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Abstract

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

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

Overall, the results show high levels of comprehension of both Yoruba and Ife, and attitudes toward Yoruba and Ife appear to be positive. Attitudes toward Idaca development are also positive with Idaca language development work in progress. There are no indications of language shift.

1. Introduction

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

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

---

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

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

2. Background information

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

2.1 Language Situation

2.1.1 Language classification

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

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

- Ede, Southwest Ede, Idaca

Alternative names and spellings are:

- Idáitsà, Dasa, Idaṣa (Capo 1989:281)
- Ede-Idaca (CENALA 1990)
- Idaaca, Ede Idaca (Grimes 1996:168)
- Ìdááṣá (spelling employed by written materials in the language)

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

2.1.2 Language area

The Idaca area refers to rural districts of Dassa and Glazoué in the Zou province, with most of the villages located along or close to highway RNIE 2 (Route Nationale Inter-Etats) and, therefore, easily accessible. Among the Ede varieties in that region (Cabe, Ica and Ife), the Idaca

---

2 The author wishes to express her gratitude to D. H. Hatfield of SIL Togo-Benin for the editing of this report, and to J. A. Durieux of SIL Africa-Area for his input on Section 4.
3 More general background information on the Ede language continuum and its communities can be found in Volume 1, Section 1.
area has a central geographical position, given that all travel between these areas has to pass one or both of the two major Idaca towns along highway RNIE 2, Dassa and Glazoué.

The northern and northeastern border of the Idaca area is defined by the southern part of the Cabe area. To the north, west and south the area is surrounded by the Maxi area, separating the Idaca area from other Ede communities (Ife and Ica) located further west along the Togolese border. Southeastwards, the Idaca area is bordered by the Southern Nago language area.

Other ethnic groups also live among the Idaca people, among which Fon and Maxi speakers seem to be in the majority; Dendi and Bariba speakers are also present. However, according to interviewed community elders, in most Idaca villages, speakers of other ethnic groups are not present. (See Appendix A for a map of the area.)

2.2 History of migration

The Idaca people migrated from Nigeria westward into Benin. Originally, according to Aguidi (1997, personal communication), they came from the Egba area in the region of Abeokuta (Ogun State). In today’s Benin, they were given the name “Idaca” by their surrounding Maxi neighbors.

2.3 Population

During the 1992 Benin Census, population data were elicited giving totals both by ethnic group, as well as by political community. The total by ethnic group numbers the Idaca population as 75,404 (36,194 males, 39,210 females) (Ministère du Plan 1994:47).

The population given by political community is lower with a total of 61,874 (29,185 males, 32,689 females) for those villages and towns which, according to interviewed Idaca elders, belong to the Idaca language area. However, this total also includes villages with a reportedly ethnically mixed population. The total population for those villages with reportedly no mixed population is listed as 29,688 (13,840 males, 15,848 females). (See Ministère du Plan 1993:30-32; see also Appendix A for a map of the area.)

Therefore, it can be concluded that the total Idaca population is somewhere between 30,000 and 75,000.

---

4 Southern Nago refers to the Nago speech communities located in the Ouémé province of Benin.
5 It is noted here, that during the census, individuals were asked to which ethnic group they belong and not which language they speak as their first language. Thus, interviewees identified with their father’s ethnic group, even though they might not speak his language nor live in the language area.
6 The Ethnologue (Grimes 1996:168) lists the Idaca population as 30,000, an estimate based on Vanderaa (1991:7) who notes that all population figures for ethnic groups in his report are for 1990, applying appropriate growth rates to older figures for ethnic groups (vi, Notes).
2.4 Non-formal education

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

It was apparently assumed that all Ede communities in Benin would be able to benefit from the Yoruba language development program and literacy efforts, given that it is linguistically close to these varieties and the language of wider communication for those communities. (For more information on Yoruba language development, see Volume 1, Section 1.7.1.)

As far as non-formal education in the Idaca language area is concerned, literacy coordinators in Léma reported the existence of an Idaca literacy program and gave the following information:

In 1986, a seminar was held in Dassa, organized by the Direction de l’Alphabétisation et de la Presse Rurale (DAPR) and UNESCO. The objective of this seminar was to train nationals for the promotion of an Idaca literacy program (DAPR 1986). Following this seminar, a local literacy program in Idaca was started, reportedly first organized in Léma. In 1994, the orthography was revised (Okoumassoun et al. 1994) and a new primer designed (Okoumassoun 1994).

By April 1993, the on-going program seemed to have spread over the whole language area due to the apparently high motivation. In almost every surveyed village the on-going project was mentioned. Usually literacy classes take place six times per week during dry-season, and one time per week during rainy-season.

2.5 Religious situation

The Idaca people are traditionally Animists (Vanderaa 1991). However, there are Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in the area, and representatives of various churches were interviewed during the course of the survey (see Section 4.2.2). Except for those churches surveyed, though, no specifics are known either in regard to the actual number of churches, their location and total membership, or the year when the various churches started their work.

3. Research questions

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

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

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

2. Language vitality
   - What are the language use patterns in various social domains, both public and private?
   - Is the pattern of language use stable, or is language shift occurring or impending?

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

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

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

Although bilingualism was not of major concern for this survey, some data were collected in order to provide SIL Togo-Benin administration with relevant and updated information about the level of reported proficiency and attitudes regarding French.

---

7 Although these criteria were not available in 1993 when the survey was conducted, these guidelines will help in drawing conclusions based on comprehension testing among the Idaca communities.
8 Marmor (1997:2f) presents the following guidelines by which to draw conclusions from comprehension testing results, along with the suggested type of SIL involvement in language development efforts (see also Volume 1, Section 3):
   a) High intercomprehension is defined by an overall test average of “over 90% by all segments of the population” (under 45 years of age). In this case, it is assumed that there is no need for separate literature.
   b) Mixed intercomprehension is defined by a situation in which “no segment of the population scores below 80%, but some segments score below 90%.” In this case the need for separate literature depends upon language attitudes and/or the possibility of a second dialect acquisition program.
   c) Low intercomprehension is defined as an “overall average below 70%.” In this case, there is a need for separate literature, or if attitudes permit, a strong second dialect acquisition program.
4. Methodology

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

4.1 Techniques

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

1. Dialect intercomprehension was assessed through:
   - Lexical similarity comparisons between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife;
   - Recorded Text Testing (RTT) assessing comprehension levels both of Yoruba and Ife.
   - Interviews with community elders regarding the degree of internal comprehension within the Idaca speech community;
   - Self-assessed (reported) active and passive proficiency, both direct and indirect (e.g. understanding of radio programming in the other language), obtained through individual interviews;
   - Interviews with church elders regarding comprehension of Yoruba in the church context.

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

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

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

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

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

---

9 A general description of the methodology as applied for the larger Ede language continuum survey can be found in Volume 1, Section 4.
1. Community interviews:

− Community questionnaires investigating: geographical boundaries of Idaca, existence of different dialects of Idaca, nature of the linguistic differences among these dialects, degree of internal comprehension within the Idaca language community, language vitality, and attitudes toward literacy in Idaca, Yoruba and Ife;
− Informal interviews with local literacy coordinators to obtain information regarding the extent of literacy work in the region (number of literacy classes, total class populations, language of instruction, general performance of students), as well as attitudes toward literacy;
− Church questionnaires exploring levels of comprehension and language use in the church context, ownership, use and understanding of written religious materials in Yoruba, and attitudes toward Bible translation.

