# AN ANALYSIS OF DIVERGENCE IN SELECTED NORTHERN SOTHO/ ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

**BY**

**MATLALA RIVONIA MAKWALA**

**MINI DISSERTATION**

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree in of

**MASTERS OF ARTS**

in

**TRANSLATION STUDIES AND LINGUISTICS**

in the

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**(SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES AND COMMUNICATION STUDIES)**

At the

**UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO**

**SUPERVISOR: Ms MJ MOTHIBA**

**2020**

# DECLARATION

I, **MATLALA RIVONIA MAKWALA**, declare that "AN ANALYSIS OF DIVERGENCE IN SELECTED NORTHERN SOTHO/ENGLISH BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES" (mini-dissertation) hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree of Master of Arts in Translation Studies and Linguistics, has not been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university; that it is my work in design and execution, and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.


……………………                                    ……………………...

**Makwala M.R. (Ms)**                                **Date**

**Student number**

███████

# DEDICATION

I dedicate this work dedicate to my daughter Rebotile Christina Makwala.

# ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank the Almighty God for giving me strength throughout my studies. *Ke a go leboga Modimo wa Kganya.*

My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor Ms. M.J. Mothiba, for being patient with me ever since I embarked on this journey. I cannot thank you enough for your guidance and patience. May God bless you and grant you more wisdom. *Ke ago leboga Mahlako.*

I would like to thank my mother, Thandy Makwala, for the love and support she gave me throughout my studies, I would not be where I am without your support. *Ke a go Leboga Ngwetsi ya Ditau. A Modimo wa lerato a go dire ka go loka.*

To my sisters Mmangwedi and Kgopotso, my brothers Neo and Tebogo, thank you for supporting me during the challenging times. May God bless you.

To my daughter Rebotile and my nieces Lehlogonolo and Thoriso thank you for being there for me.

My gratitude also goes to Patrick Christian khosa. Thank you for the love and support you have given me. *Ndza khensa Mavona wa makombandlela.*

To Julia Helen Mabale, Modibe Daniel Mehlape, and everyone who helped and supported me during this study, I thank you for dedicating your time and effort to ensure that this study becomes a success. Your support meant a lot to me and I cannot thank you enough.

# ABSTRACT

Bilingual dictionaries often do not meet the needs of dictionary users because they contain information that is not well presented. This poses as a challenge to the users because they end up retrieving the wrong information. Divergence is one of the most important equivalent relation in bilingual dictionaries and lexicographers often take it for granted. This study analyses the presentation of divergence in selected Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries with reference to Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary and Oxford Northern Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionary. This study further analyses the use of structural markers in bilingual dictionaries because the correct/incorrect use of structural markers also have an impact on the presentation of divergence.

This study reveal that bilingual dictionaries can become user-friendly and meet the needs of the users if lexicographers can apply appropriate strategies when compiling dictionaries as this will lead to communicative success.

# Table of contents

# CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

# CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

# CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

# CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

# CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

# CHAPTER ONE
# GENERAL INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Introduction

Dictionary users always expect the information presented in a dictionary to be correct and accurate. This means it is the lexicographers' responsibility to compile dictionaries that meet the needs of the dictionary users. This can be in terms of divergence, structural markers, cross-referencing, etc. Lexicographers must bear in mind the needs of their target users in order to compile dictionaries that are user-friendly. This study therefore analyses divergence in Northern Sotho/ English bilingual dictionaries.

## 1.2. Background of the study

There are different types of equivalent relations that are used to build up a user-friendly dictionary, namely: full equivalence, also known as congruence, zero equivalence and partial equivalence also known as divergence. Svenson (2009) points out that the classification of equivalent relations is rough but vital, in the sense that it may determine the manner in which a translation equivalent is presented. Among these equivalent relations, divergence is the most noteworthy, because equivalent differentiation has to be implemented in the dictionary description in some way, and the relevant information should be extracted, (Hayashi, 2011). In this regard, this study focuses on the equivalent relation of divergence.

According to Mongwe (2006), divergence is a prevailing equivalent relation when one lemma has more than one translation equivalent. Similarly, Gouws (2002:197) state that divergence is characterised by one to more than one relation between source and target language forms. This means that for a given lemma, the translation equivalent paradigm will consist of more than one translation equivalent. With regard to lexical articles, lexicographers have to distinguish between the types of divergence, and this distinction must have an influence in the microstructure, (Gouws, 1989). This serves as proof that divergence is found in the microstructure of a bilingual dictionary, where translation equivalents of a specific lemmata are provided.

