpreters: Mr. Ewura Bakari, Mr. Gilbert Nyariba, and Mr. James Bakari.

Mr. Ewura Bakari and Mr. Nyariba served as interpreters during the three community interviews and during the administration of the sociolinguistic questionnaires. During the comprehension tests Mr. Nyariba was not available, so Mr. James Bakari joined Mr. Ewura Bakari.

Both interpreters were trained for the comprehension tests to translate Safaliba responses into English and to translate probing questions of the researchers into Safaliba. The training process was a simulation of a test situation. Both interpreters took turns in acting as the subject, listening to the Gonja texts, and responding in Safaliba, while the other one translated the answers into English. They were required to translate exactly what the subjects reported.

6 Results

This section contains the results from the various community leaders’ interviews as well as individual interviews according to the following topics: level of multilingualism, language vitality, and literacy.

6.1 Level of multilingualism

In the following sections the level of tested and reported multilingualism in Gonja, Walli, Vagla, and Dagaari as well as language contact are examined.

[N.B. Whenever the terms “significant” or “not significant” are used it refers to application of the Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test. Detailed results are found in appendix K.]

6.1.1 Tested comprehension in Gonja

Comprehension testing of a Gonja narrative and Gonja Scripture passages was done to ascertain the level of comprehension. The following section refers to the comprehension results as well as relevant answers to the accompanying questionnaire.

6.1.1.1 Narrative

The following results show the percentage of correct paraphrases of the Gonja narrative sections. [See appendix J for a complete listing of raw scores.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gbenfu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0-96</td>
<td>39.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandari</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0-93</td>
<td>34.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfuli</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97-100</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>45.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>44.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>48.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>45.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>45.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SoGrp=social group; #Ss=number of subjects; %corr=% of correct answers; STD=Standard Deviation]

Figure 2: Comprehension scores for Gonja narrative.

The average test score of 47% is very low indicating low levels of comprehension. Only 18/45 subjects (40%) scored 80%; 13/13 from Manfuli, 4/16 from Gbenfu, and only 1/16 from Mandari. The high standard deviation of 45.18 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects vary extensively: the range for individuals is 0-100%.

Compared by location, subjects from Manfuli scored significantly better than subjects from Gbenfu and Mandari. While all subjects from Manfuli scored 97%, the highest score for Gbenfu is 96% and 93% for Mandari. The combined average test result for Gbenfu and Mandari is 26%, with a standard deviation of 36.36.

There is no significant difference across gender or age.

Following the comprehension test, subjects were asked if they understood “all”, “most”, “a bit”, or “very little” of the story. The comparison of the self-reported comprehension performance with the actual comprehension scores indicates that testees estimated their own test performance accurately:

- “all” 12/45 (27%) Average test scores: 98%
- “most” 5/45 (11%) 95%
- “a bit” 5/45 (11%) 58%
- “very little” 4/45 (9%) 38%
- “nothing” 19/45 (42%) 1%

Only one subject seems to have underestimated himself: he scored 95%, but reportedly understood only “very little”.

When asked if the various social groups in the village by age and gender would understand the story, about half of the sample (23/45 (51%)) anticipated some, very little, or no comprehension. Full comprehension was only anticipated by 10/45 (22%), and 5/45 subjects (11%) saying that some people would understand. The remaining 7/45 subjects (16%) said they did not know whether or not other villagers would understand the story.

Compared by location, more subjects from Manfuli (9/13 (69%)) anticipated full comprehension, than from Gbenfu (1/16 (6%)) and from Mandari (0/16). Very
little or no comprehension was anticipated by 13/16 subjects (81%) from Gbenfu, 9/16 (56%) from Mandari, and by 0/16 subjects from Manfuli.

Overall, there is no apparent difference in anticipated comprehension for the various social groups depending on their age or gender.

6.1.2 Scripture passages

The following results show the percentage of correct paraphrases of the Gonja Scripture passages. [See appendix J for a complete listing of raw scores.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gbenfu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0-72</td>
<td>24.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandari</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0-56</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfuli</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70-94</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-94</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0-86</td>
<td>37.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0-93</td>
<td>41.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0-88</td>
<td>35.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0-94</td>
<td>37.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0-94</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Comprehension Scores for Gonja Scripture Passages.

The average test score of 35% is very low indicating low levels of comprehension. Only 9/45 subjects (20%) scored 80%, all from Manfuli (9/13 (69%)). The high standard deviation of 36.89 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects vary extensively: the range for individuals is 0-94%.

Compared by location, subjects from Manfuli scored significantly better than subjects from Gbenfu and Mandari. None of the subjects from Manfuli scored below 70%, while for Gbenfu and Mandari only one subject from Gbenfu scored 72%. All other subjects in Gbenfu and Mandari scored below 60%. The combined average test result for Gbenfu and Mandari is 15%, with a standard deviation of 22.64.

There is no significant difference across gender or age. However, it is noted that all testees scoring 90% (5/45(11%)) belong to the group of older subjects.

Following the comprehension test, subjects were asked if they understood “all”, “most”, “a bit”, or “very little” of the story. The comparison of the self-reported comprehension performance with the actual comprehension scores seems to indicate that testees overestimated their own test performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>Average test scores:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“all”</td>
<td>11/45 (24%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“most”</td>
<td>3/45 (7%)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a bit”</td>
<td>7/45 (16%)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“very little”</td>
<td>4/45 (9%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“nothing”</td>
<td>20/45 (44%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among those subjects who reportedly understood "all", three subjects scored only 76%, 74%, and 0%. Among those who reportedly understood "most", one subject scored only 56%.

When asked if the various social groups in the village by age and gender would understand the story, about half of the sample (22/45 (49%)) anticipated some, very little, or no comprehension. Full comprehension was anticipated only by 10/45 subjects (22%). One subject (1/45) anticipated that most people would understand and 5/45 (11%) said that some people would understand. The remaining 7/45 subjects (16%) said they did not know whether or not other villagers would understand the story.

Compared by location, more subjects from Manfuli (9/13 (69%)) anticipated full comprehension, than from Gbenfu (1/16 (6%)) or from Mandari (0/16). Respectively, very little or no comprehension was anticipated by 13/16 subjects (81%) from Gbenfu, 7/16 (44%) from Mandari but only by 1/16 subjects (6%) from Manfuli (in regard to younger females only).

Overall, there is no apparent difference in anticipated comprehension for the various social groups depending on their age or gender.

6.1.1.3 Summary

The average scores of 47% for the narrative and 35% for the Scripture passages are very low. It can be concluded that the average level of comprehension of Gonja among the Safaliba people is low. The rather high standard deviations show that the comprehension scores vary quite extensively across subjects. Subjects from Manfuli scored significantly higher than subjects from the other villages. There are no significant differences across gender or age.

A majority of subjects reportedly understood only "a bit", "very little", or "nothing" of both the narrative and Scripture passages. It was anticipated by the majority of subjects that most people in their village would not understand all of the texts. For both the narrative and the Scripture passages, more subjects from Manfuli than from the other villages anticipated full comprehension.

6.1.2 Reported level of multilingualism

In the following sections the reported level of multilingualism in Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari is examined.

6.1.2.1 Gonja

Subjects were asked in general if they speak and understand Gonja, and more specifically about higher-level language functions.
Ability to speak Gonja (SpkAbl) was reported by 41/82 subjects (50%), with 25/26 from Manfuli (96%), 9/28 from Gbenfu (32%), and 7/28 from Mandari (25%). Ability to adequately defend/express themselves before a Gonja chief (DefAbl) was only reported by 28/82 subjects (34%), with 14/26 from Manfuli (54%), and 7/28 each from Gbenfu and Mandari (25%).

A considerably higher percentage of subjects (59/81 (73%)) reported ability to understand Gonja (UndAbl), with 26/26 from Manfuli (100%), 17/27 from Gbenfu (63%) and 16/28 from Mandari (57%). In addition 25/37 IDV-QST subjects (68%) reportedly always understand jokes in Gonja (UndJks), with 11/13 from Manfuli (85%), 9/12 from Gbenfu (7%) and 5/12 from Mandari (42%, none of them older subjects - 0/5). A considerably lower percentage of CPT-QST subjects (14/45 (31%)) reported always understanding everything when they hear Gonja people speaking Gonja (UndAll), with 11/13 from Manfuli (85%), 3/16 from Gbenfu (19%) and 0/16 from Mandari.

Overall, a considerably higher percentage of IDV-QST subjects versus CPT-QST subjects reported proficiency in Gonja (SpkAbl: 25/37 (68%) vs 16/45 (36%), DefAbl: 17/37 (46%) vs 11/45 (24%), UndAbl: 37/37 (100%) vs 22/44 (50%)).

Compared across location, Manfuli shows the highest percentages for proficiency in Gonja, while Mandari shows the lowest, except for reported defense ability with no difference between Gbenfu and Mandari.

Compared by gender, overall a slightly higher percentage of female subjects versus male reported proficiency in Gonja, except for a slightly higher percentage of male subjects versus female reporting ability of verbal defense (SpkAbl: 23/43 (53%) vs 18/39 (46%), DefAbl: 12/43 (28%) vs 16/39 (41%), UndAbl: 32/42 (76%) vs 27/39 (69%), UndJks: 15/21 (71%) vs 10/16 (63%), UndAll: 7/22 (32%) vs 7/23 (30%)).

Among the 41 subjects, one subject reported speaking Gonja “a little”. Among the 59 subjects, one subject reported understanding Gonja “some”, and one subject reported comprehension of “Market Gonja”.

Figure 4: Reported proficiency in Gonja.
In regard to age, a slightly higher percentage of younger subjects versus older reported productive abilities in Gonja (SpkAbl: 25/44 (57%) vs 16/38 (42%), DefAbl: 18/44 (41%) vs 10/38 (26%), while there is no apparent difference across age groups for passive abilities.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, only 12/33 subjects (36%) reported that children in their village can speak Gonja, with 10/13 subjects (77%) from Manfuli but only 1/10 subjects each from Gbenfu and Mandari. A slightly higher percentage reported children's comprehension of Gonja\(^7\) (16/35 (46%)), with 12/13 subjects (92%) from Manfuli, and only 4/10 subjects (40%) from Gbenfu and 0/12 subjects from Mandari.

When asked whether or not children are able to speak and understand Gonja before they reach school age, 8/9 subjects (seven from Mandari, one from Gbenfu and none from Mandari) responded positively regarding speaking ability and 10/11 regarding understanding ability (seven from Manfuli, three from Gbenfu and none from Mandari).

6.1.2.2 Wali

Subjects were asked in general if they speak and understand Wali, and more specifically about higher-level language functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>SpkAbl</th>
<th>DefAbl</th>
<th>UndAbl</th>
<th>UndJks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>12/28 (43%)</td>
<td>4/12 (33%)</td>
<td>23/28 (82%)</td>
<td>4/11 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>7/28 (25%)</td>
<td>3/12 (25%)</td>
<td>18/28 (64%)</td>
<td>3/12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>14/26 (54%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
<td>25/26 (96%)</td>
<td>6/13 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33/82 (40%)</td>
<td>11/37 (30%)</td>
<td>66/82 (80%)</td>
<td>13/36 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>SpkAbl</th>
<th>DefAbl</th>
<th>UndAbl</th>
<th>UndJks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>6/19 (32%)</td>
<td>0/ 7 ( 0%)</td>
<td>17/19 (89%)</td>
<td>2/ 6 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>13/20 (65%)</td>
<td>6/ 9 (67%)</td>
<td>18/20 (90%)</td>
<td>2/ 9 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>8/25 (32%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
<td>18/25 (72%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>6/18 (33%)</td>
<td>1/ 8 (13%)</td>
<td>13/18 (72%)</td>
<td>5/ 8 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33/82 (40%)</td>
<td>11/37 (30%)</td>
<td>66/82 (80%)</td>
<td>13/36 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Reported proficiency in Wali.

Regarding productive proficiency in Wali, 33/82 subjects (40%) reported general speaking ability with 14/26 from Manfuli (54%), 12/28 from Gbenfu (43%), and 7/28 from Mandari (25%). Ability to defend/express themselves before a Wali chief was reported by 11/37 subjects (30%) with 4/12 from Gbenfu (33%), 4/13 from Manfuli (31%), and 3/12 from Mandari (25%). It is noted that none of the educated younger males (0/3) reported speaking ability and none of the younger males (0/7) reported defense ability.

\(^7\)Among the subjects responding positively, one subject reported that “some” children speak/understand Gonja.

\(^8\)Among the 33 subjects, four younger subjects reported speaking Wali “a little”.

\(^9\)Among the 60 subjects, seven subjects reported understanding Wali “a little”.
A considerably higher percentage of subjects (66/82 (80%)) reported general understanding ability, with 25/26 from Manfuli (96%), 23/28 from Gbenfu (82%), and 18/28 from Mandari (64%). However, only 17/37 (36%) reported ability to always understand jokes in Wali, with 6/13 from Manfuli (46%), 4/11 from Gbenfu (36%), and 3/12 from Mandari (25%).

Comparing IDV-QST and CPT-QST results, a considerably higher percentage of IDV-QST subjects (17/37 (46%)) versus CPT-QST subjects (16/45 (27%)) reported both general speaking and understanding ability.