2. Individual interviews:

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

3. Word and phrase lists:

− Standardized word and phrase lists collected in Idaca, Yoruba and Ife.10

4.2 Implementation

The survey was conducted in three stages:

1. In April 1992, K. D. Odoun of CENALA elicited a word and a phrase list in Glazoué. (Igué et al. 1993)
2. In November 1992, D. Fisher of SIL Togo-Benin, accompanied by a Beninese research assistant, R. Aguidi,11 conducted preliminary interviews with chiefs and elders, and administered six ISQs in Gamba.

10 No results from phrase list analysis are included in this report. A complete listing of elicited phrases is presented in Volume 1, Appendix O.
11 Aguidi, an L1 Ica speaker, has a master’s degree in linguistics from the Université Nationale du Bénin (Département d’Etudes Linguistiques et de Tradition Orale). During stage two of the current study, Aguidi was still a linguistics student at the Université Nationale du Bénin.
3. In April 1993, A. Kluge (SIL Togo-Benin) and S. K. Ntumy of the Ghana Institute of Linguistics, Literacy and Bible Translation (GILB), assisted by Aguidi, conducted the third stage of the survey. During this stage, community and individual interviews (including comprehension testing) were conducted and data previously gathered were verified.

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

4.2.1 Procedures

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

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

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

4.2.2 Survey locations

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

- Community questionnaires were administered in two villages: Gamba, a more remote and smaller village, and Lèma, a more accessible and larger village.

- An informal interview was conducted with the literacy coordinators in Lèma.

- Church questionnaires were administered in two Union des Eglises Evangélique du Bénin (Union of Evangelical Churches of Benin, UEEB) churches in Loulè I and in Sowè, in the Methodist church of Mondji-Gangan, and in two Roman Catholic churches in Mondji-Gangan and in Sowè. In addition, informal interviews were conducted with two Catholic curates.

- Individual interviews were carried out in six Idaca villages. RTT testing was conducted in Banigbé, a more remote and smaller village in the southeast of the language area, as
well as in two more accessible villages: Erokowari to the west and Tchatchegou in the center of the language area. ISQs were administered in two villages in the center of the language area, Gamba and Mondji-Gangan, the latter a more accessible and larger village; as a representative of the northern villages, Sowè, a more remote village, was chosen. For Mondji-Gangan, Sowè and Tchatchegou it was reported that a major part of their populations is Muslim.

– A wordlist was double-checked in Dassa.

4.2.3 Subject selection

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

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

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

4.2.3.1 Gender and age by location

In all, 61 subjects from six villages were interviewed, 24 subjects during RTT testing and 37 subjects during the administration of ISQs.

Table 1: Sample by village and social group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>Banigbé</th>
<th>Erokowari</th>
<th>Tchatchegou</th>
<th>Gamba</th>
<th>Mondji-Gangan</th>
<th>Sowè</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SoGrp = Social Group, M = male, F = female, Y = younger (15-25 years), O = older (30-45 years)]
RTTs were administered to a total sample of 24 subjects; however, not all subjects took the complete set of test texts. Two subjects reported having lived for longer than one year in the Yoruba and the Ife language areas, respectively. Consequently, both subjects were not tested on the texts of the respective speech variety in question. A third subject, a Methodist preacher, reported using Yoruba for his work; thus, only the Ife narrative was administered to him. A fourth subject did not have enough time for the complete RTT set and was only tested on the Yoruba Bible passages. Thus, 21 subjects were tested on the Yoruba narrative and 22 subjects each on Acts 10:1–23, Luke 19:11–27 and Ife.

4.2.3.2 Language contact factors

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

1. Residence patterns

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

However, overall only a minority of subjects (7/61 – 11%), six of them males, reported temporary residence (at least one year) in the Yoruba language area in Nigeria, among them only two RTT subjects. Also with regard to the Ife area, only very few subjects reported temporary residence (2/61, both ISQ subjects), none of them RTT subjects.12

Given that only a few RTT subjects reported temporary residence in the Yoruba area and none reported residence in the Ife area, RTT results will not be compared across residence patterns.

2. Travel patterns

Overall, there appears to be little contact with Yoruba or Ife speakers through travel.13

The majority of subjects (38/52 – 73%) reported no travel to the Yoruba language area. One-quarter of the subjects (13/52 – 25%), 12 of them males, reported rare travel (<4-6 times / year) while only one subject reported frequent travel (4-6 times / year), to Porto-Nov. Concerning RTT subjects, only 1/24 subjects reported rare travel while the remaining 23 subjects reported no travel.

---

12 One subject reported having lived in Tchetti, the Beninese Ife language area, for 18 years and, consequently, was not tested on the Ife narrative.

13 In Gamba subjects were not asked about their travel patterns.
As regards travel to the Ife area, none of the 52 subjects reported frequent travel. The majority of subjects (44/52 – 85%) reported no travel while 7/52 subjects (13%), five of them males, reported rare travel, among them four RTT subjects.

Given the low number of traveling RTT subjects, RTT results will not be compared across travel patterns.

3. Religious affiliation

The majority of subjects (49/61 – 80%) reported being Christians (of the Christians, Roman Catholic: 17/49 – 35%, Protestant: 32/49 – 65%), while 12/61 subjects (20%), among them four RTT subjects. Given the low number of Muslim RTT subjects, RTT scores will not be compared across religious affiliation.

4.2.3.3 Education

Two-thirds of the subjects (33/53 – 62%) reported some level of formal education, among them a higher percentage of male versus female subjects (22/29 – 76% vs 11/24 – 46%), and of younger versus older subjects (23/27 – 85% vs 10/26 – 38%).

4.3 Analysis

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

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

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

4.4 Terminology

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

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

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

14 In Gamba subjects were not asked whether they had received any formal education.
“Social Group:” A social group is a subsample defined by gender and age category, i.e. one of younger men, older men, younger women or older women.

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

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

5. Results

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

5.1 Dialect intercomprehension

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

5.1.1 Internal comprehension

Neither Capo (1989) nor the Ethnologue (Grimes 1996:168) list any dialects of Idaca. This information was confirmed by interviewed community elders in Gamba, one of them the president of the local literacy program, who stated that they do not distinguish any distinct varieties of Idaca. Linguistic differences between the different Idaca villages throughout the area are reportedly minor and mainly phonological or at the level of tone, without bringing about a semantic change.

5.1.2 Lexical similarity to Yoruba and to Ife

In order to establish the degree of lexical similarity between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife, an Idaca wordlist was elicited in Glazoué15 and double-checked in Dassa and compared with a Yoruba wordlist elicited in Porto-Novo and an Ife wordlist from Tchetti. The lists were analyzed according to prescribed methodology (see Volume 1, Section 4.1.3) in order to determine from a linguistic point of view the degree of lexical similarity between these varieties.

---

15 The list was originally elicited during the first stage of the survey, in April 1992.
The following results show the percent and variance matrixes. The percent matrix reports the number of lexically similar items as a percentage of the basic vocabulary, while the variance matrix shows the range of error for each count (Wimbish 1989:59).