Structural markers also play an imperative role in the presentation of divergence in bilingual dictionaries. This is because these markers are used to separate translation equivalents (either synonyms or polysemous senses) provided in the translation equivalent paradigm of bilingual dictionaries. Al-kasimi (1977:702) contents that synonyms or near synonyms are separated by a comma and polysemy by a semicolon. Structural markers are features that ensure communicative

equivalence between the source and the target language, (Mphahlele, 2001). There are four types of divergence in bilingual dictionaries and they are as follows:

### 1.2.1. Lexical divergence

Lexical divergence prevails where a monosemous lemma has more than one translation equivalent and the translation equivalents are mostly partial synonyms in the target language (Gharaei, Moinzadeh & Barati 2013:513). Most dictionaries use a comma to separate these equivalents.

For example

Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary

 (1). *lwala* – be sick; be ill (2007:125)

The above example is an example of lexical divergence. The problem is that the lexicographer used the incorrect structural marker to present this type of divergence. According to Gouws (2002:198), where lexical divergence prevails the lexicographer has to make sure whether the translation equivalents are full or partial synonyms. This example is an example of full synonyms because the translation equivalents can substitute each other in all context. In a case where the translation equivalents are partial synonyms, the lexicographer should not only inform the user about the fact that partial synonyms can substitute the source language word, but should also notify the user that the target language equivalents cannot substitute one another in all context. For example-:

(2). *kgolo* – large; big (2007:90)

In example (2) large and big are partial synonyms, they can only substitute each other in some contexts, for instance:

Matome bought a big house - Matome bought a large house

Matome is a big boy - Matome is a large boy

From the given examples above, it is evident that partial synonyms can substitute each other in some but not all contexts. It can be said that something is large but a person can never be large. Therefore, it is evident that large and big are partial synonyms rather than total synonyms.

### 1.2.2. Semantic divergence

This type of divergence according to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:157), "semantic divergence occurs when a source language headword has more than one translation equivalent with polysemous senses". This means that polysemy occurs when one word has various semantic distinctions related to each other. Gouws (2002) states that since cases of polysemy are language specific, and since the chances are minimal that a single target language item will have the same semantic load as the source language item, a translation equivalent needs to be introduced for each sense of the source language word. A semicolon is used to separate translation equivalents with polysemous senses yet different dictionaries use different methods to mark the occurrence of semantic divergence such as the numbering of each subcomment onsemantics.

For example-:

Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary

(3). *thala* – draw; swim (2007:223)

The above example, the lemma *thala* has two translation equivalents to represent the different senses of the source language item. Gouws (2002:199) believes that no lexicographer may assume that the users of the dictionary will intuitively know which translation equivalent to choose for a given situation. The lexicographer should therefore illustrate how the translation equivalents can be used and in which context. Forinstance:

(4). Lebo o thala seswantšho – Lebo draws a picture

Lebo o thala ka meetseng – Lebo swims in thewater

If the lexicographer does not provide contextual guidance of the two translation equivalents, the dictionary user could end up choosing any translation equivalent and use it in the wrong context. For example:

(5). Lebo swims a picture

Therefore, to save the dictionary user from any communication embarrassment, the lexicographer must help the user to choose the correct equivalent by providing contextual guidance.

### 1.2.3. Polydivergence

Gouws (2002) writes that it happens very often that both lexical and semantic divergence prevail in the translation equivalents for a source language item.  Therefore, when a lemma consists of

both synonyms and polysemous senses, we have a case of poly divergence. Poly divergence is sometimes referred to as heterogenous divergence (Mphahlele 2002). In the case of poly divergence, the translation equivalents paradigm consists of synonyms separated by a comma and polysemous senses separated by a semicolon. Let us look at the following example extracted from the Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary

(6). *gopola* – think; remember; recall

The above example is an example of polydivergence, the problem is that in Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary only uses a semicolon to separate translation equivalents given in the translation equivalent paradigm. The translation equivalent provided are correct, the problem is that they cannot replace each other in all or any context. The correct presentation would be as follows:

(7). *gopola* – think; remember, recall

Garhaei et al (2013) states that the co-occurrence of lexical and semantic divergence gives rise to an equivalent relation of polydivergence that calls for a well-developed and consistently used system of contextual and cotextual guidance.