Compared across location, higher percentages of subjects from Manfuli versus from Gbenfu and Mandari reported proficiency in Wali, except for reported ability to defend/express oneself in Wali with no apparent difference in percentage between the three villages.

In regard to gender, higher percentages of male subjects versus female responded positively, except for a higher percentage for female versus male subjects reporting comprehension of jokes (SpkAbl: 19/39 (49%) vs 14/43 (33%), DefAbl: 6/16 (38%) vs 5/20 (25%), UndAbl: 35/39 (90%) vs 31/43 (72%), UndJks: 4/15 (27%) vs 9/21 (43%)).

Compared by age, higher percentages of older subjects versus younger reported proficiency in Wali. The difference in percentages is more pronounced for productive versus passive abilities, except for reported general understanding ability with equally high percentages for older and younger subjects (SpkAbl: 19/38 (50%) vs 14/44 (32%), DefAbl: 7/17 (41%) vs 4/20 (20%), UndAbl: 31/38 (82%) vs 35/44 (80%), UndJks: 7/17 (41%) vs 6/19 (32%)).

Regarding reported proficiency for children, only 4/35 subjects (11%) reported that children in their villages can speak Wali, none of them from Gbenfu (0/10). Children’s comprehension of Wali was reported by 13/36 subjects (36%), with the lowest percentage for Mandari (3/12 (25%)) versus Gbenfu (4/11 (36%)) and Manfuli (6/13 (46%)).

When asked whether or not children are able to speak and understand Wali before they reach school age, 3/3 subjects, all older, responded positively regarding speaking ability and 10/14 (71%) regarding understanding ability, five of them from Manfuli. Among the four subjects responding negatively regarding comprehension of Wali, three are from Mandari.

6.1.2.3 Vagla

Subjects were asked in general if they speak and understand Vagla, and more specifically about higher-level language functions.
In regards to productive abilities in Vagla, 13/37 subjects (35%) reported general speaking ability with 8/13 from Manfuli (62%), 4/12 from Mandari (33%), and 1/12 from Gbenfu (8%). Ability to defend/express themselves before a Vagla chief was reported by 8/37 subjects (22%), with 4/13 from Manfuli (31%), 4/12 from Mandari (33%), and 0/12 from Gbenfu (0%).

Considerably higher percentages of subjects reported passive abilities. General understanding ability was reported by 29/37 subjects (78%), with 12/13 from Manfuli (92%), 8/12 from Mandari (67%), and 9/12 from Gbenfu (75%). Fewer subjects (17/37 (46%)) reported ability to always understand jokes in Vagla, with 8/13 from Manfuli (62%), 5/12 from Mandari (42%), and 4/12 from Gbenfu (33%).

Overall, subjects from Manfuli reported the highest percentages for proficiency in Vagla while subjects from Gbenfu reported the lowest percentages, except for reported ability to defend/express oneself in Vagla with equally low percentages for Manfuli and Mandari.

There is no apparent difference across age or gender except for a considerably higher percentage of female subjects (12/21 (57%)) versus male (5/16 (31%)) reporting comprehension of jokes in Vagla.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, none of the subjects (0/35) reported that children in their village can speak Vagla and only 8/35 (23%) reported children’s comprehension of Vagla: 5/13 (38%) from Manfuli, 3/10 (30%) from Gbenfu (all of them older), and 0/12 from Mandari. Overall, a higher percentage of older subjects (6/17 (35%)) versus younger (2/18 (11%)) reported children’s comprehension of Vagla.

When asked whether or not children are able to understand Vagla before they reach school age, 4/7 (57%, three of them from Manfuli) responded positively.

Among the 13 subjects, one subject reported speaking Vagla “a little”.

---

**Figure 6: Reported Proficiency in Vagla.**
6.1.2.4 Dagaari

Subjects were asked in general if they speak and understand Dagaari, and more specifically about higher-level language functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>SpkAbl #/T</th>
<th>DefAbl #/T</th>
<th>UndAbl #/T</th>
<th>UndJks #/T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>3/12 (25%)</td>
<td>2/12 (17%)</td>
<td>8/12 (67%)</td>
<td>5/12 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAD</td>
<td>2/12 (17%)</td>
<td>2/12 (17%)</td>
<td>10/12 (83%)</td>
<td>5/12 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>5/13 (38%)</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>11/13 (85%)</td>
<td>5/13 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10/37 (27%)</td>
<td>7/37 (19%)</td>
<td>29/37 (78%)</td>
<td>15/37 (41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>SpkAbl #/T</th>
<th>DefAbl #/T</th>
<th>UndAbl #/T</th>
<th>UndJks #/T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>0/ 7 (0%)</td>
<td>0/ 7 (0%)</td>
<td>6/ 7 (86%)</td>
<td>3/ 7 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>5/ 9 (56%)</td>
<td>5/ 9 (56%)</td>
<td>7/ 9 (81%)</td>
<td>5/ 9 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>1/13 (8%)</td>
<td>10/13 (77%)</td>
<td>5/13 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2/ 8 (25%)</td>
<td>1/ 8 (13%)</td>
<td>6/ 8 (76%)</td>
<td>2/ 8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10/37 (27%)</td>
<td>7/37 (19%)</td>
<td>29/37 (78%)</td>
<td>15/37 (41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a minority of subjects reported productive abilities in Dagaari. General speaking ability was reported by 10/37 subjects (27%), with 5/13 from Manfuli (38%), 3/12 from Gbenfu (25%), and 2/12 from Mandari (17%). A still lower percentage of subjects (7/37 (19%)) reported ability to defend/express themselves before a Dagaari chief, with 3/13 from Manfuli (23%), and 2/12 each from Gbenfu and Mandari (17%).

A considerably higher percentage of subjects reported passive abilities in Dagaari. General understanding ability was reported by 29/37 subjects (78%), with 11/13 from Manfuli (85%), 10/12 from Mandari (83%), and 8/12 from Gbenfu (67%). Ability to always understand jokes in Dagaari was reported by 15/37 subjects (41%), 5/12 each from Mandari and Gbenfu (42%), and 5/13 from Manfuli (38%).

Overall, there is no apparent difference across location for reported proficiency in Dagaari except for reported general speaking ability with higher percentages for Manfuli followed by Gbenfu and then Mandari.

In regard to gender, there is no apparent difference across gender as far as reported general language abilities are concerned (SpkAbl: 5/16 (31%) vs 5/21 (24%), UndAbl: 13/16 (81%) vs 16/21 (76%). Concerning higher-level language functions, higher percentages of male subjects versus females reported such abilities (DefAbl: 5/16 (31%) vs 2/21 (10%), UndJks: 8/16 (50%) vs 7/21 (33%)).

Compared by age, a higher percentage of older subjects versus younger reported productive abilities (SpkAbl: 7/17 (41%) vs 3/20 (15%), DefAbl: 6/17 (35%) vs 1/20 (5%)). None of the younger males (0/7) reported such abilities. In regard to reported passive abilities, there is no apparent difference across age.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, only 5/34 subjects (15%) reported that children in their village can speak Dagaari. Among the five subjects,
three of them are from Manfuli, four of them are older, and none of them are younger males. Children’s comprehension of Dagaari was reported by 15/35 subjects (43%) with a higher percentage of older subjects (10/17 (59%)) versus younger (5/18 (28%)) reporting comprehension.

When asked whether or not children are able to speak and understand Dagaari before they reach school age, 4/4 subjects (three from Manfuli) responded positively regarding speaking ability and 9/12 regarding understanding ability. All three subjects responding negatively regarding comprehension of Dagaari before school age are from Mandari.

6.1.2.5 Multilingual comparison

Among those subjects reporting proficiency in several languages (Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and/or Dagaari), 10/19 (53%) reported that they speak Gonja best, with a higher percentage of subjects from Manfuli (6/9 (67%)) versus both Gbenfu and Mandari (2/5 (40%)). Wali is spoken best only by 4/19 subjects (21%), and both Vagla and Dagaari by 2/19 subjects (11%). One subject (1/19) reported speaking Gonja, Wali, and Dagaari equally well.

Regarding reported comprehension of several languages, Gonja is understood best by 25/46 subjects (54%), with 15/18 subjects from Manfuli (83%), 8/15 from Gbenfu (53%), and 2/13 from Mandari (15%). Wali is understood best only by 14/46 subjects (30%), with 1/18 subjects from Manfuli (6%), 8/15 from Gbenfu (53%), and 8/13 from Mandari (62%). Thus, overall the majority of subjects reported understanding Gonja better than Wali. However, it is noted that compared across location, the majority of subjects from Mandari reported understanding Wali better.

6.1.2.6 Summary

Reported proficiency in languages other than Safaliba seems to be rather low within the Safaliba community.

Gonja is reportedly spoken only by half of the surveyed sample (41/82) and understood by 59/81 subjects (73%). Concerning the performance of higher-level language functions, percentages are considerably lower.

Compared to Gonja, lower percentages of subjects reported productive abilities in Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari, while slightly higher percentages than for Gonja reported passive abilities. This could be due to the fact that these languages, especially Wali and Dagaari, are related to Safaliba.

In regard to questionnaire types, the difference in percentages between IDV-QST and CPT-QST subjects for proficiency in Gonja and Wali could be due to the fact that the CPT-QST was administered after the comprehension testing. It is likely that listening to the texts first probably increased the subject’s overall awareness of his/her own language productive and passive abilities both in Gonja and in Wali, thus giving a more realistic picture of a subject’s proficiency, even though comprehension testing was only done in Gonja.

Compared by location, Manfuli shows overall the highest percentages for proficiency in Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari. Overall, the lowest percentages for proficiency in Gonja and Wali are shown by Mandari, and for Vagla by Gbenfu.
Compared by gender, overall higher percentages of female subjects versus male reported proficiency in Gonja, while higher percentages of male subjects versus female reported proficiency in Wali and, for higher-level language functions, in Dagaari. Overall, there is no difference across gender concerning proficiency in Vagla or for lower-level language functions in Dagaari.

In regard to age, overall higher percentages of younger subjects versus older reported productive abilities in Gonja, while higher percentages of older subjects versus younger reported such abilities for Wali and Dagaari. There is no difference across age for passive abilities in any of these languages.

Among those subjects reporting proficiency in several languages (Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and/or Dagaari), the majority of subjects reported that they speak Gonja better than Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari. Compared by location, Manfulli shows the highest percentages. Also regarding reported comprehension, overall a majority of subjects reported understanding Gonja best. However, it is noted that compared across location, the majority of subjects from Mandari reported understanding Wali better.

Regarding proficiency in Gonja for children, about a third of the sample reported speaking ability, and about half of the sample reported understanding ability.

In regard to Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari, only a small minority of children are reportedly proficient in any of these languages, with higher percentages for reported passive versus productive abilities. Again, most subjects stated that children speak and understand these languages before they reach school age.

6.1.3 Learning environment

In this section we see the various social contexts in which Safaliba speakers might be in contact with Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari speakers, and thereby second language learning might occur. The contexts examined are social contact, education, travel, and religious services.

6.1.3.1 Social contact

The major context in which Safaliba speakers come into contact with speakers of other languages seems to be with neighbors and at markets. The majority of subjects reported having learned a language other than Safaliba through these contexts. Through such social contact Gonja was reportedly learned by 48/55 subjects (87%), of which nineteen subjects (40%) reported having learned Gonja in Bole. Bole is a Gonja town and the Gonja chiefs in the Safaliba area come from its palace. Being the nearest biggest town in the area, it is frequently visited by the Safaliba people for various purposes since the regional market, hospital, regional administration, lorry station, and the SS-School are to be found here.

Through social contact Vagla was reportedly learned by 16/21 subjects (76%), Dagaari by 13/22 (59%), and Wali by 11/35 (31%). A considerable percentage reported that they did not have to learn Wali (14/31 (45%)) or Dagaari (8/22 (36%)), since these languages are similar to Safaliba.
A minority of subjects reported having learned the above mentioned languages at home: Gonja by 5/55 subjects (9%), Vagla by 3/21 (14%), and Wall by 1/31 (3%). [See section 6.2.1.2.]

6.1.3.2 Education: formal and non-formal

Overall, there seems to be very little contact with Gonja, hardly any contact with Vagla, and no contact with Wall and Dagaari through education.

Gonja, as the district language, is a school subject. Thus, it is hypothesized that those with some degree of education would show higher levels of tested and reported proficiency than those without education. Also, it is expected that Gonja is used to some extent between students. However, due to lack of teachers Gonja is not taught in all schools, and overall the level of formal education among the Safaliba seems to be rather low. Thus, contact with Gonja in the context of formal education seems to be very limited.

Of the surveyed sample, only 17/82 subjects (21%) reported having had some level of formal education, of which five subjects (29%) reported having had anywhere from one to three years of Gonja in school, either as the medium of instruction or as a subject. Only 2/55 subjects (4%) reported having learned Gonja at school (both had one and two years of Gonja classes in school).