Table 2: Lexical similarity between Ede varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent matrix</th>
<th>Variance matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaca</td>
<td>Idaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76  Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
<td>5.5 Yoruba (Porto-Novo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88  Ife (Tchetti)</td>
<td>4.2 5.7 Ife (Tchetti)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the wordlist analysis show that the degree of lexical similarity between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife is >80% at the upper confidence limit of the calculations. Between Idaca and Yoruba the degree of lexical similarity is 81.5% while it is higher between Idaca and Ife with 92.2% (at the upper confidence limit of the calculation).

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

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

In view of these guidelines, the results of the wordlist analysis do not seem to indicate, from a linguistic point of view, that Idaca is a different language, either from Yoruba or Ife. Therefore, as pointed out above, comprehension testing was needed in order to determine how well the Idaca people are able to understand Yoruba and Ife.

5.1.3 Comprehension of Yoruba

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

---

16 See Volume 1, Appendix L for a complete listing of elicited data sorted by gloss and Appendix M for computed percentage and variance matrixes for lexical similarity between all elicited Ede wordlists.

17 Upper confidence limit = percentage + range of error (variance).

18 For the computations in Table 3 and 4, morphemes that are apparently affixed to the form used in another variety are ignored if they occur always in the same position. Including all morphemes in the analysis results in an, overall, lower degree of lexical similarity as shown in Table 7, Appendix B. (See Volume 1, Appendix K for further details regarding the criteria applied for similarity groupings, Appendix L for a complete listing of elicited data sorted by gloss, and Appendix M for computed percent and variance matrices for lexical similarity for all elicited Ede wordlists.)

19 These criteria were “approved for general use as administrative guidelines by the Area Directors and Vice Presidents” of SIL based on a statement adopted by participants of the International Language Assessment Conference in Horsleys Green, England in 1989. (International Language Assessment Conference 1990:1)
5.1.3.1 Tested comprehension

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

5.1.3.1.1 Narrative

Table 3: RTT scores for Yoruba narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77-95</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82-100</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82-100</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The average score of 93% is high, indicating high levels of comprehension with about three-quarters of the subjects (15/21 – 71%) scoring at least 91%. One-quarter of the subjects (5/21 – 24%), four of them from Erokowari, scored between 80% and 90%, while one subject only obtained 77%. The moderate standard deviation of 7.55 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively: the range is 77–100%.

There is no significant difference across gender, age or education. Across location, subjects from Erokowari scored significantly lower than subjects from Banigbé and marginally significantly lower than subjects from Tchatchegou, while there is no significant difference between subjects from Banigbé and from Tchatchegou.20

---

20 Average scores across location, gender, age and education are as follows:
- Banigbé versus Erokowari: 87% vs 91% STD: 11.29 vs 7.85, Sign.: >98%
- Banigbé versus Tchatchegou: 87% vs 91% STD: 11.29 vs 5.87, Sign.: <95%
- Tchatchegou versus Erokowari: 91% vs 91% STD: 6.87 vs 7.85, Sign.: 95%< – <98%
- men versus women: 94% vs 92%, STD: 6.46 vs 8.31, Sign.: <95%
- young versus old: 92% vs 95%, STD: 8.40 vs 6.71, Sign.: <95%
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 92% vs 96%, STD: 8.20 vs 5.52, Sign.: <95%.
Following the RTT, subjects were asked to identify the origin of the narrator of the story. Almost all subjects (19/21 – 90%) correctly identified the narrator as a Yoruba speaker, however, not from Porto-Novo but from Nigeria. Among the remaining subjects, one stated he was from Kétou (Southern Nago language area) while another stated he was from Dassa (Idaca area).

In regard to comprehension of the narrative, subjects were asked if they understood “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing) of the narrative. Most subjects (17/21 – 81%) reported having understood “all” (14/21 – 67%) or “most” (3/21 – 14%) with average scores of 94% and 92%, respectively. The remaining 4/21 subjects (19%) understood “a little”; their average test score of 91% appears to indicate that they underestimated their own test performance:

When asked if the various social groups in the village would understand the story, most subjects (17/21 – 81%) anticipated comprehension. Among the remaining subjects, two subjects thought that across all social groups some would not understand the story, while the remaining two subjects felt unable to pass any judgments.


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73-95</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82-100</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86-95</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77-100</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73-100</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score of 90% is high, indicating high levels of comprehension with 15/22 subjects (68%) scoring at least 91%. However, a considerable percentage (9/22 – 41%) scored 90%; 4/22 subjects (18%) scored between 80% and 90%, and 3/22 (14%) subjects scored 80%. The moderate standard deviation of 8.37 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively: the range is 73–100%. There is no significant difference across location, gender, age or education.²¹

²¹ Average scores across gender, age and education are as follows:
- men versus women: 90% vs 90%, STD: 7.28 vs 11.13, Sign.: <95%;
- young versus old: 90% vs 90%, STD: 6.69 vs 10.13, Sign.: <95%;
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 92% vs 87%, STD: 8.78 vs 12.25, Sign.: <95%.
Also, following this RTT test, subjects were asked how well they understood the text: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). Most subjects (20/22 – 91%) reported having understood “all” (15/22 – 68%) or “most” (5/22 – 23%) with average scores of 90% and 94%, respectively. Among the remaining two subjects one understood “a little” and one “very little.” Their respective average test scores of 77% and 91% appear to indicate that the latter underestimated his own test performance.

5.1.3.1.3 1960 Bible passage – Luke 19:11–27

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74- 86</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55- 91</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45- 95</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45- 95</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45- 91</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64- 91</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55- 86</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73- 95</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45- 95</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score of 75% is rather low, indicating low levels of comprehension. Only 3/22 subjects (14%) scored >90% (either 91% or 95%), and one-third of the subjects (7/22 – 32%) scored between 80% and 90%. The remaining subjects, about half of the total sample (12/22 – 55%), scored less than 75%. The high standard deviation of 13.58 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects vary extensively: the range is 45–95%. There is no significant difference across location, gender, age or education.22

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

---

22 Average scores across gender, age and education are as follows:
- men versus women: 74% vs 82%, STD: 14.42 vs 9.64, Sign.: <95%;
- young versus old: 69% vs 81%, STD: 14.86 vs 9.34, Sign.: <95%;
- educated versus uneducated subjects: 72% vs 78%, STD: 15.18 vs 9.94, Sign.: <95%.
Response | n        | Average test scores |
----------|----------|---------------------|
“all:”    | 12/22 (55%) | 80%                |
“most:”   | 6/22 (27%)  | 65%                |
“a little”| 3/22 (14%)  | 70%                |
“very little:” | 1/22 (5%)  | 86%                |

5.1.3.2  Reported proficiency

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

The vast majority of subjects reported passive abilities in Yoruba. General understanding ability was reported by all subjects (59/59), while 40/58 subjects (69%) reported the ability to always understand everything when they hear Yoruba people speaking. In addition, ISQ subjects were asked if they listen to radio broadcasts in Yoruba, and if so, whether they understand everything they hear. The majority of subjects (24/36 – 88%) who reported listening to radio broadcasts in Yoruba stated that they understand everything.