### 1.2.4. Homogenous divergence/ mono-equivalence

According to Mothiba (2012:46), homogenous divergence is a type of divergence proposed by Mphahlele (2002). This occurs when the translation equivalent paradigm of a lemma consists of either lexical or semantic divergence and not the mixture of the two. This implies that the translation equivalent paradigm will only consists of only synonyms or only polysemous senses. The following is an example of homogenous divergence extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho/English Dictionary (2009).

(8). mabjala- beer, liquor (2009:80)

Example (8) is an example of homogenous divergence whereby the translation equivalents paradigm consists of only synonyms and not the mixture of synonyms and polysemous senses.

### 1.3. Research problem

In some Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries, due to lack of lexicographic knowledge, divergence is not well presented. This is because some articles are given only one translation equivalent and this leaves the dictionary user with no choice but to go with the given translation equivalent regardless of the context in which it is going to be used. This is a problem because

different speakers of Northern Sotho (Batlokwa, Balobedu, Bahananwa and Bapulana) language have different words to refer to a certain word but sometimes lexicographers decide to do away with providing translation equivalents in all these dialects. Sometimes lexicographers use the wrong structural markers to separate translation equivalents and this leads the dictionary user into choosing any translation equivalent and use it in the wrong context. For some lemma, the lexicographers do not provide the translation equivalent and this will pose as a challenge to the dictionary user. For instance, with the lemma **purpose** in Oxford Bilingual School Dictionary, the lexicographer did not give its translation equivalent.

(9). **purpose** -        (2007:459)

Given the above example, the dictionary user would not know what the translation equivalent of the lemma purpose is and this poses a challenge for the user to learn the Northern Sotho language.

The following example is extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho/English Dictionary (2009)

(10). **dihlare** – trees, medicine

The above example is an example of semantic divergence, and the first mistake the lexicographer did was to use a comma as a structural marker to separate the translation equivalents instead of using a semicolon as a structural marker. This will lead the dictionary user into choosing any translation equivalent and use it in the way he or she see fit. The correct presentation should be as follows:

(11). **dihlare** – trees; medicine

The above presentation will assist the user into choosing the correct context since it is known that a semicolon is used to separate polysemous senses.

## 1.4. Literature Review

Hart (2018) defines literature review as a systematic search of the accredited sources and resources. It involves identifying paper and method(s) by preparing clear plan for the search that includes a justifiable vocabulary that defines what will and not be included in the search. In this study, literature review reviews refer to the sources the researcher will read to strengthen the research study.

### 1.4.1. Lexicographic process

According to Gouws (2001), a dictionary should be based on a comprehensive lexicographic process- this process is the most vital element of the compilation of a dictionary. Gouws (2001:62) further states that this process is "part of a comprehensive historical process which coincides with the development of a language". The lexicographic process is established by all the activities leading to the publication of a dictionary as a text – which includes the actual compilation, planning and data collection, - (Wiegand in Gouws, 2001). Landau (2001) asserts that every dictionary has essentially three stages namely: planning, writing and producing.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:9) emphasise that "one of the most annoying experience in the process of consulting a dictionary is to be confronted with an inconsistent presentation of data". This suggests that dictionary users want to find the data they are looking for as quickly as possible and each consultation is done with the knowledge that the data is presented in a systematic way. Lexicographers should therefore compile dictionaries that are according to a consistently applied pattern. One common feature of lexicographic activities is their aim to produce dictionaries that can be used as practical instruments. For that reason, the main aim of lexicography should be to produce dictionaries that will be practically by catering for the needs of the dictionary user.

### 1.4.2. Lexicographic functions

Tarp (2000:96) views lexicographic function as "the endeavor and ability of the dictionary to cover the complex needs that arise in a particular user situation". This mean that lexicographers must compile dictionaries that cater for different needs of different users. Once the lexicographer has determined whom the target users will be, what their characteristics are and which user situations and which needs will play a role, he or she can determine the so called lexicographic function of the dictionary.

Pienaar (2006) in support of Tarp (2000) agrees that dictionaries, for instance, include functions in order to give the target users information on cultural differences in the same subject field. As the Oxford and Pharos Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries are intended for diverse and bigger target group, the lexicographers should include functions to serve the needs of the whole target user group. Additionally, Tarp (2008:87) asserts that "user needs are always needs for information which can be extracted from lexicographic data. Once this information has been extracted, it can be used to solve the communicative problems that led to the consultation in question".

### 1.4.3. Dictionary typology

There are various criteria to which dictionary typology can be classified: It can be according to the number of considered languages, the amount of lexical material, the dictionary's size, the dictionary's medium, its organisation, the users' language and their skills or the purpose of the dictionary for its users, (Atkins & Rundell, 2008:24). These criteria can be used in monolingual, bilingual and multilingual dictionaries.