In regard to tested comprehension of Gonja, the test results show a higher percentage for educated subjects versus noneducated. However, the sample of educated subjects is very small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education #Ss</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Scripture Passages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 8</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 37</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as reported proficiency in Gonja is concerned, overall higher percentages of educated versus noneducated subjects reported proficiency in Gonja (SpkAbl: 11/17 (65%) vs 30/65 (46%), DefAbl: 9/17 (53%) vs 19/65 (29%), UndAbl: 15/17 (88%) vs 44/64 (69%), UndJks: 7/9 (78%) vs 18/28 (64%), UndAll: 4/8 (50%) vs 10/27 (27%)). All five subjects who reportedly have had anywhere from one to three years of Gonja in school, either as the medium of instruction or as a subject, answered positively to the various questions regarding proficiency in Gonja, except for one subject who reportedly does not always understand everything when Gonja speakers speak Gonja.

Concerning non-formal education, there seems to be slightly more contact with Gonja. In regard to the surveyed sample, 18/69 subjects (26%) reported having registered for a literacy class (three of them also reported having attended school). A slightly higher percentage of younger subjects (11/35 (31%)) versus older (7/34 (21%)) and, paralleling the information given by literacy facilitators in Gbenfu and Mandari, a slightly higher percentage of male subjects (11/32 (34%)) versus female (7/37 (19%)) reported having registered for Gonja literacy classes.

However, not all subjects who registered are presently enrolled in classes. Only 9/18 subjects registered (9/69 (13%)) seem to participate in classes (seven subjects from Gbenfu and two from Mandari; seven males and two females). Among the other nine subjects, eight subjects reported that either they stopped attending classes (four subjects in Gbenfu and Mandari) or that
literacy classes were discontinued (four subjects in Mandari), and one subject was the Gonja literacy facilitator in Mandari.

When CPT-QST subjects were asked why they had not registered for Gonja literacy classes, the main reasons given were:

Subjects do not understand Gonja.
Gonja is not their mother tongue.
Subjects prefer literacy classes in Safaliba.

One older female from Mandari explained that she had registered for a Gonja class because she wanted to learn Gonja.

In regard to Vagla or Dagaari, neither of these languages is a school subject. However, it is noted that overall higher percentages of educated subjects versus uneducated reported proficiency in Vagla, except for reported general understanding ability in Vagla with a higher percentage of uneducated subjects versus educated. (SpkAbl: 5/9 (56%) vs 8/28 (29%), DefAbl: 4/9 (44%) vs 4/28 (14%), UndAbl: 5/9 (56%) vs 24/28 (86%), UndJks: 5/9 (56%) vs 12/28 (43%)).

Also regarding Dagaari, overall (slightly) higher percentages of educated subjects versus uneducated reported proficiency (SpkAbl: 4/9 (44%) vs 6/28 (21%), DefAbl: 3/9 (33%) vs 4/28 (14%), UndAbl: 7/9 (78%) vs 22/28 (79%), UndJks: 5/9 (56%) (none from Gbenfu) vs 10/28 (36%).

Concerning the Vagla literacy class in Mandari, only 1/28 subject from Mandari reported having registered.

6.1.3.3 Travel

The questionnaires had sections which pertained to frequency of travel to the Gonja, Vagla, Wali, and/or Dagaari area. Safaliba speakers who had stayed for more than one year in one of those areas were exempted from the interview.

Overall, it can be noted that only a minority of the interviewed subjects travels outside the area. Compared by location, less subjects from Gbenfu (5/28 (18%)), the most remote Safaliba village, versus subjects from Manfuli (7/26 (27%)) or Mandari (8/28 (29%)) tend to travel at all. There is no apparent difference for travel patterns when compared across gender or age.

Reportedly, only 6/77 subjects (8%) travel at least once a year to the Gonja area, e.g., Damongo: only two of them travel there one time a month, the other four travel there one to two times a year.

In the following table the results for test comprehension of Gonja for traveling versus nontraveling are given. However, only three subjects have traveled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>#Ss</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Scripture Passages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To Vagla speaking areas, reportedly 15/37 subjects (41%) travel at least once a year. However, only three of them travel there one time every one to two months. Overall, higher percentages of traveling subjects versus nontraveling reported proficiency in Vagla (SpkAbl: 7/15 (47%) vs 6/22 (27%), DefAbl: 5/15
(33%) vs 3/22 (14%), UndAbl: 13/15 (87%) vs 16/22 (73%), UndJks: 10/15 (67%) vs 7/22 (32%).

Only 3/34 subjects (9%) reported traveling to Wali-speaking areas at least once a year. None of the interviewed subjects (0/37) reported traveling to Dagaari-speaking areas.

6.1.3.4 Religious service

Subjects do not seem to be exposed to Gonja in the mosque or at church, since the preferred language is Safaliba. [See section 6.2.1.5.] There are no reports of use of Gonja in the mosque nor church context.

6.1.3.5 Summary

There is contact with non-Safaliba speakers both within the Safaliba communities and in other geographical areas. There are Gonja speakers in every Safaliba village. However, Gonja people are reported to speak Safaliba with the Safaliba people. [See section 6.2.1.3.] Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari speakers are found less frequently.

Though Gonja is the official language for both formal and non-formal education, only a minority of the subjects also comes into contact with Gonja in the educational context due to the fact that the general level of education is very low.

Travel patterns indicate that subjects only have little contact with non-Safaliba speakers outside the area, with Gbenfu, the most remote village, reporting the least amount of traveling.

Regarding reported proficiency, higher percentages of educated versus non-educated subjects reported proficiency in Gonja. It is noted though that the number of traveling subjects seems to be too small to draw conclusions from the results for reported proficiency.

Subjects do not seem to come into contact with the aforementioned languages in the religious context of the mosque or church.

6.1.4 Summary

The Gonja comprehension test results show very low average scores indicating that the general level of comprehension of Gonja among the Safaliba people is low. Levels of comprehension vary quite extensively within the Safaliba community. The test results seem to be paralleled by reported data, with rather low percentages reporting proficiency in Gonja. Both for tested comprehension and reported proficiency, Manfuli shows overall the highest percentages, while Mandari shows the lowest.

Reported proficiency in Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari is also low. The majority of subjects reporting proficiency in Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and/or Dagaari reported that they speak and understand Gonja best. Compared by location, Manfuli shows the highest percentages. However, it is noted that compared across location the majority of subjects from Mandari reported understanding Wali better.
Regarding reported proficiency for children, about a third of the sample reported speaking ability in Gonja, and about half of the sample reported understanding ability, while only a minority of subjects reported proficiency in Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari.

There is contact with non-Safaliba speakers both within the Safaliba communities and in other geographical areas. There are Gonja speakers in every Safaliba village. However, Gonja people are reported to speak Safaliba with the Safaliba people. Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari speakers are found less frequently. In the educational context there is some contact with Gonja, little contact with Vagla, and no contact with Wali or Dagaari. Travel patterns indicate that subjects only have little contact with non-Safaliba speakers outside the area. Subjects also do not seem to come into contact with the aforementioned languages in the religious context of the mosque or church.

6.2 Language vitality

In the following section two aspects of language vitality, language use, and language attitudes, are examined.

6.2.1 Language use

During the community, church, and individual interviews several questions were asked to explore language use in various domains.

6.2.1.1 Language use for community activities

According to interviewed chiefs and elders, Safaliba is the dominant language for community activities and is used exclusively in most public domains, such as announcements, community meetings, and all customary rites (only in Manfuli both Safaliba and Gonja are used for pouring libation). For chiefs and elders meetings Safaliba is used exclusively, except for Gbenfu, where both Safaliba and Gonja are used. Gonja is used exclusively only in few instances, such as traditional council meetings in Mandari and Manfuli or information meetings and political rallies in Gbenfu or for customary rites where Gonja people are involved.

When Gonja is used in elders and council meetings and community meetings, there is reportedly a need for an interpreter in Gbenfu and Mandari but not in Manfuli.

When comparing language use by village, Mandari reported the least use of Gonja.

6.2.1.2 Language use in private domains

According to the elders interviewed on the community questionnaire, the Safaliba people use Safaliba exclusively in their homes. Also for activities such as singing songs and telling folktales, Safaliba is used. Only in Gbenfu and Mandari are songs sung both in Safaliba and Gonja.
On the post-comprehension questionnaire and on the individual sociolinguistic questionnaire, subjects were asked which language(s) they use in various domains and for various purposes.

All subjects reported the use of Safaliba in the home. As a follow-up question subjects were asked if they also use another language in the home. Gonja is used by 19/82 subjects (23%). Overall, a considerably higher percentage of subjects from Manfuli (15/26 (58%), six of them having a Gonja parent) versus from Gbenfu (2/28 (7%)) and Mandari (2/28 (7%)) reported additional use of Gonja in the home. When compared by age and gender, a slightly higher percentage of female subjects (9/19 (43%)) versus male (10/39 (26%)) and younger subjects (11/34 (32%)) versus older (8/38 (21%)) reported such use. CPT-QST subjects were also asked which language they use more often, Safaliba or Gonja. All 8/8 CPT-QST subjects, who use Gonja in the home, reported using Safaliba more often than Gonja.

In addition to Safaliba, Vagla is used in the home by 2/82 subjects and Wali by 1/82. Dagaari is reportedly not used in the home.

Subjects were also asked if they use any of the aforementioned languages on a daily basis. Daily use of Gonja was reported only by 13/75 subjects (17%): 9/25 subjects (36%) from Manfuli, 2/26 (8%) from Gbenfu, and 2/24 (8%) from Mandari. Compared by gender and age, a slightly higher percentage of male subjects (9/36 (25%)) versus female (4/39 (10%)) and of older subjects (7/34 (21%)) versus younger (6/41 (15%)) reported daily use of Gonja.

In regard to language use in the immediate family, almost all of the thirty-seven subjects from the sociolinguistic questionnaire reported the use of Safaliba with parents, spouse, and their own children (for whom these contexts applied). Only one subject from Manfuli reported speaking exclusively Gonja with her Gonja-speaking mother.11 A few subjects from Manfulli reported using both Safaliba and another language with their immediate family. Additional use of Gonja with one of their parents was reported by 2/13 subjects, with their spouses by 2/13 subjects, and with their children by 2/12 subjects. Additional use of Vagla with either mother or spouse was reported by 2/13 subjects.

With their Safaliba friends, neighbors, Safaliba elders, and at work/in the farm, all thirty-seven subjects reported almost exclusive use of Safaliba. Only one subject from Manfulli reported using both Safaliba and Gonja with neighbors and using exclusively Gonja at work. For arguments with other Safaliba speakers, all subjects (35/35) reportedly use Safaliba.

In the market in Bole all subjects (28/28) reportedly use Safaliba. Gonja is additionally used by 10/28 subjects (six from Manfulli and one from Mandari), Vagla by 2/28, and Wali by 1/28.

Subjects were also asked which language they use to dream, sing, and count money, with the following results

37/37 reported using Safaliba when they dream. One subject from Manfulli reported the additional use of Gonja.

11Another younger female reported speaking exclusively Twi with her father. However, this information seems peculiar, since both her parents are L1 Safaliba speakers, and since otherwise only Safaliba reportedly is spoken in the home.
35/37 (95%) reported the use of Safaliba for singing. Additional use of Gonja was reported by 3/37 subjects (8%) and 2/37 subjects (5%) reported exclusive use of Gonja. Among the five subjects using Gonja, four are from Manfuli. One subject reported the use of Vagla in addition to Safaliba and Gonja.

36/37 (97%) reported using Safaliba to count money. Additional use of Gonja was reported by one subject from Manfuli, and one subject reported exclusive use of English.

Overall, Gonja is more frequently used by subjects from Manfuli, while Mandari seems to report the least overall use of Gonja. There are no apparent differences in regard to the use of Gonja when compared by age or gender.

In regard to language use by children, interviewed chiefs and elders reported that Safaliba is used exclusively in the home or when children play with other children such as Gonja, Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari children. Only children from mixed marriages in Gbenfu are reported to use both Safaliba and Gonja in the home. All subjects (37/37) from the sociolinguistic questionnaire also reported that children use Safaliba exclusively when playing with other Safaliba children.

6.2.1.3 Language use with non-Safaliba speakers

According to the interviewed elders, Safaliba is the normal means of communication between Safaliba and Gonja people because reportedly the Gonja people, living in Safaliba villages, speak Safaliba as a second language, while only a minority of Safaliba speak Gonja well.

During the administration of the sociolinguistic questionnaire, subjects were asked which languages they use in their interactions with non-Safaliba speakers.

With the Gonja elders in their village the majority of subjects (20/25 (80%)) reported use of Safaliba, while only 5/25 (20%, four subjects from Manfuli, one from Gbenfu) reported use of Gonja.

With Gonja friends, both Safaliba and Gonja are used to the same extent: 17/32 subjects (53%) reported use of Safaliba and 16/30 (53%) use of Gonja. However, it is noted that 8/16 subjects using Gonja are from Manfuli and only four each from Gbenfu and Mandari. Five out of thirty-seven (5/37) reported not having any Gonja friends.