A considerably lower percentage of subjects also reported productive abilities in Yoruba. General speaking ability was reported by 31/59 subjects (53%) and 23/58 subjects (40%) reported the ability to always say everything they want to say in Yoruba.

Compared across location, the data for ISQ subjects indicate a link between geographical location, i.e. accessibility, and reported proficiency in Yoruba: overall, higher percentages of subjects from Mondji-Gangan, a more accessible village, reported proficiency in Yoruba versus subjects from Gamba and Sowè, both more remote villages. There appears to be no such link for RTT subjects. Across social group, overall higher percentages of male versus female subjects reported proficiency in Yoruba while there are no considerable differences across age. As far as language contact due to residence in or travel to a Yoruba-speaking area is concerned, the data indicate that higher percentages of subjects with such contact reported productive abilities in Yoruba, while there are no considerable differences across contact patterns as regards reported comprehension. Further, the data do not indicate any link between religious affiliation and proficiency in Yoruba. (See Appendix D for details.)

Subjects were also asked about L2 abilities of children. When asked about the age at which children in their villages are able to understand Yoruba, 5/32 subjects (16%) stated that children between the ages of 7–9 years are able to understand Yoruba. However, more than half of the subjects (18/32 – 56%) gave ages of 10–12 years and 5/32 subjects (16%) stated that children must be older than 12 years; 4/32 subjects could not indicate a precise age. Among the subjects who gave ages of 7–9 years, two older men stated that only children belonging to the Protestant church would be able to understand Yoruba at this early age. Productive abilities of their own children were only reported by 1/24 subjects (4%).

---

23 As an exception, a higher percentage of subjects from Gamba, a more remote village, reported full comprehension of radio broadcasts in Yoruba versus subjects from Mondji-Gangan.
In regard to comprehension of Yoruba in the church context, the representatives of four surveyed churches\(^{24}\) stated that their congregations do not understand well the Bible readings in Yoruba from the 1960 translation. In expressing biblical doctrines or concepts in Yoruba, the representatives of both UEEB churches of Loulé I and Sowè stated that they have no difficulties, while representatives of the Catholic and the Methodist churches of Mondji-Gangan stated having difficulties.

5.1.3.3 Summary

In regard to tested comprehension of spoken Yoruba, the average score of 93\% for the narrative is high, indicating high levels of comprehension for the whole text. At the same time, the moderate standard deviation of 7.55 shows that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively. Thus it can be concluded that the average level of comprehension of Yoruba among the Idaca people is also high, if the subjects are representative of the community.

As far as tested comprehension of both Bible passages is concerned, the average scores differ considerably between the 1987 translation passage (Acts 10:1–23) and the 1960 translation passage (Luke 19:11–27): the high average score of 90\% and moderate standard deviation of 8.37 indicate that comprehension of the 1987 translation passage is high, and that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively, while the low average score of 75\% and high standard deviation of 13.58 indicate that comprehension of the 1960 translation passage is low with extensive variation across subjects. It is assumed that this difference is due to the different language registers employed in both translations. The 1960 translation is, according to B. Elegbe (1993, personal communication), former member of the Alliance Biblique au Bénin (Bible Society of Benin) in Cotonou, marked by a rather antiquated register of language. The 1987 translation is close to Yoruba as spoken in Nigeria today and, therefore, easier to understand.\(^{25}\)

Overall, there are no significant differences across location, gender, age or education for any one of the tested texts, except as regards results across location for the Yoruba narrative with lower scores for subjects from Erokowari versus subjects from both Banigbé (significant difference) and Tchatchegou (marginally significant difference.)

With regard to reported data, all subjects reported ability to understand Yoruba and, in addition, two-thirds of the subjects reported higher-level language functions; percentages for productive abilities are considerably lower. When compared across gender, overall higher percentages of male versus female subjects reported proficiency. Across language contact categories, the reported data appear to indicate a link between residence and travel patterns and productive Yoruba abilities.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, about three-quarters of the subjects stated that children between the ages of 7–12 years are able to understand Yoruba, while the remaining subjects thought that children must be older. Only very few subjects reported that their children speak Yoruba.

In regard to comprehension of Yoruba in the religious context, representatives of four churches stated that their congregations do not understand well the Bible readings in Yoruba from the

\(^{24}\) This issue was not raised with the Catholic church of Sowè.

\(^{25}\) For more details regarding both translations see Volume 1, Section 1.7.1.
1960 translation. Regarding the expressing of biblical doctrines or concepts in Yoruba, half of the representatives stated that they have no difficulties while the other half reported having difficulties.

5.1.4 Comprehension of Ife

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

5.1.4.1 Tested comprehension

Testing of an Ife narrative was conducted to ascertain the level of comprehension. The following section refers to the RTT results and relevant answers to the accompanying questionnaire. The results listed below show the percentage of correct responses to the comprehension questions. (See Appendix C for a complete listing of raw scores.)

Table 6: RTT scores for Ife narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75-92</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83-92</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79-92</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79-92</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>&lt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoGrp</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%corr</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79-92</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83-92</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79-92</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83-92</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79-92</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score of 87% indicates moderate levels of comprehension with only about one-third of the subjects (8/21 – 38%) scoring 90% and above. Almost half of the subjects (10/21 – 48%) scored between 80% and 90%, while 3/21 subjects (14%) scored less than 80%. The standard deviation of 5.09 is moderate indicating that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively: the range is 79–92%. There are no significant differences across location, gender or age.27

---

26 In addition, testing with one younger male from Tchatchegou had to discontinued after six questions due to lack of comprehension.

27 Average scores across gender and age are as follows:

- men versus women: 86% vs 87%, STD: 5.67 vs 4.59, Sign.: <95%
- young versus old: 85% vs 88%, STD: 6.27 vs 3.46, Sign.: <95%
Following the RTT, subjects were asked to identify the origin of the narrator of the story. About two-thirds of the subjects (15/22 – 68%) identified the origin of the speaker correctly as an Ife speaker while one-third of the subjects (7/22 – 32%) stated he was an Ica speaker. The geographical location of the Ica, Idaca and Ife language areas is most likely the reason why subjects identified the narrator’s language as either an Ica or an Ife speaker.28

When asked whether his manner of speaking was “très” (very) or “un peu” (a little) different from their own, all but one subject (20/21 – 95%) reported that the narrator’s speaking manner was “a little” different; the remaining subject thought that his speaking manner was “very” different.

Also following this narrative, subjects were asked to evaluate their level of comprehension: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). The comparison of the self-reported comprehension performance with the actual comprehension scores indicates that overall, subjects who reportedly understood “all” overestimated their own test performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“all:”</td>
<td>12/20 (60%)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“most:”</td>
<td>2/20 (10%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a little:”</td>
<td>6/20 (30%)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if the various social groups in the village would understand the story, about two-thirds of the subjects (13/20 – 63%) anticipated comprehension while 2/20 subjects (10%) anticipated comprehension for the older generation only. The remaining five subjects felt unable to pass any judgments.