Niesel (1999) defines a dictionary as a lexicographic reference work compiled to fulfil one or more of its functions (its true potential) and contains lexicographic data supporting the functions and the lexicographic structures that combine and link the data in order to fulfil the functions. However, Landau (2001) states that a dictionary is a book that lists words in alphabetical order and describe their meanings, information about spelling, syllabication, pronunciation, etymology (word variation), usage, synonyms and grammar. From Landau's definition, it is clear that a dictionary is a book that provide the meanings, pronunciation, usage and synonyms of a given lemma.

Monolingual dictionaries are those dictionaries whose lemma are of the same language as the translation equivalents, (Bejoint, 2004). This means that monolingual dictionaries are written in one language, for instance, if it is a Northern Sotho monolingual dictionary, the headword and its definition(s) will be written in Northern Sotho. According to Barnbrook (2002), a monolingual dictionary has double purposes which need to be taken into consideration, it is an object of the lexicographers' work irrespective of whether the purpose of the dictionary is explanation, definition or description and on the other hand it is the instrument by which this work (definition, description, etc) is done.

Bilingual dictionaries register the equivalences of meanings in two languages, (De Sousa, 1995). This suggests that a bilingual dictionary does not give the meaning of the lemma in another language, but supplies the user with translation equivalents of the given lemma. According to Mongwe (2006:44), in a multilingual society, the use of bilingual dictionaries forms an integral part of the daily communication process. This is because bilingual dictionaries are essential for efficient and active communication between different cultural groups and speech communities, therefore, it is the responsibility of lexicographers to compile bilingual dictionaries that will aid users in ensuring the success of multilingualism in South Africa.

### 1.4.4. Dictionary use

So common in modern-day metalexicography, the user-perspective compels lexicographers to compile their dictionaries according to the needs and research skills of well-defined target user groups, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). This means that lexicographers must keep in mind the needs of their target users and their reference skills when compiling dictionaries. This is because the dominant role of the user has a definite effect on the compilation of dictionaries as well as on the evaluation of their quality.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) are of the view that good dictionaries are products that can be used as linguistic instruments by their respective target users. Lexicographers are therefore expected to present divergence in a manner which the dictionary user would be able to choose the translation equivalent and use it in the correct context.

"The analysis of users' needs should precede dictionary design", (Hartmann, 1989:103). This implies that if the dictionary users happen to be learners of a foreign language, lexicographers have the responsibility to select and present the information in ways appropriate to their particular reference skills.

Wiegand (1989:298) describes dictionaries as "utility articles – dictionaries are produced with the purpose of aiding their potential user in reaching a certain context". This means that dictionaries are compiled with the aim of assisting the user, and the lexicographer should keep that in mind. Gouws (2001) also state that dictionaries are practical instruments and that they are compiled with a specific target user group in mind. Dictionaries have to fulfil a specific purpose in order to be a functional tool. This purpose has to be identified and formulated before the compilation process can begin, since the compilation process must proceed in such a way that its ultimate aim is the purpose of the specific dictionary project, (Pienaar, 2006:9).

In the same way, Haas (1962) confirms that a good dictionary is one in which you can find the information you are looking for- preferably in the very first place you look. This means that information should be easily accessible and readily available to the user. The lexicographer is in terms of Gouws and Prinsloo (1996:103) the mediator between linguistics and the everyday dictionary user. The modern trend in lexicography is thus to compile very practical and extremely user-friendly dictionaries. Barnhart (1962) believes that the lexicographer has to include those words which are likely to be consulted by the target user and to lemmatize them in a user-friendy. Furthermore, Lew (2015) points out that there are several ways one can go about accommodating the needs of users in designing and perfecting dictionaries and one approach is to try to predict

what the user might need by taking time to think about what they need to do, what they can do, and what skills they possess.

## 1.5. Role of Theory in the Study

This study is underpinned by the function theory of lexicography. The function theory considers dictionaries to be tools that are constructed for assisting specific users with punctual needs in specific usage situations, e.g. communicative-oriented situations and cognitive-oriented situations, (Tarp, 2008). There are two main reasons for choosing this theory. Firstly, is its transformative nature. Tarp (2008:84) explains that this theory is transformative because it does not only lead to improved dictionary concepts, but it also lays a solid theoretical foundation for reviews and criticism of dictionaries that do not perform their role optimally as utility tools. Its transformative nature also means that it does not rely on the solutions offered by current dictionaries but strive to produce new and better solution to lexicographical problems. Secondly, it focuses on the dictionary users. This theory is relevant to the study because the dictionary users are affected by how lexicographers present divergence in bilingual dictionaries. This is because lexicographers do not make a profile of the intended user group and the user situations where problems or needs may pop up that can be solved by providing lexicographic data in a dictionary.