With their other non-Safaliba friends the majority of subjects stated using Safaliba as seen in the following:

- 21/31 (68%) use Safaliba with Wali friends, and 12/31 (39%) use Wali (seven of them older subjects), while 5/36 reported not having any Wali friends.
- 20/31 (65%) use Safaliba with Vagla friends, 9/31 (29%) use Vagla (six of them younger subjects), 1/31 uses Wali and 1/31 Dagaari, while 5/36 reported not having any Vagla friends.
- 21/29 (72%) use Safaliba with Dagaari friends and 8/29 (28%) use Dagaari, while 7/36 reported not having any Dagaari friends.
For arguments with non-Safaliba speakers, the majority of subjects also reported use of Safaliba. With Gonjas, 26/35 subjects (74%) reportedly use Safaliba. However, 11/35 (31%) stated (additional) use of Gonja (five from Manfuli, four from Mandari, and two from Gbenfu).

For arguments with other non-Safaliba speakers the majority of subjects stated using Safaliba as seen in the following:

- 22/28 (79%) use Safaliba for arguments both with Walì and with Vagla speakers and 6/28 (21%) use, respectively, Walì or Vagla.
- 23/27 (85%) use Safaliba for arguments with Dagaari speakers and 4/27 (15%) use Dagaari.

Safaliba is the preferred language for children when playing with non-Safaliba children and is almost exclusively used.

Almost all subjects (34/35 (97%)) reported use of Safaliba for children playing with Gonja children. Additional use of Gonja was reported by 8/35 subjects (23%) and 1/35 subject reported exclusive use of Gonja. Among those nine subjects reporting use of Gonja, eight are from Manfuli. In Gbenfu two subjects (2/37) reported that there are no Gonja children in their village.

All subjects reported use of Safaliba for children when playing with other non-Safaliba children: 24/24 with Walì children, 25/25 with Vagla children, and 32/32 with Dagaari children. A minority reported additional use of other languages: 1/24 reported additional use of Walì with Walì children, 2/25 of Vagla with Vagla children, and 2/32 of Dagaari, and 1/32 (from Manfuli) of Gonja with Dagaari children. Some subjects reported that there are no non-Safaliba children in their village: 13/37 stated that there are no Walì children, 12/37 that there are no Vagla children, and 4/37 that there are no Dagaari children in their village.

6.2.1.4 Language use in the educational system

In this section language use in schools in the Safaliba area is investigated.

Only one teacher, Mr. Damanga, the headmaster of the primary school in Mandari, an L1 Safaliba speaker, was available for an interview. He reported that no Ghanaian languages are taught, neither in the primary school nor in the JSS. This includes Gonja which, though it is supposed to be taught as a school subject, cannot be taught due to lack of teachers.

During P1-3, Safaliba is the language of instruction. In addition, a little English is used. After P3, English is the official language of instruction. However, explanations in Safaliba remain necessary.

According to the headmaster, the students speak Safaliba with their teachers and among themselves, mixing Safaliba with English though. In informal situations the headmaster himself uses Safaliba with the students.

As far as proficiency in any of the local languages is concerned, the children reportedly understand Walì, Dagaari, and some Gonja when they reach school age, but they do not speak any of these languages. They neither speak nor understand Vagla.

During PTA meetings Safaliba is used exclusively by the parents.
6.2.1.5 Language use in the church/mosque context

There are three churches in the Safaliba area: Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu, Roman Catholic Church and Assemblies of God Church in Mandari. The preferred language in these churches is Safaliba, and its use is encouraged by the leadership of the church, e.g., the elders use Safaliba for preaching. Safaliba is used almost exclusively for all church activities, such as announcements, prayers, testimonies, Sunday school, women’s and youth meetings. If a language other than Safaliba is used, e.g., for preaching, everything is translated into Safaliba. Such is the case in the Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu, where both Safaliba and English are used for preaching, and in the Assemblies of God Church in Mandari, where both Safaliba and English are used for preaching, announcements, and funerals.

In the Roman Catholic Church in Mandari, Sunday School classes both in Safaliba and English are organized. In the Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu songs are sung both in Safaliba and Twi. Scriptures are read in Twi or English (Christ Appointed Church in Gbenfu) or in English or, if people are present who understand it, in Vagla (Assemblies of God Church in Mandari). In both churches the read texts are then translated into Safaliba. In the Roman Catholic Church in Mandari, the interviewed elder, Mr. Damanga who is also the headmaster of the primary school, usually prepares a translation into Safaliba of the Sunday Readings based on the English Bible. Mr. Damanga has also translated some material into Safaliba and it is used during the service: the Lord’s Prayer, the Rosary, and the Creed.

There are two mosques at Gbenfu and Mandari. For Mandari it is reported that during services Safaliba is used for announcements and preaching. The Koran is read in Arabic and translated into Safaliba. Gonja is not used, since it is reportedly understood by few people.

6.2.1.6 Language use in the written register

Subjects were asked which language they use when writing to Safaliba friends. Due to the high rate of illiterate subjects (33/37 (89%)), only four subjects reported writing letters: three of them in English. In Mandari one older male stated that he tried to write in Safaliba.

According to church leaders, few, if any, members of their congregations own a Bible.

6.2.1.7 Summary

Safaliba is the preferred language of the Safaliba people and is used almost exclusively in all domains.

In public domains, such as customary rites, chiefs and elders meetings, community meetings, and announcements, Safaliba is used almost exclusively. Only in few instances both Safaliba and Gonja or exclusively Gonja are used. When Gonja is used, reportedly interpreters are necessary in Gbenfu and Mandari, but not in Manfuli. When comparing language use by village, Mandari reported the least use of Gonja.
In regard to private domains, all subjects reported use of Safaliba in the home. Only a minority of subjects reported additional use of Gonja in the home, almost all of them from Manfulli. With immediate family members, i.e., parents, spouse and children, Safaliba is used almost exclusively. Only a few subjects from Manfulli reported using both Safaliba and another language with their immediate family.

With Safaliba elders, Safaliba friends, with neighbors, and at work Safaliba is used exclusively. Only one subject reported use of Gonja in addition to Safaliba with friends and exclusive use of Gonja at work.

Languages other than Safaliba are generally only used during interactions with speakers of these languages. A considerable percentage of Safalibas speaks Gonja with Gonja speakers, while only a minority of Safalibas uses Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari with speakers of these languages. However, Safaliba is the preferred language for interactions with speakers from other languages, including Gonja.

Also children are reported to use Safaliba exclusively with other Safaliba children. With Gonja children only a minority of Safaliba children uses Gonja, the majority reportedly uses Safaliba. With all other non-Safaliba children Safaliba is used exclusively.

In a comparison by village, Manfulli reported the most overall use of Gonja. Mandari reported less overall use of Gonja than Gbenfu.

In the religious domain Safaliba is used almost exclusively. In regard to the church context its use is encouraged by the church’s leadership. There is no reported use of Gonja in the religious domain of churches and mosques.

6.2.2 Attitudes

During both the community and the individual interviews, several questions were asked to explore attitudes toward the spoken and written register of Safaliba versus other pertinent languages.

6.2.2.1 Attitudes towards Safaliba

An indicator for generally positive attitudes of the Safaliba people toward their own language is their reported view of the vitality of their language.

When asked whether or not the young people in the village speak Safaliba well, 37/37 subjects responded positively. Subjects were also asked what language they think their grandchildren will use in their homes. Almost all subjects (36/37) stated that Safaliba will still be used. Only one subject stated that she did not know which language would be used. When asked to give a reason why they think this way, all subjects gave the response that it is their language, the only language they understand. This same question was asked during the community interviews. Elders in all villages said their grandchildren will still use Safaliba.

6.2.2.2 Attitudes toward the development of Safaliba

Since the Safaliba people live under the Gonja chieftaincy, a major issue, concerning a possible language development programme in Safaliba, will be
whether or not such a programme would be supported by the Gonja leadership. In an interview with the Bolewura in Bole, Mr. Amankwa Gbeadese, the Gonja chief stated that he and his elders would be ready to give their support, knowing that education in their own language will improve the living conditions of the Safaliba people.

At the same time the Bolewura expressed his concern that the development of their own language could estrange the Safaliba people from the Gonja.

According to Mr. Ewura Bakari, Gonja teacher in Bole, the Gonja people would not object to a Safaliba literacy programme. He rather anticipated that they would be proud of such a programme and would most likely want to become literate in Safaliba, since almost every Gonja speaks Safaliba.

On the last day of the survey, the Safaliba chief in Gbenfu expressed his desire for the development of his language: “We never knew we were also people. We thank God you recognize us as people.”

During the sociolinguistic questionnaires subjects were also asked if they thought it would be good for the Safaliba people if they could read and write Safaliba. All of them (37/37) responded positively, stating they would want to enroll in a Safaliba literacy class if one were established in their village. Most subjects cited Safaliba being their mother tongue as a reason (26/34 (76%)). Other reasons were language vitality, potential development of the language, and progress (7/34 (21%)).

Subjects were also asked if they knew any Safaliba people who write Safaliba. Only 5/37 subjects (14%), all from Mandari, reported positively, citing, for example, the literacy facilitator. Only 2/37 subjects, both from Manfuli, reportedly had tried themselves to write Safaliba.

As a final question, subjects were asked if they thought their community would give financial support for the printing of Safaliba books. Almost all subjects (35/37 (95%)) gave a positive response, while two subjects stated that they did not know what people would do. Subjects stated that money could be raised through contributions, community labor, or farming.

Church leaders also expressed their interest in a Safaliba language development project, stating that a Safaliba Bible Translation would be well received since the Safaliba people do not understand Gonja well.

Mr. Damanga from the Roman Catholic Church in Mandari, stated: “We love our language. It is spoken in Bole and in Sawla. Even Gonja chiefs speak Safaliba. So we need our own translation in Safaliba to be able to understand the Word of God better.” As already described in section 6.2.1.5, Safaliba is the preferred language in the church context where its use is encouraged by the leadership. And in the Roman Catholic Church in Mandari some material has already been translated into Safaliba.

Thus, the use of Gonja or Wali in the church context does not seem to be considered an option, since neither of the languages or material in these languages are used in any of the churches reportedly due to lack of understanding.
6.2.2.3 Attitudes toward spoken Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari

There are certain evidences that Safalibas do not have a negative attitude towards spoken Gonja, Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari. However, only one item on the sociolinguistic questionnaire addressed specifically this issue. Subjects were given a situation in which a young Safaliba person preferred speaking Gonja, Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari at home and were asked whether or not they thought their parents would be happy about this.

Half of the subjects responded “yes”, the parents would be happy (for Gonja: 19/36 (53%), Wali: 17/31 (55%), Vagla: 15/29 (52%), Dagaari: 17/31 (55%)). In addition two subjects from Mandari stated for each language, that, given that the parents understand the language, they would be happy. There is no difference in percentages across location or gender. Compared by age, a higher percentage of older subjects versus younger anticipated that the parents would approve of the preferred use of a language other than Safaliba in their house (Gonja: 11/17 (65%) vs 8/19 (42%), Wali: 11/17 (65%) vs 6/19 (32%), Vagla: 9/17 (53%) vs 6/19 (32%), Dagaari: 11/17 (65%) vs 6/19 (32%)).

When subjects were asked why they had responded “Yes”, subjects gave as reasons:

- that the child learned something,
- positive effects for communication, and
- positive effects for travel.

Among those who had responded negatively, the vast majority explained that the mentioned languages are not their mother tongue 16/19 (84%).

6.2.2.4 Attitudes towards written materials in Gonja versus Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari

During the administration of the sociolinguistic questionnaires, the interviewees were asked which language they would prefer for a literacy programme. When given a choice between Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari, 49/82 (60%) chose Gonja, 25/82 (30%) mentioned Wali, and 8/82 (10%) said Vagla. Dagaari was not given as a choice by any of the 82 subjects.

In regard to Gonja versus Wali, a difference in percentage can be noted across location. In Manfuli 25/26 subjects (96%) would prefer Gonja over Wali (0/26); 1/26 subject would prefer Vagla. In both Gbenfu and Mandari there is no difference in percentage in regard to Gonja versus Wali (Gbenfu: 11/28 (39%) vs 13/28 (46%), Mandari: 13/28 (46%) vs 12/28 (43%)).

Overall, a higher percentage of female subjects versus male would choose Gonja over Wali (32/43 (74%) vs 17/39 (48%)), while a higher percentage of male subjects versus female would choose Wali over Gonja (16/39 (52%) vs 9/43 (21%)).

Among educated subjects, a considerably higher percentage of subjects would choose a Gonja literacy programme over a Wali programme (13/17 (76%) vs 3/17 (18%)), while the difference is less pronounced for uneducated subjects (36/65 (55%) vs 22/65 (34%)). Among the subjects who have not registered in a Gonja literacy class yet, 26/51 (51%) would choose a Gonja literacy programme, while 20/51 (39%) would choose a Wali programme.

When asked to explain their choice, most subjects who had chosen Gonja cited the fact that the Safaliba live together with the Gonja (25/48 (52%)). Other reasons given were that subjects speak and/or understand Gonja (5/48), that they wanted to learn more Gonja (4/48), that Gonja was the next popular language to Safaliba (3/48), or that one of their parents was an L1 Gonja
speaker (8/48). All twenty-five subjects who had chosen Wali cited language comprehension as a reason.