5.1.4.2 Reported proficiency

With regard to reported proficiency of Ife, subjects were asked if they speak and understand Ife. As regards passive abilities, ISQ subjects were asked if they understand Ife, while RTT subjects were asked how well they understand Ife speakers when talking to them: “tout” (all), “la plupart” (most), “un peu” (a little), “très peu” (very little), or “rien” (nothing). Most subjects (43/52 – 83%), both ISQ and RTT29 subjects, reported ability to understand Ife. Among RTT subjects, three-quarters (15/19 – 79%) reported that they understand “all” (12/19 – 63%) or “most” (3/19 – 16%), while the remaining four subjects, all of them younger, understand only “a little.” In addition, 14/55 ISQ and RTT subjects (25%) reported ability to speak Ife.

Regarding L2 abilities of children, ISQ subjects were asked about the age at which children in their villages are able to understand Ife speakers. According to 14/33 subjects (42%), children of 10 years and younger are able to understand Ife, while 6/33 (18%) gave ages between 10–12 years and 6/33 (18%) ages above 15 years. The remaining 7/33 subjects could not indicate any precise age. None of the 24 subjects with children reported that their children speak Ife.

28 The Ica area is located north of the Ife area and the major road leading to the Ica area passes through the Ife area.
29 Only RTT subjects reporting that they understand “all,” “most,” or “a little” are included.
5.1.4.3 Summary

The RTT results for the Ife narrative show an average score of 87% indicating moderate levels of tested comprehension. At the same time, the moderate standard deviation of 5.09 indicates that comprehension levels across subjects do not vary extensively. There are no significant differences across location, gender or age.

With regard to reported data, the majority of the subjects reported ability to understand Ife with three-quarters of the RTT subjects reporting that they understand “all” or “most.” Speaking ability in Ife was reported by only one-quarter of the subjects.

Regarding reported proficiency for children, 42% of the subjects stated that children of 10 years and younger are able to understand Ife while, according to one-third of the subjects, children must be older. None of the interviewed subjects reported that their children speak Ife.

5.1.5 Summary of dialect intercomprehension

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

With regard to internal comprehension, community elders reported that distinct varieties of Idaca do not exist even though there are minor differences between the different Idaca villages throughout the area. These differences are mainly phonological or at the level of tone, without bringing about a semantic change.

As far as the lexical similarity to Yoruba and to Ife is concerned, the results show a lexical similarity of >80% at the upper confidence limit between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife, indicating that Idaca speakers may be able to understand Yoruba and Ife. However, it was necessary to verify the lexico-statistical results through further comprehension testing.

Concerning levels of comprehension of Yoruba, the tested data show high average scores and moderate standard deviations for the Yoruba narrative (93%, STD of 7.55) and the passage from the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation (90%, STD of 8.37) indicating that the general level of comprehension of Yoruba among the Idaca people is high. In regard to the considerably lower average score of 75% (STD of 13.58) for the passage from the 1960 Yoruba Bible translation, it is assumed that this result is due to the antiquated language of this translation. Overall, there are no significant differences across gender, age or education for any of the tested texts. Regarding results across location, scores for the Yoruba narrative are lower for subjects from Erokowari versus subjects from both Banigbé (significant difference) and Tchatchegou (marginally significant difference), while there are no significant differences for the Bible passages.

For the Ife narrative, test results show an average score of 87% and a moderate standard deviation of 5.09 indicating moderate levels of comprehension of Ife. There are no significant differences across location, gender or age.

Regarding reported data, all subjects reported understanding Yoruba, with two-thirds of them also reporting higher-level language functions. Most subjects also understand Ife with most RTT
subjects stating that they understand “all” or “most.” Considerably lower percentages reported productive abilities in either Yoruba or Ife. In regard to L2 abilities of children, three-quarters of the subjects stated that children between the ages of 7–12 years are able to understand Yoruba, and 42% of interviewees thought that children 10 years and younger are able to understand Ife.

Concerning comprehension of Yoruba in the religious context, interviewed church representatives stated that their congregations do not understand well the Bible readings in Yoruba from the 1960 translation. In expressing biblical doctrines or concepts in Yoruba, half of the representatives reported difficulties whereas the other half reported no such difficulties.

5.2 Language vitality

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

5.2.1 Language use in private domains

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

All subjects reported use of Idaca with their parents30 (51/51), spouses (45/45) and children (24/24).

In regard to language use outside the home domain, ISQ subjects reported almost exclusive use of Idaca with Idaca friends, neighbors and elders (37/37), and at work or on the farm (33/36 – 92%). Only a few subjects, all of them males, reported use of French (4/37 with friends, 3/36 at work or on the farm), in addition to or instead of Idaca. When RTT subjects were asked whether they ever use Yoruba with their Idaca friends, the majority of subjects (15/22 – 68%) reported exclusive use of Idaca. However, a considerable percentage reported use of Yoruba (7/22 – 32%), among them a higher percentage of younger versus older subjects (5/11 – 45% vs 2/11 – 18%).

Regarding language use by children, all interviewed ISQ subjects (36/36) reported that in their villages children use Idaca while playing with other children.

Concerning language use by the youth, interviewed subjects were asked how well, in their opinion, the youth speak Idaca. Overall, the majority of ISQ subjects (31/34 – 91%) thought that the young people speak Idaca correctly. Specifically, in Mondji-Gangan and in Sowè, subjects were asked whether young people still speak Idaca “comme il faut” (as they should), while in Gamba subjects were asked if the young people speak Idaca “de moins en moins” (less and less). In Mondji-Gangan and in Sowè, almost all subjects (25/28 – 89%) reported that the young people speak Idaca “as they should.” The remaining two subject responded negatively, considering this situation a negative development. In Gamba, none of the subjects (0/6) reported that the young people speak Idaca “less and less.”

30 One RTT subject reported using Idaca with his Fon L1 father.
5.2.2 Language use in public domains

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

In regard to language use in the markets, all subjects (37/37) reported use of Idaca in the local market, with additional use of Yoruba reported by 3/37 subjects (8%), and use of French by one subject. Also in the regional market, most subjects (32/37 – 86%) use Idaca, while 6/37 subjects (16%) use Yoruba, and 8/37 (22%), all of them educated males, use French, in addition to or instead of Idaca.

In offices of the sous-préfecture, about two-thirds of the subjects (20/31 – 65%) use Idaca, while one-third (10/31 – 32%) use French and 3/30 (10%) use Fon, in addition to or instead of Idaca.

5.2.3 Language use with non-Idaca speakers

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

With Yoruba speakers, about two-thirds of the subjects (22/36 – 61%) use Idaca, while only one-third reported use of Yoruba (19/58 – 33%), among them a higher percentage of male versus female subjects (17/32 – 53% vs 5/26 – 19%). Among the remaining subjects, one reported using Yoruba mixed with Idaca and another one using French.

For interactions with speakers of other Ede varieties, the majority of subjects reportedly prefer Idaca: 29/37 subjects (78%) with Cabe speakers; 27/34 subjects (79%) with Ica speakers; 46/55 subjects (84%) with Ife speakers. Only a few subjects reported use of other languages in addition to or instead of Idaca among which French seems to be the preferred language: with Cabe speakers (2/37 – 5%), with Ica speakers (5/34 – 15%) and with Ife speakers (4/35 – 11%). Use of Yoruba was only reported for interactions with Cabe speakers (3/37 – 8%); among these three subjects, one reported use of Cabe, another one Cabe mixed with Yoruba and a third one Idaca mixed with Yoruba with Cabe speakers. With Ica speakers, 2/34 (6%) reported use of Ica and 6/55 (11%) reported using Ife with Ife speakers.