## 1.6. Purpose of the study.

The aim of the study was to analyse divergence in selected Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries.

**Research objectives**

• To identify specific lemmata with only one translation equivalent.

•To identify lemmata with more than one translation equivalent and the usage of structural markers.

•To examine the types of divergence in bilingual dictionaries.

•To analyse how divergence influences the choice of a translation equivalent by the user.

## 1.7. Research Methodology

Research methodology is the scientific way of solving the research problem. It is a science of studying how researchers conduct research scientifically (Rajasekar et al, (2013:50). This study employed a qualitative research method. This research method was chosen by the   researcher

because the research aims to get the meaning, the feeling and description of the situation dictionary users find themselves in when consulting bilingual dictionaries. According to Meriam (2009:13), qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed.

## 1.7.1. Research Design

A research design is "an action plan for getting from here to there, where 'here' may be defined as the initial set of research questions to be answered, and 'there' as some set of conclusions or answers about these questions", (Yin,1994:10). In other words, the research design articulate what data is required, what methods are going to be used to collect and analyse this data, and how all of this is going to answer the research question. This study used a descriptive research design. This is because the main aim of descriptive research design is to provide an accurate and valid representation of the factors that are relevant to the research question which in this case, is divergence.

## 1.7.2. Population and sampling

Population refers to the entire full set of elements, data or group of people that are of interest to the researcher and from which a sample is selected, (Beins, 2009). In this study, population was all the articles that were extracted from the Northern Sotho/English Pharos Popular Dictionary and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Bilingual School Dictionary.

Sampling can be defined as the act, process or technique of selecting a suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population, (Mugo, 2002). The researcher employed purposive sampling technique when choosing the sample of the study. This is because it allowed the researcher to select decisively those texts from the population that fit the parameters required for the study, (Duplooy, 2002:114). In this study, purposive sampling allowed the researcher to select articles that present lexical divergence, semantic divergence, homogenous and polydivergence.

A sample is a finite part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole, (Webster, 1985). The sample size in this study was twenty lexical articles: five articles that present the examples of lexical divergence, five articles that present the examples of semantic divergence, five articles that present the examples of homogenous divergence and five articles that present the examples of polydivergence.

### 1.7.3. Data collection

Data collection as the process of collecting information from all the relevant sources to find answers to the research problem, test the hypothesis and evaluate the outcomes, (Dudovskiy, 2016). Data collection methods can be divided into two categories: primary method of data collection and secondary method of data collection. This study used the secondary method of data collection. This means that data would be collected through textual analysis, it would be collected from two dictionaries namely the Northern Sotho/English Pharos Popular Dictionary and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Bilingual School Dictionary.

### 1.7.4. Data analysis

"Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning of the mass of collected data. Quality data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data", (Marshall & Rossman, 1990:11). In this study, the researcher used textual analysis technique to analyse and interpret the data once identified. Textual analysis as defined by McKee (2003:1) is when a text is analysed, and an educated guess is made as some of the most likely interpretations of that text. Frey at al. (1999) states that the purpose of textual analysis is to describe the content, structure, and functions of the messages contained in the text. Therefore, in this study, the researcher extracted twenty articles, five presenting each type of divergence, analysed and interpreted them.

### 1.7.5. Quality criteria

Quality criteria refers to the list of requirements a certain product conform to, (Chandrupatla,1989). In this study, quality criteria were the criteria which the researcher used or follows in order to make sure that this study meets the expectations of its future users.

**Credibility**

Credibility establishes whether or not the research findings represent plausible information drawn from the participants' original data and is a correct interpretation of the participants' original views (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It examines the matter of 'fit' between what the participants say and the representation of these viewpoints by the researcher. Credibility asks whether 'the explanation fits the description and whether the description is credible', (Tobin & Begley, 2004).

**Dependability**

Dependability raises questions whether the research findings 'fit' the data that have been collected, (Carpenter & Suto, 2008). According to Tobin and Begley (2004), dependability is gained through an auditing process, which requires the researcher to ensure that the process of research is logical, traceable and clearly documented.