IDV-QST subjects were also asked to consider a situation in which they could choose between four books, a Gonja, a Wali, a Vagla, and a Dagaari book. All thirty-seven subjects, but one made the same choice as for the literacy programme: 23/37 chose a Gonja book, 7/37 a Wali book, and 7/37 a Vagla book. All subjects but one cited the same reasons as given for the choice of a literacy programme.

The opinion that a Gonja literacy programme would be preferable to a literacy programme in Wali was shared by the Bolewura. According to the Bolewura, he and his Gonja elders in the Safaliba area would not be in favour of a Wali literacy programme because the Wali people are a different people with a different land and culture from a different region (Upper West Region), even though Safaliba and Wali are closely related languages. This view was shared by the Gonja and Safaliba elders in Gbenfu and in Manfuli with one elder from Manfuli stating, “A Guinea fowl is never a fowl.” Thus, the Safaliba would prefer literacy classes in Gonja since they have been together with the Gonja for such a long time and since they have everything in common with them. The elders in Mandari expressed feeling unable to make a choice between Gonja and Wali.

According to Mr. Ewura Bakari, Gonja teacher in Bole, the Gonja would not be in favour of a Wali literacy programme because they would be concerned that the Safaliba would “want to leave them for the Wali who are a different people from far away.”

However, the Bolewura also stated that the Gonja people themselves might not be opposed to a Wali programme since mixed marriages between Gonjas and Wali are frequent. Thus, a Wali programme would possibly not be a problem for them provided the Safaliba people are interested in Wali.

According to Mr. Abdala, the son of the Iman in Mandari, the Safaliba people in Mandari would be interested in a literacy programme in Wali if they had to choose between Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari. This opinion was shared by the Gonja literacy facilitator in Gbenfu, since, according to him, Wali is easier to understand than Gonja and only those who lived among the Gonjas and who have been to school in the Gonja area can understand and speak Gonja to some extent. However, according to Mr. Abdala, there are no Wali classes because the Government has decided that people in this area should study Gonja.

6.2.2.5 Summary

All subjects thought that young people speak Safaliba well and that Safaliba will continue to be spoken by their grandchildren. Half of the subjects anticipated that parents would be unhappy if their children preferred using another language than Safaliba at home, while half of the subjects anticipated that parents would be happy.

All subjects were positive about the development of Safaliba, stating they would want to enroll in a Safaliba literacy class, and almost all thought that the community would financially support literacy development in Safaliba. Only very few subjects had already tried to write Safaliba.

Concern was expressed by the Gonja leadership that literacy development in Safaliba could have possible negative side-effects on the relationship between the Safaliba and Gonja people. However, the Bolewura stated that he and his
elders would be ready to give their support for a Safaliba language development project. Given that a literacy programme in a language other than Safaliba was to be promoted, the Bolewura and elders in the area expressed the opinion that a Gonja literacy programme would be preferable to a literacy programme in Wali since the Wali people are a different people with a different land and culture from a different region.

This view was shared by the majority of subjects from the individual interviews. Given a choice between Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari, the majority of subjects stated that they would choose Gonja for a literacy programme. However, it is noted that only in Manfuli a considerable majority chose Gonja. In Mandari and Gbenfu both Gonja and Wali were chosen to an equal extent.

Church leaders also expressed their interest in a Safaliba language development project, stating that a Safaliba translation would be well received. The use of Gonja or Wali in the church context does not seem to be considered an option due to lack of understanding.

**6.3 Literacy**

In the following section, reading and writing ability in Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari are examined as well as reported attempts to write in Safaliba.

### 6.3.1 Reading and writing ability

The overall literacy rate among subjects is rather low for the investigated languages. Reading ability in Gonja was only reported by 7/82 subjects (9%): 4/28 from Mandari (14%), 2/28 from Gbenfu (7%), and 1/26 from Manfuli (4%). Ability to write Gonja was reported by 5/82 subjects (6%): 3/28 from Mandari (11%), 1/28 from Gbenfu (4%), and 1/26 from Manfuli (4%). Overall, a slightly higher percentage of male subjects versus female reported reading ability (5/39 (13%) vs 2/43 (5%)) and writing ability (4/39 (10%) vs 1/43 (2%)); all female subjects are from Mandari.

All subjects reporting reading and writing ability had some level of either formal or informal education. However, only 4/17 subjects with formal education (24%) reported reading and writing ability (three are among the 5/17 educated subjects who reported having had anywhere from one to three years of Gonja in school). Only 3/9 subjects presently enrolled in Gonja literacy classes (33%) reported reading ability and 1/9 (11%) writing ability.

For Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari the percentages are even lower. Reading ability in Wali was only reported by 3/82 subjects (4%), among which one subject also reported writing ability. All three subjects had some level of formal education. Reading and writing ability in Vagla was only reported by one subject from Mandari, who also reported ability to read Dagaari. He is also the only subject who reported having registered for the Vagla literacy classes.

### 6.3.2 Writing in Safaliba

Subjects were asked if they had ever tried to write Safaliba. Only 2/37 subjects (5%) responded positively. Both subjects are educated males (JSS 3, Middle Form 3) from Mandari.
When asked if they knew Safaliba speakers who write Safaliba, 5/37 subjects (14%), all from Mandari, responded positively, e.g., mentioning the literacy facilitator.

6.3.3 Summary

Very low percentages of subjects reported being literate (·9%). This seems to be due to the overall rather low percentage of formal education in the area. An equally rather low percentage is presently enrolled in literacy classes.

7 Conclusion

The purpose of this survey was to gather data that would help GILLBT administrators decide whether or not GILLBT would pursue a language development programme in Safaliba, or whether these communities should be linked to literacy efforts in a language other than Safaliba. Criteria for making this decision have been proposed by Ring (1994). Based on these criteria, the Safaliba language development needs were to be determined by investigating the following areas:

1. bilingualism in Gonja, Wali, and Vagla (essentially "comprehension"), first from reported data and later from tested data if necessary,
2. language contact to investigate the access to Gonja, Wali, and Vagla acquisition,
3. use of Safaliba, Gonja, Wali, and Vagla in various speech domains to determine whether or not Safaliba is a viable language,
4. attitudes toward community involvement in a language development programme, and
5. information on population, education levels, literacy, and religious environment.

Some information was also to be gathered on:

6. reported Dagaari proficiency and use.

Based on the data from sociolinguistic questionnaires administered during a first stage of the survey indicating that a literacy programme in Wali or Vagla does not seem to be an option, GILLBT administration decided at a meeting held October 9, 1995 that L2 comprehension testing should be conducted in Gonja, but not in Wali or Vagla.

The survey results are summarized as follows.
7.1 Multilingualism

Gonja language abilities were assessed by tested and reported data. The average comprehension scores of 47% for the narrative and 35% for the Scripture passages are very low, indicating low levels of tested comprehension. The test results seem to be paralleled by reported data, with rather low percentages reporting proficiency in Gonja. It can be concluded that the average level of comprehension of Gonja among the Safaliba people is low.

Language abilities in Wali, Vagla, and/or Dagaari were only assessed by reported data, also indicating rather low levels of proficiency. The majority of subjects, reporting proficiency in Gonja, Wali, Vagla, and/or Dagaari, stated that they speak and understand Gonja best. In regard to Wali and Vagla, these results concur with the findings of the 1979 study which showed low tested comprehension among the subjects.

The reported data from the present survey indicate that overall only a minority of children speak and understand the aforementioned languages, with apparently more children speaking and understanding Gonja than Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari.

7.2 Language contact

Contact with non-Safaliba speakers occurs in several domains in the Safaliba community, although contact is not extensive. There are Gonja speakers in every Safaliba village. However, they are in the minority and Gonja people are reported to speak Safaliba with Safaliba people. Speakers of other languages, such as Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari are found less frequently. In the educational context there is some contact with Gonja, little contact with Vagla, and no contact with Wali or Dagaari. Travel patterns indicate that subjects only have little contact with non-Safaliba speakers outside the area. Subjects also do not seem to come into contact with the aforementioned languages in the religious context of the mosque or church.

7.3 Language use

There are no indications for language shift toward Gonja, Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari. For most community gatherings Safaliba is used almost exclusively. In more private domains Safaliba is the preferred language of the Safaliba people, both for adults and children. All subjects reported that they use Safaliba in the home and only a minority of subjects reported additional use of Gonja in the home. Almost all subjects reported exclusive use of Safaliba with immediate family members, with Safaliba elders, Safaliba friends, with neighbors, and at work. Languages other than Safaliba are only used during interactions with speakers of these languages. Thus, in interactions with Gonja speakers a considerable percentage of Safaliba speaks Gonja. However, Safaliba is the preferred language for interactions with non-Safaliba speakers, including Gonja speakers.

7.4 Language attitudes

Attitudes toward having literature in Safaliba are positive, with all subjects stating they would want to enroll in a Safaliba literacy class. Church leaders also expressed their interest in a Safaliba language development project,
stating that a Safaliba Bible Translation would be well received. A Safaliba language development project would also be supported by the Gonja leadership in the area, in so far as it enhanced the good relations that exist between the Safaliba and Gonja people.

In regard to a literacy programme in a language other than Safaliba, the Bolewura, Gonja, and Safaliba elders in Gbenfu and Manfulli stated that a Gonja literacy programme would be preferable to a literacy programme in Wali, since the Wali people are a different people from a different region, while the Safaliba people have everything in common with the Gonja people. This opinion was shared by the majority of interviewees, who would rather choose Gonja for a literacy programme than Wali, Vagla, or Dagaari. According to church elders, the use of Gonja or Wali in the church context does not seem to be considered an option, due to lack of understanding.

7.5 Comparison across location

Compared across location, the gathered data show that level of language proficiency, language use, and attitudes vary considerably between Manfulli versus Gbenfu and Mandari. Overall, Manfulli shows the highest percentages for tested comprehension, reported proficiency, and use of Gonja, while the data seem to indicate that Mandari shows the lowest percentages. (The same pattern applies for Wali, Vagla, and Dagaari.) It is also in Manfulli that a considerable majority chose Gonja for a possible literacy programme, while in Mandari and Gbenfu both Gonja and Wali were chosen to an equal extent.

7.6 Summary

In summarizing the results, there is very low tested comprehension and rather low reported proficiency of Gonja in the Safaliba speech community. Reported proficiency in Wali is equally low. The language learning environment for Gonja and Wali is not very extensive and there is no indication of language shift from Safaliba to Gonja or Wali. Expressed attitudes toward Safaliba development were positive. If a language other than Safaliba were to be chosen for a literacy programme in the Safaliba area, a literacy programme in Gonja would reportedly be preferable to a programme in Wali.

8 Recommendations

As described above, Ring (1994) suggests that GILLBT consider assigning teams to pursue language development in the language groups where low levels of bilingualism (i.e., less than 80% average comprehension of a local second language (L2) having Scripture) have been identified in a segment of the population which has no access to L2 acquisition (e.g., adults or children living in a predominantly L1 language environment).

Considering the results of the Gonja comprehension tests, it can be concluded that the average comprehension scores of 47% for the narrative and 35% for the Scripture passages are far below 80% considered by GILLBT to be necessary for use of Scriptures in an L2 (Ring 1994). The low comprehension and the fact that the Gonja learning environment is not very extensive, indicate that the Safaliba people are not adequately reached by the literacy programme in Gonja and that they do not have adequate access to the Scriptures in Gonja.

In regard to Wali, a literacy programme does not seem to be an option either. Even though Safaliba and Wali are linguistically related, and therefore,
tested comprehension in Wali might show better results than for Gonja, the data gathered show that a Wali literacy programme would most likely not be well accepted in the Safaliba area, especially by its Gonja leadership.

These factors, as well as the positive local language attitudes and the use of Safaliba in various domains, point to the fact that the Safaliba language needs to be developed to enable the Safaliba people to have adequate access to non-formal education and the Scriptures.
Appendix A: Map of the Safaliba Area

- Safaliba
- Other languages:
  - B = Birifor
  - Ch = Choruba
  - E = Ewe
  - G = Gonja
  - L = Lobi
  - V = Vagla
Appendix B: Wali Materials

Information from the Baptist Mid-Mission (BMM)

New Testament:
- Register: the language spoken today by the Fufulee people and therefore well understood. However, some of the terminology (such as “righteousness” and “justification”) and other doctrinal expressions are more difficult to understand and must be taught in church.
- Style: semiliteral translation (closer to King James than to The Good News)
- The New Testament is widely used in the BMM churches in the Wali area, in the Youth Ministries and in the Wali Bible School, as well as among several Dagaari groups. Since the Wali people are Muslim, the New Testament is not widely distributed among the Wali.

Primers:
- A considerable part of the teaching material, such as drills and charts, are not in the primers, but are used only in class, either on the blackboard or as flash cards.