5.2.4 Language use in the church context

Interviews with regard to language use in the church context were conducted with representatives of five different churches, as well as two of the Catholic church curates.

During the service/mass, Bible readings are done in Yoruba in four of the five surveyed churches while in the Catholic church of Sowè, not the Yoruba Bible, but the French Jerusalem Bible is

---

31 ISQ subjects were asked which language they use with Yoruba speakers: 12/36 subjects (33%) gave Yoruba; RTT subjects were asked whether they ever use Yoruba with Yoruba speakers: 7/22 (32%) responded affirmatively.

32 RTT subjects were not asked directly which language they use for interactions with Ife speakers: after the administration of the Ife narrative they were asked which language they use when talking to speakers from “là-bas” (over there), i.e. with people who speak the language of the narrator. Since one-third of the subjects did not identify the origin of the narrator correctly (see Section 5.1.4.1), it is likely that subjects responding to this question did in actual fact not refer to Ife.
used. As regards translation of the Bible readings into Idaca, spontaneous translation of difficult words and passages was reported by the UEEB church of Loulé I and the Methodist and Catholic churches of Mondji-Gangan, while the preacher of the UEEB church and the priest of the Catholic church of Sowè prepare translations at home, based on the Yoruba and French Bibles respectively. As regards Catholic churches in the Idaca area in general, one of the curates explained that they already have a set of Idaca Bible portions available which had been translated during a translation workshop organized several years previously. Otherwise, the French Bible is used while the Yoruba Bible is used only in a few villages, and usually not during the service, since it is difficult to understand.

For preaching, the representatives of the five surveyed churches reported exclusive use of Idaca. For the Communion/Eucharist, for announcements, songs, prayers from the pulpit, baptisms, confirmations, weddings and funerals, Idaca is used almost exclusively in the Catholic churches with use of Idaca being encouraged by the Catholic leadership. In the Protestant churches use of Idaca is also predominant, however, use of Yoruba is also common especially during Communion with spontaneous translation given into Idaca. For counseling and church discipline, women’s and youth meetings, prayer meetings and testimonies during the service/mass, exclusive use of Idaca was reported by all surveyed churches. In regard to Sunday classes for children, representatives of four churches\(^{33}\) reported exclusive use of Idaca, while in the UEEB church of Loulé I no Sunday classes are organized for children.

Regarding available Bible translations and other Yoruba materials, the representatives of the Catholic church of Sowè stated not being interested in Yoruba, neither regarding the Bible nor Yoruba materials in general. Among the remaining four churches, representatives of three churches were unaware of the existence of the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation, while the evangelist of the UEEB church of Loulé I reportedly has seen it once. The representatives of these four churches reported further that in their churches the 1960 translation of the Yoruba Bible is used. When asked approximately how many of their members own a private Bible in Yoruba, representatives of the UEEB church of Loulé I, the Methodist and the Catholic churches of Mondji-Gangan reported that only a minority (≤25%) of their church members own Bibles, while the UEEB church of Sowè reported that about three-quarters of the members own a private Bible. In addition, the representatives of the four churches reported the use of Yoruba songbooks. The representatives of the UEEB church of Sowè further stated that in their church, Yoruba primers are used.

When asked the location of the nearest place to buy Yoruba Bibles and other materials, all representatives mentioned Dassa.\(^{34}\)

5.2.5 **Summary of language vitality**

Idaca is the preferred language of the Idaca people and is being used in all domains. There are no indications of occurring or impending language shift.

With regard to private domains, Idaca is used almost exclusively within and without the home domain. Also in more public domains and in interactions with non-Idaca speakers, Idaca is

---

\(^{33}\) In the Catholic church of Mondji-Gangan adults and children meet in one Bible study group.

\(^{34}\) This issue was not raised with the Catholic church of Sowè.
widely used; however, Yoruba is also used in addition to or instead of Idaca, while use of French or Fon is rare. Concerning intergenerational change, the reported data indicate that Idaca is also the preferred language of children and the youth.

In the church context, Idaca appears to be the preferred language for all activities, especially in the Catholic churches, while the Protestant churches reported additional use of Yoruba. The Bible is read in Yoruba or French with spontaneous or prepared (especially in the Catholic churches) translations given in Idaca. In regard to available Bible translations, representatives of all but one church stated that they were unaware of the existence of the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation.

5.3 Language attitudes

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

5.3.1 Attitudes toward Idaca and its development

In almost every surveyed village the on-going Idaca literacy project was mentioned by the subjects. In addition, all ISQ subjects (37/37) stated that it would be a “good thing” for the Idaca people to be literate in Idaca, explaining that Idaca literacy would promote the development of their language as well as progress and, therefore, would help the people in their daily lives. When asked if they would want to enroll in an Idaca literacy class if one were established in their village, all subjects (14/14) responded affirmatively.

In regard to the choice of a potential reference dialect, interviewed community elders in Lèma stated that they do not distinguish any distinct varieties of Idaca, and that differences between the different Idaca villages throughout the area are minor. However, the same elders stated that Idaca as it is spoken in Lèma is the purest variety of Idaca and that it had already been chosen for Idaca literacy due to the fact that the on-going program has its roots there.

To probe more indirectly with regard to the choice of a reference dialect, ISQ subjects were asked where the best place was to learn Idaca. The majority of subjects (29/37 – 78%) named their own villages while 4/37 (11%) gave Dassa. The remaining subjects stated that any village with an on-going literacy program or any small village would be suitable.

5.3.2 Attitudes toward Yoruba and Ife

During individual interviews, subjects were asked questions about their attitudes toward spoken Yoruba and Ife. All ISQ subjects (36/36) professed positive attitudes toward the ability to speak and understand Yoruba. Also with regard to Ife, most ISQ and RTT subjects (43/46 – 93%) expressed positive attitudes. Only two younger males gave negative statements explaining that there are no Ife speakers living in their area. Subjects expressing positive attitudes toward both Yoruba and Ife explained that both languages are important for communication, work and travel.

35 This issue was not raised in Gamba.
and that with regard to Yoruba, written materials, and more specifically the Bible, already exist. In addition, it was stated that the Idaca and both the Yoruba and the Ife languages are the same. At the same time, however, it was also claimed that the Idaca, Yoruba and Ife people belong to ethnically distinct groups and that their speech forms differ.

When ISQ subjects\textsuperscript{35} were asked if they would like to be literate in Yoruba or Ife, the majority of subjects responded affirmatively both to Yoruba (17/18 – 94%) and Ife (20/25 – 80%).\textsuperscript{36} When those subjects responding negatively, all of them younger, were asked to explain why they think this way, subjects stated either that they had never heard of this variety, or that they were not interested in literacy other than in Idaca.

5.3.3 Attitudes in the church context

During interviews with church representatives, including two of the Catholic church curates, several questions were asked to explore attitudes toward Idaca and its development as well as toward oral and written Yoruba in the church context.