**Transferability**

Transferability refers to the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be transferred to other contexts with other respondents, (Tobin & Begley, 2004). In other words, it means that a study must be able to be compared to other studies.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability refers to the degree to which the results of an inquiry could be confirmed or corroborated by other researchers (Baxter & Eyles, 1997). In this study, confirmability attempted to show that the findings and the interpretations of the findings are not derived from the imagination of the researcher, but are linked to the data. "Conformability is the degree to which findings are determined by the respondents and conditions of the enquiry and not the biases, motivation, interests or perspectives of the enquirer", (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:290).

## 1.8. Significance of the study

This study will benefit lexicographers, translation students, Northern Sotho students, translators, language practitioners and any other person who would like to consult Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries. This is because this study will assist them to make the correct choices of translation equivalents whenever consulting their Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries and serve as a guide for lexicographers on how to present divergence in bilingual dictionaries.

## 1.9. Ethical considerations

This study relied on textual analysis, therefore there was no need to interview respondents. Yet, all the sources that formed part of this study were fully acknowledged. The researcher also applied for ethical clearance from the Turfloop Research Ethics Committee.

## 1.10. Conclusion

Chapter one discussed the introduction, the background of the study, literature review, role of theory in the study and the research methodology together with the significance of the study and

ethical considerations. This chapter shed light on what to expect in the next coming chapters and outlined which sources the researcher used and acknowledged in supporting this study and how data was collected throughout the study. The following chapter is chapter two, which discusses literature review.

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1. Introduction

In order to present divergence in bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers should keep their target users in mind, and try to compile dictionaries that will meet their needs (target users' needs). This means that the dictionary in mind (of the lexicographer) should be user-friendly. Therefore, this chapter outlines the importance of how a well-compiled dictionary can be of good use to the dictionary user, and what dictionary users expect to find when consulting their bilingual dictionaries as far as divergence is concerned.

## 2.2. Lexicographic process

According to Gouws (2001), a dictionary should be based on a comprehensive lexicographic process- this process is the most vital element in the compilation of a dictionary. Gouws (2001:62) further state that this process is "part of a comprehensive historical process which coincides with the development of a language". The lexicographic process is established by all the activities leading to the publication of a dictionary as a text – which includes the actual compilation, planning and data collection, (Wiegand in Gouws, 2001). Landau (2001) opines that every dictionary has essentially three stages namely: planning, writing and producing.

Moreover, Pienaar (2006:12) asserts that the establishment of a lexicographic process leads to the formulation of a dictionary plan, which forms the basis of all the decisions regarding the compilation of the dictionary. This means that in order for a dictionary to be planned and compiled, a lexicographic process should be established. In other words, the planning and compilation of a dictionary is dependent on the lexicographic process. In the same way, Gouws (2001:68) confirms that the compilation of a dictionary is only part of the overall lexicographic process and is preceded by the planning phase during which the dictionary conceptualisation plan is formulated and a sound theoretical basis is established.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:9) emphasise that "one of the most annoying experience in the process of consulting a dictionary is to be confronted with an inconsistent presentation of data". This suggest that dictionary users wants to find the data they are looking for as quick as possible and each consultation is done with the knowledge that the data is presented in a systematic way. Lexicographers should therefore compile dictionaries that are according to a consistently applied pattern. One common feature of lexicographic activities is their aim to produce dictionaries that

can be used as practical instruments. For that reason, the main aim of lexicography should be to produce dictionaries that will be practical by catering for the needs of the dictionary users. To elaborate on that, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) further add that the publication of any dictionary should not only be the result of the proceeding compilation activities but it has to be considered as the culmination of a much more comprehensive set of activities, the so-called lexicographic process. The compilation and eventual publication of any dictionary form part of at least one lexicographic process.

According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:9) "a lexicographic process represents the blueprint for the compilation of a dictionary and although different dictionary projects often share the same goals and objectives, each dictionary project needs to be the product of its own lexicographic process, formulated uniquely for that dictionary. This means that the lexicographic process of each dictionary is unique though dictionaries often share the same goals and objectives of meeting and fulfilling the needs of the users. This implies that as far as both Pharos Popular Northern Sotho/English and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English School Bilingual Dictionary are bilingual dictionaries, their lexicographic process are different. The dictionary plan plays a vital role in determining the design of the dictionary to be compiled and this is because each dictionary project needs its own lexicographic process and each needs its own design. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:12) believe that "each lexicographic process leads to the formulation of a dictionary plan which can be divided into an organizational plan and a dictionary conceptualisation plan".