Post-Primers:
- Books with animal stories and descriptions on the life of the people (Some of these stories are written by former literacy class participants.)
- Practical guide books, e.g., how to plant trees
- Religious books
- Work is currently underway on a health book, based on Where there is no doctor.
Appendix C: Community Questionnaire

(GILLBT, rev. 9/95, based on COM-QST of SIL/Benin)

Date: / /95 Place: _____________ Researcher: _____________

Name and address of the chief:

Ethnic identity of chief: _________ Ethnic identity of his elders: _________

Abbreviations: S=Safaliba, W=Wali, V=Vagla, D=Dagaari, G=Gonja, Y=Yes, N=No

I. THE SURVEYED LANGUAGE AND ITS NEIGHBORING LANGUAGES

A. LANGUAGE SITUATION

1.1. How do you call your language? _____________________________

1.2. In which villages is your language spoken? In (x)? ... (ask for each village of the area)

(Make a green circle around those villages where the lg is spoken. Put in parenthesis those villages where it is not certain which lg is spoken in them.)

1.3. Are there any other languages besides your own spoken in these villages?
   If YES, which languages? __________________________

   (Make a blue box around those villages where the surveyed lg and other lgs are spoken.)

B. REFERENCE DIALECT

1.4. Among those villages where your language is spoken, are there differences in the way of speaking it?

   1
   2

1.5. Which villages speak differently?
   (According to the information given by the interviewee:)

   Write the letter A besides those villages where people speak like the interviewees, write the letter B besides the villages of a different, group C, etc.

   Make a continual line for the dialect boundaries which are certain and a interrupted line where the boundaries are uncertain.

1.6. How are the people called who speak like those in the villages?

   A ______________ B ______________ C ______________
1.7. What kinds of differences (pronunciation, vocabulary, tone?) are there between
A and B _____________________________________________________
A and C _____________________________________________________
B and C _____________________________________________________

1.8. Which speech form is the most difficult for you to understand? __________________

1.9. How do you understand the speakers of the other speech forms?
++ very well + half half - very little

(The surveyor has to use the following table in order to ask speakers of each speech form how well they understand the other speech forms.)

How well do they understand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10. Do children/men/women who speak A understand speaker of ... well?

(a) Children
    | B | C | D |
    | A | y | n | y | n |

(b) Men
    | B | C | D |
    | A | y | n | y | n |

(c) Women
    | B | C | D |
    | A | y | n | y | n |

1.11. Where is your language spoken the best? __________________

1.12. If one would like to write your language which speech form should be chosen? __________________

II. RATIO OF POPULATION

2.1. Give an estimate of the people in this village: C: _________
    W: _________ V: _________ D: _________ G: _________ : _________
2.2. Give an estimate of the S speakers in this village: _______

2.3. Are there any mixed marriages? If yes, how many?
   S-W: Y N _______ S-V: Y N _______ S-D: Y N _______ S-G: Y N _______

2.4. Are there any S people who work outside the S area? How many?
   W area: _______ When they come back to the village, which language do they use at home? S W with their Safaliba friends? S W
   V area: _______ When they come back to the village, which language do they use at home? S W with their Safaliba friends? S W
   D area: _______ When they come back to the village, which language do they use at home? S W with their Safaliba friends? S W
   G area: _______ When they come back to the village, which language do they use at home? S W with their Safaliba friends? S W

III. LANGUAGE USE AND BILINGUALISM IN THE AREA

A. LANGUAGE USE AND COMPREHENSION IN PUBLIC FUNCTIONS

3.1. Announcements
   Language used
   Gong-Gong beating S W V D G ______
   Talking drums S W V D G ______
   Interpreter used for (meetg, sgrp) ______________________________

   Interpreter desired for (meetg, sgrp) ____________________________

3.2. Customary rites
   Language used
   Pouring libation S W V D G ______
   Enstooling S W V D G ______
   Outdooring of a child S W V D G ______
   Puberty rites S W V D G ______
   Funeral S W V D G ______
   Marriage (mixed marriage) S W V D G ______
   Songs (Female, Male) S W V D G ______
   Folktales S W V D G ______
   Interpreter used for (meetg, sgrp) ______________________________

   Interpreter desired for (meetg, sgrp) ____________________________
3.3. Elders’ or council meetings

Chief and elders meetings  S W V D G ____
Traditional council meetings  S W V D G ____

Interpreter used for (meetg, sgrp) ____________________________

Interpreter desired for (meetg, sgrp) __________________________

3.4. Community meetings

Community discussion (Dev.) meetings  S W V D G ____
Information van  S W V D G ____
Public Information Meetings (Govt.)  S W V D G ____
Political rallies  S W V D G ____
Others  S W V D G ____

3.5. When a community devlp meeting is organized in W/V/D/G/__, can the S speakers participate well in ...?

W: Y N Which people can’t?  MY MO FY FO Edct NEdct
V: Y N Which people can’t?  MY MO FY FO Edct NEdct
D: Y N Which people can’t?  MY MO FY FO Edct NEdct
G: Y N Which people can’t?  MY MO FY FO Edct NEdct
__: Y N Which people can’t?  MY MO FY FO Edct NEdct

B. LANGUAGE USE AND COMPREHENSION IN PRIVATE FUNCTIONS

3.6. Which lg(s) do you speak in your home? _______________
   If C: Do they also use W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N ____: Y N

3.8. Which lg(s) do S people in Bole speak in their homes? _______________
   If C: Do they also use W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N ____: Y N

3.9. Which lg(s) do S people in the other S villages speak in their homes?
   If C: Do they also use W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N ____: Y N

3.10. How do the people in this village understand speakers of the other languages? (++ very well; + half half; - very little)

   W  V  D  G  ____

Children
-----------------------------------------------
MY
-----------------------------------------------
MO
-----------------------------------------------
FY
-----------------------------------------------
FO

3.11. Which language do the S children speak at home?
   If C: Do they also use W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N ____: Y N
In which instances do they use these other languages:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3.12. When the S children play, which language do they use:

with S children S W V D G ___
with W children S W V D G ___
with V children S W V D G ___
with D children S W V D G ___
with G children S W V D G ___
with ___ children S W V D G ___

3.13. Which language do you think your grandchildren will use in their homes when they have become adults? S W V D G ___

C. LANGUAGE USE IN MEDIA

3.14. Does radio broadcasting exist in one of the reg lgs? Y N
   In which languages? S W V D G ___
   What kind of programs? _____________________________________

3.15. Do TV programs exist in one of the reg lgs? Y N
   In which languages? S W V D G ___
   What kind of programs? _____________________________________

IV. LITERACY

4.1. Do you have a literacy program in your village? Y N

4.2. In which language? S W V D G ___

4.3. Who are the organizers? ______________________________________

4.4. If NO: in which other villages are literacy programs conducted? ______________________________________

4.5. Do you know any S people who write S? Y N
   Who? ______________________________________

4.6. If there was a literacy program set up in the area in a language other than Safaliba, in which language would you prefer that it be? W V D G ___
Appendix D: School Questionnaire

(GILLBT rev 9/95, based on SCH-QST SIL/Benin)

Date: / /95 Place: _____________ Researcher: _____________

Abbreviations: S=Safaliba, W=Wali, V=Vagla, D=Dagaari, G=Gonja
Y=Yes, N=No, M=Male, F=Female

I. PRESENTATION OF THE INTERVIEWEE

1. Name: _____________________________ 2. Mother tongue: ______
3. Years of teaching in this village: _____ 4. Level: _________

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. How many Preschools primary schools ______ JSS ______ SSS ______
are there in this area?
6. What is the average educational level of people under age 25?
   M: primary JSS SSS
   F: primary JSS SSS
7. Any post secondary institutions in the S area? Y N
8. How many teachers in this school are: S_______ W_______ G_______ V_______
   D_______
   At what levels? S teachers: Level(s) ______
   W:_______, V:_______, D:_______, G:_______
9. Total enrollment in this school? ______
10. How many boys/girls are in this school? Boys ______
    Girls________
11. How many students in P6 complete primary school each year? ______
    JSS complete JSS level/year? ______

III. LANGUAGE USE

12. What Ghanaian lgs are taught in the schools?
   primary_______________________, secondary_______________________
13. (Primary school): When they start school, do the children
   understand: W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N __: Y N
   speak: W: Y N V: Y N D: Y N G: Y N __: Y N
14. What is the medium of instruction for
preschool ______________________________
the first three years ______________________________
later ______________________________

15. In the classroom, what lg(s)
do you use with S children? S W V D G __

16. Do they always understand
when you give instructions in W/V/D/G/__? Y N

17. Is it ever necessary to give explanations in C? Y N

18. When S students give explanations in W/V/D/G/__
can they communicate their ideas as clearly as W/V/D/G/__ students (if any)? Y N

19. Do S students perform as well as W/V/D/G/__
students (if any) on their W/V/D/G/__ exams? Y N

20. In informal situations: what lg(s) do S teachers use with S students? S W V D G __

21. Which lg do S students use with S teachers in class S W V D G __
outside of class S W V D G __

22. What lg do the children use at break while playing? ________

23. What language is used by the parents at PTA meetings? ________
If they use W/V/D/G/__ can S parents communicate their ideas as clearly as W/V/D/G/__ parents? Y N

24. Are there any literacy materials in the mother tongue? Y N
Appendix E: Church Questionnaire

(GILLBT rev 9/95, based on CHUR-QST of SIL/Benin)

Date: / /95 Place: _____________ Researcher: _____________

Name(s): ______________________________ Denomination: _________

Abbreviations: S=Safaliba, W=Wali, V=Vagla, D=Dagaari, G=Gonja, Y=Yes, N=No

1. Are the majority of people in the area: Muslim Chr Anim
   Give estimated proportions for each location: __________

2. Which churches in the area have:
   largest number in the congregations? ________________
   most churches? ________________________________

3. What language(s) are used in the main / “spiritual” churches for [probe for various areas]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>S W/V/D/G/</th>
<th>S W/V/D/G/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer: by leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What language(s) are used for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>S W/V/D/G/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>women’s meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plays or drama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testimonies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayers during Bible studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If in W/V/D/G: Do all members of the congregation understand the preaching? Y N
   Scriptures? Y N
   (Youth? Older people?)

6. Which Bible is used in the various churches? W V D G ___

7. Do people own W/V/D/G/ __ Bibles? Y N
   What proportion of the congregation? ________________

8. Are there any Christian materials available in Safaliba? Y N
   What? ________________

9. Are there Safaliba people in church leadership? Y N
   What language do they use for preaching? S W/V/D/G/ __

10. Does the church leadership allow/encourage Safaliba in:
    the worship service/mass? Y N
    during various meetings? Y N
    Which ones? __________
Appendix F: Gonja Texts: Transcription and Interlinear Translation


1. PERSONAL NARRATIVE

(1) [G] N tuto ka da wuta, ndaa sa kakrang ga
[IE] my father was there I liked learning much
[ME] When my father was alive, I liked learning very much

male n ka sa koto N° Kache-kama ni anyi
I too and also like farm and day-every that we
and I also liked farming, and any day we

men yo karagnto anyii be ntuto so na ayo ndoto nya do.
do not go to school we follow my-father go to-farm to weed.
didn’t go to school, we would follow my father to the farm to work.

(2) Anyi ka be do na, ni anyi yen ajiibi anyen amansitibi
we as weeding then we get food we-get money
As we farmed, we got (some) food and money.

ni ntuto ba wu n ka ka anyi.
then my-father died and left us
Then my father died, leaving us.

(3) E ka wu nka anyi na ni male keti fene ni men pre keneshin
he died and left us then I-too saw that if I-don’t redden-eye
When he died, leaving us, then I thought, if I didn’t become serious

wuta kakrang na to ama nyale. Ni n wura ania n luge
in the school it-won’t-go-well and I did my to finish
with schooling, things wouldn’t go well. Then I tried, finished
kakragn na nbeti mba, mba ka ngneni mbia
school the I-came back and was teaching children
school, came back, and taught.

(4) Nka be ngneni bu mu na, maale be kimansiribi wei ne mei
I was teaching them I too money that I
When I was teaching them, the salary I received was
yen na, me kakuka ma ler ma. N ban ya yen jiman kama
get my salary not enough for me I if just get time any
insufficient. Any time I was free,
me ta na nyo basa be ndoanto n ya do n se bu mo
I take it and go people their farms and go weed for them
I would go to people’s farms to do some work for them.

(5) Ni n chema nkanga fene ke man daga, a dagga
and I sat and said that it was not right it is good that
Then I thought it was not right to do that. It is good to
male gba ka do me ndo. Ndong na ni nyo nya wu ntutokra ana
I too weed my farm there I went to see my uncles
have my own farm. Then I went to see my uncles and I was
ni be sima kasawule.
and they gave me the land.
given some land.

(6) Be ka sima kasawule na ni male min ko amansiribi
they when gave me land the and I too didn’t have money
When I was given the land, I didn’t have money to hire people
to take people to go weed to give
to go and weed for me.

Then I tried each afternoon after I closed from school
to, a ni nyo nya do. Nwura long mba nyen men ndoto.
and I go to weed I did that to come get my farm
to go and do some work. I did this till I got my farm.

I alone was tired food time reached then I saw people many
I suffered alone. When it was time for food then I found many
ka ba. Basi my e che me to aji me ajibi ere? Be yu.
came people which are helping me to eat my food this thieves
more people. Who are those helping me consume my produce? Thieves!

One day I went to farm and found out that my corn was
harvested. Then I said to myself: I will check these people.

The next day I went very early to farm to wait for the thief.
Mere ya ka kete ni bore mol ni kabong birito.
I saw later that the clouds were dark and the place dark
I realized the clouds had gathered making the place dark.