Expressed attitudes toward Idaca language development and Bible translation appear to be positive, with representatives stating that their congregations would prefer the use of Idaca in church over the use of Yoruba or French. Translation efforts are already underway within the Catholic church. Besides the continuing translation of the weekly Bible readings, a variety of other materials has already been translated into Idaca. However, as of spring 1993 none of these materials had as yet been revised or printed. The priest mainly involved in the translation work expressed interest in receiving SIL training as well as in cooperating with the Protestant churches which, overall, seemed to be unaware of the on-going translation work. The interviewed church representatives shared the interest in multi-denominational translation efforts and thought they would receive permission to be involved in a multi-denominational translation project.

Overall, attitudes toward written Yoruba in the church context also appear to be positive. At the same time, however, efforts with regard to Yoruba literacy seem to be limited. As far as the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation is concerned, most representatives expressed interest stating it is easier to understand than the 1960 translation.

5.3.4 Summary of language attitudes

Overall, attitudes toward Idaca and its development, as well as toward the oral and written forms of Yoruba and Ife appear to be positive.

In almost every surveyed village the on-going Idaca literacy project was mentioned, indicating high motivation for language development throughout the whole language area. Also with regard to the church context, expressed attitudes toward Idaca language development and Bible translation appear to be positive, with translation efforts already underway within the Catholic church.

\textsuperscript{36} The majority stated that they would also like to be literate in Cabe (20/26 – 88%) or Ica (20/26 – 77%).
Attitudes toward both the oral and written forms of Yoruba and Ife also appear to be positive, with subjects stating that the Idaca and both the Yoruba and Ife languages are the same. At the same time, however, subjects also claimed that the Idaca, Yoruba and Ife people belong to ethnically distinct groups and that their speech forms differ. Also, in the general church context, attitudes toward written Yoruba appear to be positive although efforts with regard to Yoruba literacy seem to be limited.

5.4 Bilingualism and attitudes regarding French

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

Half of the subjects reported ability to speak (16/32 – 50%) and understand (18/32 – 56%) French, among them higher percentages of educated versus uneducated subjects. In addition, all subjects (36/36) professed positive attitudes toward the ability to speak and understand French, explaining that French, as an international language and language of formal education, is important for communication, work, and travel.

Subjects with children were also asked about the L2 abilities of their children. Of those subjects who reported having children, 10/24 (42%) reported that their children speak French, explaining that they started learning it when they enrolled in school.

5.5 Literacy

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Yoruba</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>34/58 (59%)</td>
<td>16/36 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>22/57 (39%)</td>
<td>16/36 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than half of the subjects reported being literate in French. Regarding Yoruba, more than half of the subjects reported reading ability, while fewer subjects reported writing ability. Across gender, considerably higher percentages of male versus female subjects reported being literate in Yoruba or French, while across age the difference of the overall higher percentages for younger versus older subjects is less pronounced. In regard to education, it is noted that among

37 Educated versus uneducated subjects:
   Ability to understand French: 16/18 – 89% vs 0/11 – 0%
   Ability to speak French: 14/18 – 78% vs 3/11 – 0%

38 Male versus female subjects:
   Yoruba: Reading: 23/32 – 72% vs 11/26 – 42%
   Writing: 16/31 – 52% vs 6/26 – 23%
   French: Reading and writing: 15/20 – 75% vs 1/16 – 6%

Younger versus older subjects:
   Yoruba: Reading: 19/30 – 63% vs 15/28 – 54%
   Writing: 14/29 – 48% vs 8/28 – 29%
   French: Reading and writing: 10/19 – 53% vs 6/17 – 35%
uneducated subjects a considerable percentage reported reading ability in Yoruba (8/19 – 42%); all subjects reporting being literate in French had some level of formal education.

ISQ subjects were also asked whether they had ever tried to write Idaca. A little less than half of the subjects (15/36 – 42%) answered affirmatively, among them a higher percentage of male versus female subjects (11/20 – 55% vs 4/16 – 25%) and of educated versus non-educated subjects (11/17 – 65% vs 2/11 – 18%).

6. Conclusions

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

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

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

6.1 Dialect intercomprehension

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

First, with regard to the degree of internal comprehension within the Idaca speech community, community elders reported that they do not distinguish any distinct varieties of Idaca and that differences across the language area are minor.

The second factor to be considered is the degree of lexical similarity between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife. The results show a lexical similarity of >80% at the upper confidence limit between Idaca and both Yoruba and Ife, indicating that, in accordance with previously established guidelines for wordlist analysis, Idaca speakers may be able to understand Yoruba and Ife.

The third factor concerns comprehension of Yoruba and Ife. Applying Marmor’s (1997:2f) above-mentioned guidelines by which to draw conclusions from comprehension testing results, the average scores of 93% for the tested Yoruba narrative (STD of 7.55), and of 90% for the Bible passage in modern Yoruba (STD of 8.37) can be defined as “high” dialect comprehension.

39 For more details, see Footnote 8 in Section 3.
Marmor specifies further that this classification refers to all segments of the population. The RTT results of the three Yoruba texts do not indicate any significant differences across gender, age, or location for any of the tested texts. However, as regards average test scores across location for the Yoruba narrative, Erokowari’s comprehension can be defined as “mixed.”

Regarding comprehension of Ife, the average score of 87% for the Ife narrative (STD of 5.09) can be defined as “mixed” dialect comprehension. There are no significant differences across location, gender, age or education.

Given these findings, it appears that there is no need for SIL to be involved in a language development effort for Idaca and that the Idaca communities could benefit from existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba. However, it is noted that in Erokowari comprehension of the Yoruba narrative is “mixed.” With regard to the “mixed” comprehension of Ife the “need depends upon language attitudes and/or [the] possibility of [a] second dialect acquisition program” (Marmor 1997:2f).

6.2 Language vitality

Based on reported data gathered during community and individual interviews, it appears that Idaca continues to be used in all public and private domains across social groupings and there are no indications of occurring or impending language shift toward any of the local L2s or French.

In the church context, Idaca appears to be the preferred language for all activities, especially in the Catholic churches where Idaca Bible portions are already available and in use. For the Protestant churches, additional use of Yoruba was reported. As far as Yoruba Bible translations are concerned, it was reported that the 1960 translation of the Bible is used while, overall, the 1987 New Testament translation is unknown.

6.3 Language attitudes

Overall, the attitudes of the Idaca communities toward their language and its development appear to be positive. The positive attitudes are partially evidenced by the existing Idaca literacy program and on-going efforts to translate religious materials into Idaca. However, the latter appear to be limited to the Catholic church with the Protestant churches being unaware of the translation project. Interviewed church representatives, as well as curate Seglo, the priest mainly involved in translation, expressed interest in a multi-denominational translation project, though, and thought they would receive permission to be involved in such a project. Seglo also expressed interest in receiving SIL training.

Applying the guidelines presented by Marmor (1997:2, 3; see Section 3) for the evaluation of need for language development by SIL, the existence of these “internal structures/institutions” as well as the “expressed need/interest” need to be taken into consideration with regard to the Idaca situation. Although, according to Marmor, the relative weighing of these criteria has not yet been

---

40 As far as the lower average score of 75% (STD of 13.58) for the Bible passage from the 1960 translation is concerned, it is assumed that this rather low average score is due to the antiquated language of this translation.
41 “Need refers here to the point of view of SIL vis-a-vis the allocation of its resources.” (Marmor 1997:2)
fully defined, the current Idaca language development efforts, as well as the expressed interest in SIL training, appear to advocate some degree of SIL involvement.