**2.2.1. The dictionary plan**

**2.2.1.1. The organizational plan**

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) state that the organisational plan is primarily directed at the logistics of the project and all the managerial aspects, this is because this planning is essential for the success of any dictionary project and the logistic and managerial infrastructure must proceed any editorial work. This plan should include everyone who is involved in a dictionary project.

A vital plan in the organisational plan of a dictionary is the genuine purpose of the dictionary, which is decisive in ensuring a sound and theoretical point of departure for the compilation process, (Pienaar, 2006). While this is the case, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) claim that one aspect regarding a dictionary plan which has been neglected in the planning of so many dictionaries but which forms an integral part of the organisation plan is the identification and formulation of the genuine purpose of the intended dictionary.

### 2.2.1.2. The dictionary conceptualisation plan

In the planning of a dictionary project, the dictionary conceptualization plan as part of the dictionary specific lexicographic process has the most direct influence on the compilation process, (Gouws and Prinsloo, 2005). This therefore means that the compilation of a dictionary is directly influence by this plan. Wiegand (1998:151) divides the conceptualization plan into f ive subdivisions namely: the general preparation phase, the material acquisition phase, the material preparation phase, the material processing phase and the publishing material phase.

### (a). - The general preparation phase

According to Pienaar (2006) the general preparation phase forms the basis for the structure, contents and presentation of the dictionary. One of the task of the project members when commencing with this phase to compile a lexicographic instruction book or a lexicographic style guide, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). This is the most essential instrument available to ensure consistent and systematic presentation and treatment in the compilation process. This suggests that if there is no such guide available, the result would be a dictionary that lacks logic structure, especially where more than one person is responsible for the lexicographic treatment. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) state that there are certain issues to be dealt with in this stage.

The first issue to be dealt with in an instruction book include the lemmatisation process (with reference to, for example, the influence of initial capital letters, diacritics, the order of the word and stem forms), the use of typographical and non-typographical structural indicators in the articles, the marking of different senses of a lemma, the use of abbreviations in the metalanguage of the dictionary, the positioning and marking of new research fields in the article, etc. (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:15). This means that the instruction book should elaborate on how all the aforementioned issues will be dealt with. For instance, the dictionary or instruction book should treat divergence in full, with the correct usage of structural markers.

The second issue to be dealt with is the microstructural programme of the dictionary which should be developed during the general preparation phase. According to Pienaar (2006:14) "the microstructural programme determines the different data categories to be included in the treatment of the lemmata and typical article slots allocated to these categories". More importantly, Gouws (2001) adds that "the early identification of the microstructural programme enables the lexicographer to focus on those data categories that will be included in the dictionary during the early phases of the compilation process". This implies that the microstructural programme also determine the size of the dictionary, resulting in a functional use of the space available in the

dictionary. One of the typical consequences of a dictionary planned without paying attention to the microstructural programme is a situation where the lexicographers decide to haphazardly include a certain data category in a specific article and omit it from the next, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). This suggests that the dictionary functions in an unsystematic way and cannot adhere to the predictability criterion.

The third issue to be dealt with in the general preparation phase, which according to Gouws (2001) and Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) is the planning of the frame structure of the dictionary. EbanEga (2007) emphasises that the frame structure should be well planned in advance so that the lexicographers know which texts and what kind of data should be included in the front and back matter texts. This is because these texts allow the lexicographers to provide a more comprehensive variety of data in the dictionary.

According to Gouws (2001) and Gouws and Prinsloo (2005), the fourth issue to be dealt with is the dictionary basis, i.e. the total source of language material for specific lexicographic process. This includes all the possible sources that accommodate such material as well as informants and mother tongue speakers of a language. This is because an early identification of the dictionary basis makes it possible for the lexicographer to apply a well-directed material collection policy, which leads to a quicker macrostructural collection.

**(b). - The material acquisition phase**

This phase is primarily aimed at establishing the dictionary basis identified during the general preparation phase, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:17). Pienaar is of the view that during this phase the lexicographer collects speech material from the sources which forms the dictionary basis. "The result of the material acquisition phase is the compilation of the lexicographic corpus, which is the collection of items gathered from the primary, secondary and tertiary sources of the dictionary basis", (Gouws and Prinsloo, 2005). This implies that the main focus of this stage is to establish the dictionary basis and nothing more; - therefore, the lexicographer needs to collect every possible item to ensure the best establishment of a dictionary basis.