(11) Ni nye kumore eyu ere mana mba. Mere ka ban kili
and I said then thief this will not come I just turned
Then I said that this thief will not come again, when I

nyo, ndong ni nun awor ko men do na to.
to go then I heard noise some my farm inside
heard some noise in my farm.

(12) Ni nye aa, ntema eyu na ba. Mere ka ban mpeta nya
And I said aah I think thief the come I when I discreetly
Then I said, aah, I think the thief has come. When I discreetly

ka fo ni wana nde eyu ka ban wuma ni ebirto.
was getting there and who is this thief when saw me and he run
was approaching, there he was. When the thief saw me, he ran.
2. SCRIPTURE PORTIONS

(a) Acts 21:30-36

30 [G] Ndong nna nk kadegbong na to ebi kik luri

[IE] There then that big town the people all entered kebagato to nk confusion and

[ME] It was then that the people of the city got in confusion and all basa na kik shile m ba abar so m ba nyang Pool ng gberge people the all ran all together came grabbed Paul and pulled/dragged the people ran together and came and grabbed Paul and dragged him out mo n lar bor lambu na to nseng ti bor lambu na be mbuna him out of church the and then closed church the its doors epul na to.

immediately of the prayer room/church and immediately closed the doors of the temple.

31 Jimang yenso na daa sha kemog Pool nna nk esa ko ya kango

crowd wild the wanted to kill Paul and someone went and told/said The wild crowd wanted to kill Paul and someone went and told the leader of Romans their warriors their leader the that Jerusalem-people are rioting the Roman warriors that the people of Jerusalem were on strike/rioting.

32 epul na to nk enimu na lara ekrachi ko nk benapo

immediately then leader the appointed/sent officers some and warriors Immediately (there and then) the leader ordered/asked some officers and
ko ᵇ b ᵇ mo so n nya manang n yo jimang na to.
some and they followed him and hurried to go crowd the
soldiers and then they quickly followed him to the crowd.

*4 B ka bang wu mo ᵇ benapo ᵇ na ᵇ b yige Pool be
when they saw him and warriors the then they stopped/left Paul him
kebri.
beating
When they saw him with the soldiers, they stopped beating Paul.

*5 33 N enimu na yo Pool kuto n ya shin ᵇ ᵇ pr
and leader the went Paul to and made they catch/arrest
And the leader went up to Paul and asked that he be arrested
mo nseng shin ᵇ b ta ngb lebi anyo ng kre mo. Kumo be
him and made them take sticks two and tied him after that
and to be chained (with two sticks). Afterwords he asked,

kaman ᵇ e bishi: "Nuso be esa e la kanyen ere, ᵇ man ᵇ ᵇ e wora?"
he asked what person is man this, what he does
“Who is this man and what did he do?”

*6 34 Ndong nna ᵇ jimang na gbar ᵇ juge to. Kebagato
It was then that crowd they wanted all saying what confusion
Everybody was talking at the same time / It was there that the
na be keshi na so benapo be enimu na daa mang
the its big because warriors their leader the couldn’t
crowd got divided. The leader of the soldiers did not really

ting m pin kuso ᵇ k bang wora, amoso, ᵇ e dang shin
know/ understand thing that that did therefore he asked his
get to know what happened because of the intensity of the
nɛ mbe benapo keta Pool nna n yo kesɔnyige be ebu lempo that his warriors handle Paul the to go to courtyard this room hall na to.
in confusion. So he asked his soldiers to take Paul to the courtyard.

35 Ebu na be kabondiikpa nawule nɛ b dang fo nɛ room the its climbing place (doorsteps) only that they reached and They got only to the doorstairs and had to
benapo na mang mo so ngkpal kananɛ jimang yenso na warriors the raised him because how crowd wild the nyangɛ to na so. rioting/angry carry him because of how angry the crowd was.

36 Bumo kikr daa shil nna a buu mo a ponte a kàngɛ: “Men mo mo.” they all were running, covering him shouting saying: kill him They all ran after him shouting and saying, “Kill him!”

(b) 1st Peter 4:7-8

Aso kikr be ekar be jemanɛ na bee taga to nna na, amoso, things all their end their time the is near so
men baa ko nfrɛa
you have thoughts
The end of everything is coming soon. Therefore think rightly
ningiso nsaa ting men be amu, sange na so menyeeng ting ng kule straight and manage your heads time the you can beg

God well
and guide/comfort yourself. It is then that you can pray very well.

8 Ade kikœ be kaman, men baa sha abar kashenteng to,
these all back you should love each other truly
Above all these / After all these, love each other,

ngkal manœ so, kasha e naa buu alubi damta so.
because love the covers sin many on
because the love covers many sins.

(c) 1st Timothy 6:8

8 Amoso, nœ an baa ko ajibi nœ asœbuuso, a kukwe anyi
therefore if we have food and clothing enough us

Therefore if we have food and clothing, that should be enough.
Appendix G: Gonja Comprehension Testing: Base for Scoring

I. GONJA NARRATIVE

1. When my father was alive, I liked learning very much and I also liked farming, and any day we didn’t go to school, we would follow my father to the farm to work.

Base Line (answers given by L1 Gonja speakers):
When his father was living he liked to learn, he liked to farm. Any time they didn’t go to learn, they went to farm with their father.

When my father was alive, I liked to learn and I also liked to go to farm. Any time we didn’t go to school, we followed my father to the farm to work.

When his father was alive, he liked learning and liked to go to farm. Any day he didn’t go to school, they would follow their father to the farm and work.

When my father was there, I loved learning and also farming. Any time I didn’t go for studies, I accompanied my father to the farm and to weed.

When his father was there, he liked learning. Any time he didn’t go to school, he followed his father to the farm and did some work.

2. As we farmed, we got some food and money. Then my father died, leaving us.

Base Line:
As we did the farming, we got food and money. But my father died later, leaving us.

As they farmed, they got food and money. And their father died later, leaving them.

During the course of farming we had money and food. Then the father died and left us.

As they farm, that’s when they get money and food. But the father died and left them alone.

3. When he died, leaving us, then I thought, if I didn’t become serious with schooling, things wouldn’t go well. Then I tried, finished school, came back, and taught.

Base Line:
When his father died, he realized he had to be serious with learning. Otherwise things wouldn’t be good for him. And so he tried to finish school and to come and teach children.

When he died, leaving us, I realized that I needed to be serious in school. So I tried and finished school, came back, and was teaching.

When his father died and left them, he realized that he had to be serious with schooling. And he tried and completed school, came back and was teaching.
When the father died he saw it won’t go well with him if we wouldn’t continue learning. When he completed and came back, he became a teacher.

After the father died he thought that if he didn’t become serious with the learning it would not be good for him. So he completed school and came back and taught others.

4. When I was teaching them, the salary I received was insufficient. Any time I was free, I would go to people’s farms to do some work for them.

Base Line:
When I was teaching them, the salary I received was insufficient. Any time I was free, I would go to people’s farms to do some work for them.

The money he got from teaching the children was insufficient. And so any free time he got he would go to people’s farms and work for them.

The money he got from teaching wasn’t enough. So he would go any time he was free to work for people on their farms.

During the teaching the amount I was receiving wasn’t enough for me. Any little time, when I had time, he accompanied people to farms and helped them in farming.

As he thought then the money he’s paid, was not sufficient. So any free time he had he goes to the farms to help other people.

5. Then I thought it was not right to do that. It is good to have my own farm. Then I went to see my uncles and I was given some land.

Base Line:
He realized it was not fair and he needed to have his own farm. So he went to his uncle who gave him a piece of land.

So one day I realized it was not good enough. I needed to have my own farm. So I went to my uncle who gave me a piece of land.

So he realized that was not good enough and he needed to have his own farm. So he went to see his uncle who gave him a piece of land.

I thought that was not fine. It’s better to have my own farm. So I decided to see my uncle who gave a piece of land.

So he thought that’s not wise doing so. It’s better to have a land of his own. So he went and saw his uncles and they gave him one.

6. When I was given the land, I didn’t have money to hire people to go and work for me.

Base Line:
When he got the piece of land he didn’t have money to get people to work for him.

So when he was given the land he didn’t have enough money to hire people to work for him.
When he was given the land he didn’t have money to hire people to work on his land.

When they gave me the land, I had no money to employ people to farm for me.

After he was given the land, he didn’t have the money to employ laborers.

7. Then I tried each afternoon after I closed from school to go and do some work. I did this till I got my farm.

Base Line:
So every day after work in the afternoons he would go to weed. He did that till he got his own farm.

So he tried all by himself and every afternoon after work he would go and farm. And he did that until he got his own farm.

So each time after work in the afternoon, he would go to farm and he did that till he got his own farm.

Every afternoon when he closed from work he goes to farm to work on the farm. So he was able to get his own farm.

He started doing the farming himself after he closed from work and gradually he got a farm.

8. I suffered alone. When it was time for food then I found many more people. Who are those helping me consume my produce? Thieves!

Base Line:
He was the only one who suffered, who got tired in the farm. But when it was time for the food there were many people. Who are these people? Thieves.

He was the only one who suffered. But when it was time for the food there were many people. And he asked: Who could be helping me eating my food? Thieves.

He suffered alone. But when it was time for the food many people came around. And he asked who could be helping him eating his food? Thieves.

I labored / suffered alone. But when it was time for the food I saw that so many came. They helped me in eating the food. Who are those people? Thieves.

He suffered alone. He saw that people were helping him eating the products of his farm. Who are these people? Thieves.

9. One day I went to farm and found out that my corn was harvested. Then I said to myself: I will check these people.

Base Line:
One day he went to the farm and realized that they had harvested some corn. And so he decided to find out who these thieves were.
One day he went to farm and realized that they had harvested his corn and he said, I will find out who these people are.

So one day when he went to farm he realized his corn was harvested. So he decided he was going to find out who it was.

So one day he went to the farm and found that people had harvested some of corn. He said he’ll watch out for these people.

One day he went to the farm to see that people have harvested his corn. He said he would hide and get these people one day.

10. The next day I went very early to farm to wait for the thief. I realized the clouds had gathered making the place dark.

Base Line:
So very early one day he went to the farm to wait for the thief. And later he realized the clouds were dark and the place was dark.

So the next day he went very early to the farm to wait for the thief. Then he suddenly realized the clouds were dark and the place became dark.

So the next day he went very early to farm to wait for the thief. Then he realized the clouds had gathered and the place became dark.

The following day I went to the farm early to watch out for the thieves. But I found out the clouds were dark and the place was dark.

The following morning he got up very early and left for the farm to find the thief. But clouds gathered and the place was dark.

11. Then I said that this thief will not come again, when I heard some noise in my farm.

Base Line:
Because of the rain he thought the thief wouldn’t come anymore. Just when he decided to go he heard some noise in the farm.

So he said: Ah, the thief will not come anymore. Just when he turned to go he heard a noise in his farm.

So he said: Ah, the thief will not come anymore. As he turned to go he heard a noise in his farm.

He said then: This thief wouldn’t come again. So when he turned to go he heard noise in the farm.

Then he said the thief will not come again. So he turned to go and then heard some noise in his farm.

12. Then I said, Aah, I think the thief has come. When I discreetly was approaching, there he was. When the thief saw me, he ran.

Base Line:
He said: Ah, this must be the thief. So he got back. And there the thief was. The thief saw him and ran.
So he said: The thief might have come. But as he got there, when the thief saw him, he ran away.

So he said: This must be the thief. And so he went closer and there the thief was. When the thief saw him, he ran away.

Then he said: The thief has come. So he was walking slowly towards him. Then the thief saw him, he ran away.

He said: “I think that is the thief.” He hid to find out whether it was the thief. And when the thief saw, he “was in a state of confusion” / ran away.

II. GONJA SCRIPTURE PORTIONS

(a) Acts 21:30-35

1. It was then that the people of the city got in confusion and all the people ran together and came and grabbed Paul and dragged him out of the prayer room/church and immediately closed the doors of the temple.

Base Line:
There was disorder and all the people of the big town ran together and grabbed Paul, sent him out of the prayer room and immediately closed the doors of the temple.

The town got into confusion, the people ran together, came and grabbed Paul, pulled him out of the church and immediately closed the doors of the church.

And the people of the city were in confusion and they ran along together, grabbed Paul.

There was tension in the town and all the people ran together and grabbed Paul and they dragged him out of the worship place and closed the doors.

2. The wild crowd wanted to kill Paul and someone went and told the leader of the Roman warriors that the people of Jerusalem were on strike/rioting.

Base Line:
And then the people wanted to kill Paul and someone went to tell the leader of the Roman warriors that the people of Jerusalem were on strike.

The crowd wanted to kill Paul and then someone went to tell the leader of the Roman warriors that Jerusalem was rioting.

So the people wanted to kill Paul and someone went to tell the leader of the Roman warriors that Jerusalem was rioting.

The people wanted to kill Paul and then someone ran to the leader of the Roman army and told him that there was an uprising in Jerusalem.

3. Immediately (there and then) the leader ordered/asked some officers and soldiers and then they quickly followed him to the crowd.