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

Also within the church domain, attitudes toward written Yoruba, overall, appear to be positive except for the Catholic church of Sowè. At the same time, however, efforts in regard to Yoruba literacy appear to be limited. As far as the 1987 Yoruba New Testament translation is concerned, most representatives expressed interest in its use, stating it is easier to understand than the 1960 translation.

6.4 Summary

To restate the final conclusions, the results with regard to dialect intercomprehension, as well as language attitudes, indicate that the Idaca communities could be linked to existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba, even though comprehension of the Yoruba narrative is “mixed” in Erokowari. Therefore, it appears that there is no need for SIL to pursue a language development program in Idaca. This situation corresponds with the objectives of the national literacy strategy for Benin, which chose Yoruba as one of six national languages for non-formal adult education.

At the same time, however, existing literacy efforts throughout the language area appear to be limited to Idaca, with language development efforts already organized on a local level, as well as within the Catholic church.

Therefore, even though the results indicate that the Idaca communities could be linked to existing literature and literacy efforts in Yoruba, it appears that the on-going Idaca language development efforts, as well as the expressed interest in SIL training, require some degree of SIL involvement.
Appendices

Appendix A. Map of the Idaca language area

This map is based on the information given by chiefs and elders in the Idaca language area:

- 100% Idaca
- Idaca + other language
- Non-Idaca
Appendix B. Lexical similarity

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

Table 7: Lexical similarity between Ede varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent matrix</th>
<th>Variance matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaca</td>
<td>Idaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Yoruba</td>
<td>6.0 Yoruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Ife</td>
<td>5.1 6.3 Ife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

C.1. Yoruba narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJ#</th>
<th>#CORR</th>
<th>#TOT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 18</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 20</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#CORR #TOT</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Banigbé</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 3</td>
<td>7.5 11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 4</td>
<td>9.5 11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 1</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO 2</td>
<td>9 11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 5</td>
<td>9.5 11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO 7</td>
<td>8 11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Erokwari**  |               |    |               |    |
| MY 17 | 7 11 | 64  | 10  11 | 91  |
| MY 18 | 10 11 | 91  | 9.5 11 | 86  |
| MO 22 | 9 11 | 82  | 11  11 | 100 |
| MO 25 | 8 11 | 73  | 9  11  | 82  |
| FY 23 | 6 11 | 55  | 9  11  | 82  |
| FY 24 | 8 11 | 73  | 11  11 | 100 |
| FO 19 | 9.5 11 | 86  | 10  11 | 91  |
| FO 20 | 9 11 | 82  | 11  11 | 100 |

| **Tchatchegou**  |               |    |               |    |
| MY 13 | 6.5 11 | 59  | 10  11 | 91  |
| MY 16 | 5 11 | 45  | 9.5 11 | 86  |
| MO 14 | 9.5 11 | 86  | 10.5 11 | 95  |
| MO 15 | 10 11 | 91  | 10  11 | 91  |
| FY 11 | 8 11 | 73  | 8.5 11 | 77  |
| FY 12 | 6 11 | 55  | 10.5 11 | 95  |
| FO 9 | 10.5 11 | 95  | 11  11 | 100 |
| FO 10 | 8 11 | 73  | 10  11 | 91  |
C.3. Ife narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJ#</th>
<th>#CORR</th>
<th>#TOT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé:</td>
<td>MY 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO 8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari:</td>
<td>MY 17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MY 18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO 19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO 20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou:</td>
<td>MY 13</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MO 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO 10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Proficiency in Yoruba: Reported data in detail

D.1. Comparison across location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High Cmp:</th>
<th>Radio Broadcasting Cmp:</th>
<th>General Proficiency:</th>
<th>High Proficiency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banigbé:</td>
<td>5/6 – 83%</td>
<td>4/6 – 67%</td>
<td>3/6 – 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erokowari:</td>
<td>5/8 – 63%</td>
<td>5/8 – 63%</td>
<td>3/8 – 38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamba:</td>
<td>4/7 – 57%</td>
<td>8/8 – 100%</td>
<td>3/8 – 38%</td>
<td>2/7 – 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondji-Gangan:</td>
<td>13/17 – 76%</td>
<td>10/17 – 59%</td>
<td>9/17 – 53%</td>
<td>10/17 – 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowè:</td>
<td>8/12 – 67%</td>
<td>6/11 – 55%</td>
<td>5/12 – 42%</td>
<td>4/12 – 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchatchegou:</td>
<td>5/8 – 63%</td>
<td>5/8 – 63%</td>
<td>1/8 – 13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.2. Comparison across social group

1. Gender: Male versus female subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Cmp:</th>
<th>Radio Broadcasting Cmp:</th>
<th>General Proficiency:</th>
<th>High Proficiency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20/31 – 65% vs 20/27 – 74%</td>
<td>14/19 – 79% vs 9/16 – 56%</td>
<td>23/32 – 72% vs 8/27 – 30%</td>
<td>17/31 – 55% vs 6/27 – 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age: Younger versus older subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Cmp:</th>
<th>Radio Broadcasting Cmp:</th>
<th>General Proficiency:</th>
<th>High Proficiency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>24/31 – 77% vs 18/27 – 67%</td>
<td>14/19 – 74% vs 13/17 – 76%</td>
<td>16/31 – 52% vs 15/28 – 54%</td>
<td>13/31 – 42% vs 10/27 – 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3. Comparison across language contact

1. Residence patterns: Subjects reporting temporary residence versus those with no residence in the Yoruba language area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Cmp:</th>
<th>Radio Broadcasting Cmp:</th>
<th>General Proficiency:</th>
<th>High Proficiency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>3/4 – 75% vs 22/33 – 69%</td>
<td>2/4 – 50% vs 22/32 – 69%</td>
<td>3/4 – 75% vs 14/33 – 42%</td>
<td>2/4 – 50% vs 14/32 – 44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Travel patterns: Subjects rarely traveling versus not traveling to the Yoruba language area\textsuperscript{47}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Comparison</th>
<th>R-Br Comparison</th>
<th>General Proficiency</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>9/12 – 75% vs 11/15 – 73%</td>
<td>9/12 – 75% vs 8/15 – 53%</td>
<td>8/12 – 67% vs 5/15 – 33%</td>
<td>8/12 – 67% vs 3/15 – 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Comparison across religious affiliation: Christians versus non-Christians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Comparison</th>
<th>R-Br Comparison</th>
<th>General Proficiency</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>28/47 – 60% vs 12/12 – 100%</td>
<td>16/29 – 55% vs 8/8 – 100%</td>
<td>22/47 – 47% vs 9/12 – 75%</td>
<td>17/47 – 36% vs 6/12 – 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.4. Comparison across education

1. Educated versus uneducated subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Comparison</th>
<th>R-Br Comparison</th>
<th>General Proficiency</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HghCmp</td>
<td>21/32 – 66% vs 15/19 – 79%</td>
<td>11/18 – 61% vs 5/11 – 45%</td>
<td>21/32 – 66% vs 7/19 – 37%</td>
<td>14/32 – 44% vs 7/19 – 37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{47} The only frequently traveling subject reported proficiency in all areas.
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