Base Line:
So immediately some officers and soldiers were asked by the leader to leave and they hurried to the crowd.

Immediately the leader asked some officers and soldiers who followed him quickly to the crowd.

So immediately the leader chose some officers and soldiers to quickly go to the crowd.

Probe: with the leader

Immediately the leader of the Roman army sent some scholars and some soldiers to the crowd. They followed the leader to the crowd.

4. When they saw him with the soldiers, they stopped beating Paul.

Base Line:
When they saw him with the warriors, they stopped beating Paul.
When they saw him with the soldiers, they stopped beating Paul.
When they saw him with the soldiers, then they stopped beating Paul.
When they saw the leader and the warriors, they stopped beating Paul.

5. And the leader went up to Paul and asked that he be arrested and be chained (with two sticks). Afterwards he asked, “Who is this man and what did he do?”

Base Line:
So the leader went up to Paul and made the people to arrest him and asked him to be chained. After that he asked them who this man was and what he did.

So the leader went up to Paul, got him arrested and asked him to be chained. Then he asked, “Who is this man and what has he done?”

So when they got there to Paul, the leader got him arrested and chained and asked them who this man is and what he did.

Then the leader went to Paul, they caught Paul and he made them to chain him. He asked who Paul was and what he did.

6. Everybody was talking at the same time / It was there that the crowd got divided. The leader of the soldiers did not really get to know what happened because of the intensity of the confusion. So he asked his soldiers to take Paul to the courtyard.

Base Line:
The people spoke. And because of the intensity of the confusion the leader didn’t understand what they were saying. They were making noise. So he asked his soldiers to take Paul to the courtyard.

The crowd was speaking at the same time and so the leader of the soldiers did not really know what happened. He asked his soldiers to take Paul to...
The crowd was speaking at the same time and so the leader of the soldiers did not really know what happened. He asked his soldiers to take Paul to ...

So the confusion was so great that the leader did not know what happened, he didn't understand. He asked the soldiers to take Paul to a courtyard.

When he asked, the people were talking all in a confusing way. The leader couldn't understand what they were meaning. He made them capture Paul and sent him to the courtyard.

7. They got only to the doorstairs and had to carry him because of how angry the crowd was. They all ran after him shouting and saying, “Kill him!”

Base Line:
They only got to the doorsteps and then the soldiers carried him, because of how angry the people were. They were all running and following and shouting and saying, “Kill him!”

They had only got to the doorstairs when the people carried him high because of how the tension was. So the people were running, following him, shouting, saying, “Kill him!”
Probing: the soldiers were carrying him

So the people got only to the door and because of the way the people were rushing on Paul, the soldiers carried him high. So all of them were running after him, shouting and saying, “Kill him!”

They had only reached the doorstairs of the courtyard when the soldiers raised Paul because of the tension of the people on them. They were all running after them and shouting, “Kill him!”

(b) 1st Peter 4:7-8

8. The end of everything is coming soon. Therefore think rightly and guide/comport yourself. It is then that you can pray very well.

Base Line:
The end of things is coming near. And so we should be thinking rightly and then comport ourselves. And this should help us to pray well.

The end of everything is coming soon. Think rightly and comport yourself. It is then that you can pray very well.

The end of everything is coming soon and everybody should think rightly and comport themselves. It is then that you can pray very well.

The end of things is near. So we must think well and comport ourselves.

9. Above all these / After all these, love each other, because the love covers many sins.

Base Line:
Above all this, we should love each other. This love covers all sins.
Probe: many sins
Above all this, do really love each other, because the love covers many sins.

Above all, we should love each other, because this love covers many evils.

Above all this, we must love one another. Love covers many sins.

(c) 1st Timothy 6:8

10. Therefore if we have food and clothing that should be enough.

Base Line:
Therefore, if we have food and dresses that should be enough for us.
So if we have food and clothing that is enough for us.
So if we have food and dresses that is enough for us.
So if we have food and dress it’s enough for us.
Appendix H: Post Comprehension Test Questionnaire

(08/95, rev 10/95, GILLBT)

Date: / /95 Place: _____________ Researcher: _____________

Abbreviations: S=Safaliba, G=Gonja, W=Wali, Y=Yes, N=No

I. PRESENTATION OF THE TESTEE

1.1. Name and surname: ______________________ 1.2. Age: _____
1.3. Sex: 1 1.4. Profession: __________________
1.5. Last class in school? _____ Yrs of reg lg in school? Lg: ___ Yrs: ____
1.6a Religion: ____ 1.6b Denomination? ______
1.6c Church/Mosque attendance: Dly sev/wk 1x/wk 2x/mth 1x/mth >1x/mth
1.7. Where were you born? _____________ 1.8. Where did you grow up? ________
1.9. Where do you live now? ______________________
1.10 Did you ever live in the G language area for more than one year?  Y N
1.11. Testee’s mother tongue? S G ____
1.12. Father’s mother tongue? S G ____
1.13. Mother’s mother tongue? S G ____
1.14. Language use between parents? S G ____
1.15. Spouse(s)’s mother tongue(s)? S G ____
1.16. Language use of testee at home? S G ____
   If S, additional use of? G: Y N
   Language used most often S G

1.17. Have you registered for a Gonja literacy class? Y N
   Why? / Why not? ________________________________

1.18. If you had a choice between attending either a literacy class in Gonja or one in Wali, which one would you choose? Y N
   Why? __________________________________________
II. AFTER THE GONJA NARRATIVE

2.1. How did you understand the story?
   all / most / a bit / very little / nothing

2.2. Would the people in this village understand the story?
   MY: Y N / MO: Y N / FY: Y N / FO: Y N

III. AFTER THE GONJA SCRIPTURE PORTIONS

3.1. How did you understand the story?
   all / most / a bit / very little / nothing

3.2. Would the people in this village understand the story?
   MY: Y N / MO: Y N / FY: Y N / FO: Y N

3.3. Do you travel to Gonja-speaking areas?
   Y N
   Where? ____________________________
   How often? (>1x/wk, 1x/wk, 2x/mth, 1x/mth, 4-6x/yr, 1x/yr) _______________
   Duration of stay? ____________________________

3.4 Do you speak:
   G: Y N / W: Y N
   If YES: Which do you speak best?
   Which do you understand best?
   G: Y N / W: Y N
   If NO: Do you understand:
   G: Y N / W: Y N
   Which do you understand best?
   G: Y N / W: Y N

3.5. Where did you learn G?
   Home School Other: __________

3.6. If you were brought before the Gonja chief to defend/express
   yourself, would you be able to express yourself in Gonja?
   Y N

3.7. Do you always understand everything when you hear
   Gonja people speaking Gonja?
   Y N

3.8. Do you speak Gonja every day?
   Y N

Appendix I: Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

(rev 9/95, 6/95, after the Cameroonian version)

Date: / /95 Place: _____________ Researcher: _____________

Abbreviations: S=Safaliba, W=Wali, V=Vagla, D=Dagaari, G=Gonja, E=English,
Y=Yes, N=No

I. PRESENTATION OF THE TESTEE

1.1. Name and surname: _______________________ 1.2. Age: _____
1.3. Sex: ___ 1.4. Profession: ______________________
1.5. Last class in school? _____ Yrs of reg lg in school? Lg: ___ Yrs: ___
1.6a Religion: ____ 1.6b Denomination? ______
1.6c Church/Mosque attendance: Dly sev/wk 1x/wk 2x/mth 1x/mth >1x/mth
1.7. Where were you born? _____________ 1.8. Where did you grow up? __________
1.9. Where do you live now? ________________________
1.10a Did you ever live outside of your village? Y N
1.10b Where? ________________________________ For how long? ____
1.11. Testee’s mother tongue? S W V D G
1.12. Father’s mother tongue? S W V D G
1.13. Mother’s mother tongue? S W V D G
1.14. Language use between parents? S W V D G
1.15. Spouse(s)’s mother tongue(s)? S W V D G
1.16. Language use of testee at home? S W V D G
   If S, additional use of? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N

II. MULTILINGUALISM

2.1. Do you travel to W / V / D / G areas Y N

Where

How often

(4-6x/yr, 1x/mth, 2x/mth, 1x/wk, >1x/wk)

Duration of stay?

2.2a Do you speak: W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N
If YES: Which do you speak best? S W V D G
2.2b Do you understand: W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N
If YES: Which do you understand best? S W V D G

2.3. Where did you learn W? Home School Other: ____________
V? Home School Other: ____________
D? Home School Other: ____________
G? Home School Other: ____________

2.4. If you were brought before the chief to defend yourself, would you be able to defend/express yourself in his lg? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N

2.5. Do you always understand jokes in W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N

### III. LANGUAGE USE

3.1. Which language do you use the most often Which one do they speak with you with your father S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your mother S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your spouse S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your children S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your S friends S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your V friends S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your D friends S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your G friends S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with your neighbors S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with the S elders S W V D G ____ S W V D G
with the G elders S W V D G ____ S W V D G
at work / field S W V D G ____ S W V D G

3.2. What language do you use to:
Dream S W V D G ____
Sing S W V D G ____
Count Money S W V D G ____
Write Letters to S friends S W V D G ____
In arguments with Spk: ____, Wspk: ____, Vspk: ____, Dspk: ____, Gspk ____

3.3. Do you speak ____ every day? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N

3.4. Do you have children? Y N
Do they speak? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N
Did they speak it before they reached school age? Y N
Do they understand? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N
Did they understand it before they reached school age? Y N
If YES: Where did they learn it? Home School _______________

3.5. When the S children play, which language do they use:

### IV. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

4.1. When a young person prefers speaking ... at home, are the parents happy about it? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N
Why? ____________________________________________________________________
4.2. Do the young people speak S well? Y N

If NO: Why not? ____________________________________________________________

4.3. What language do you think your grandchildren will use in their homes when they have become adults? S W V D G

Why? ______________________________________________________________________

V. LITERACY

5.1. Read W? Y N ________________ Write W? Y N ________________

5.2. Read V? Y N ________________ Write V? Y N ________________

5.3. Read D? Y N ________________ Write D? Y N ________________

5.4. Read G? Y N ________________ Write G? Y N ________________

5.5. Registered for literacy class? W: Y N / V: Y N / D: Y N / G: Y N

5.6. If there was a literacy program set up in the area in a language other than Safaliba, in which language would you prefer that it be? W V D G

5.7. If someone has four books, one in W, V, D, G, which one would you take? W V D G

5.8. Do you know any S speakers who write S? Y N

5.9. Have you ever tried to write S? Y N

5.10. Do you think it would be good for the S people if they could read and write S? Y N

Why? ______________________________________________________________________

5.11. If there were S literacy classes in this village/town, would you want to enroll for classes? Y N

5.12. Would your people contribute money for printing books? Y N

How could you raise funds? _________________________________________________
### Appendix J: Comprehension Test: Raw Scores

#### I. GONJA NARRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj#</th>
<th>#Corr</th>
<th>#Tot</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBE - MY</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - MO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - FY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - FO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - MY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - FY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - FO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - MY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - MO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - FY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - FO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. GONJA SCRIPTURE PORTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ#</th>
<th>#CORR</th>
<th>#TOT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBE - MY</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - MO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - FY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE - FO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - MY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - FY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN - FO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - MY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - MO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - FY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - FO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
GBE=Gbenfu, MAN=Mandari, MAF=Manfuli
SUBJ#=Subject Number
#CORR=Number of correct answers, #TOT=Number of total possible correct answers
Appendix K: Comprehension Test Results:

Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test

Formula for Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test

\[ U_{ab} = \frac{N_1 \times n_2 + n_1 (n_1+1) - R_1}{2} \]

\[ U_{ba} = \frac{n_1 \times n_2 + n_2 (n_2+1) - R_2}{2} \]

n = number of subjects
R = sum of ranks assigned to the samples a and b of sizes n₁ and n₂

I. GONJA NARRATIVE

A. LOCATION

Gbenfu: n₁=16  Mandari: n₂=16

\[ U_{ab} = 153 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 103 \]

Manfuli: n₁=13  Gbenfu: n₂=16

\[ U_{ab} = 208 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 0 \]

Manfuli: n₁=13  Mandari: n₂=16

\[ U_{ab} = 208 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 0 \]

B. GENDER

Men: n₁=23  Women: n₂=22

\[ U_{ab} = 261 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 245 \]

C. AGE

Younger: n₁=23  Older: n₂=22

\[ U_{ab} = 307.5 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 198.5 \]
II. GONJA SCRIPTURE PORTIONS

A. LOCATION

Gbenfu: \( n_1=16 \)  Mandari: \( n_2=16 \)
\[ U_{ab} = 159 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 97 \]

Manfuli: \( n_1=13 \)  Gbenfu: \( n_2=16 \)
\[ U_{ab} = 206 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 2 \]

Manfuli: \( n_1=13 \)  Mandari: \( n_2=16 \)
\[ U_{ab} = 208 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 0 \]

B. GENDER

Men: \( n_1=23 \)  Women: \( n_2=22 \)
\[ U_{ab} = 273.5 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 232.5 \]

C. AGE

Younger: \( n_1=23 \)  Older: \( n_2=22 \)
\[ U_{ab} = 267.5 \]
\[ U_{ba} = 238.5 \]
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