**(c). -The material preparation phase**

According to Pienaar (2006) during this phase, the gathered material is prepared so that it can be processed in the remaining phase of the lexicographic process. By the end of this stage, the corpus should be in good order and the lexicographers should be in a state where they can use the corpus to choose the examples and citations to be included in the dictionary, (Gouws &

Prinsloo, 2005). This suggests that everything to be included in the dictionary should be ready and the lexicographers are aware of that. In addition, according to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:11) this phase is "one of the beginning of the compilation phase because some of the activities are already directed at filing specific article slots".

The lexicographer can proceed with the macrostructural selection, for instance, to select the items to be added as lemmata in the dictionary once the corpus is complete, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). Pienaar (2006) claims that the selection of macrostructural items takes place according to the typological criteria of the specific dictionary. However, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:18) state that "the lemmata function as the most typical treatment units of a dictionary and once these treatments units have been selected, ordered and presented as guiding elements of their respective articles, the lexicographers are in a position to apply the lexicographic treatment by activating the macrostructure. This implies that lexicographers can only activate the macrostructural programme once the lemmata has been organised as guiding elements of their articles.

**(d). - The material processing phase**

During this phase, the lexicographers know which data to include in the dictionary and where to include it, this is because prior to this phase, the frame structure and the microstructural programme have been devised, as well as the macrostructural selection completed, in the material preparation phase. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) stress that the lexicographers know what to entail in the dictionary, where to entail each entry and at which primary treatment units the entries have to be addressed. This tells us that lexicographers know the order in which the dictionary should be compiled. The material processing phase consists of the application of the data distribution structure of a dictionary, and this phase consists of the application of data distribution structure of a dictionary, (Gouws, 2001). This distribution structure of a dictionary allows the lexicographer to accommodate the lexicographic data in more than one text.

While this is the case, the data distribution structure determines the specific position of each data type in the dictionary as a so called carrier of text types, (Gouws, 2001:68). In addition, Pienaar (2006) highlights that some data will be included in the texts provided in the front and back matter, while other data will be included in the articles. In this case, the data that will be included in the articles refers to the texts constituting the central list of a dictionary.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:18) emphasise that "once the macrostructural programme has been formulated and the macrostructural selection has been completed, the lexicographers are in a

position to pursue the construction of the dictionary articles as texts in the central list of the dictionary". This implies that lexicographers cannot pursue the construction of the dictionary without the macrostructural programme and selection. According to Gouws (2001) and Gouws and Prinsloo (2005), a macrostructural programme can be regarded as the second issue to receive attention in the general preparation phase of the conceptualisation plan. This is because during the compilation process, lexicographers should be aware of the macrostructural programme of the dictionary, such as the different data categories to be included in the treatment of the lemmata. No dictionary should be compiled without paying attention to the macrostructural programme of the dictionary. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) explain that if the dictionary is compiled without paying attention to the macrostructural programme, lexicographers could decide to include a certain data category in a specific article and omit it from the next. If this is the case, therefore the dictionary cannot adhere to predictability criterion and that means it functions in an unsystematic way.

One of the first assignments the lexicographers have when commencing with the general preparation phase is the compilation of the lexicographic book or the lexicographic style guide, (Gouws, 2002). Further, the instruction book should contain a comprehensive description of the system applied in the dictionary. This is because the instruction book is regarded as the most important tool in the hands of staff members to ensure a consistent and systematic presentation and treatment in the compilation process. Bergenholtz (1990) proposes typical issues to be dealt with in the instruction book, namely:

- the lemmatization process (with reference to the influence of capital letters, diacritics, the order of a word and the stem form);
- the use of typographical and non-typographical markers in the articles;
- the marking of different senses;
- the use of abbreviations in the metalanguage of the dictionary;
- the positioning and marking of new zones in the article, etc.

**(e). -The publishing preparation phase**

This is the final phase of the dictionary conceptualisation plan. According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005), this phase involves the different stages of proofreading and final adjustments. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) write:

"From an editorial point of view, this phase is directed at the various stages of proofreading and final adjustments to the manuscript. The dictionary plan has to make provision for a

rapid and functional execution of this part of the lexicographic process. It is important that this phase of the lexicographic process, albeit the final part of the lexicographic process, should be planned during the early phases of the lexicographic process".

This means that the lexicographers should know from the start of the dictionary project what kind of a dictionary are they going to produce, whether electronicor printed dictionary.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) also emphasise how the layout of dictionaries forms an integral part of the publishing preparation phase, this is because it is no longer a task solely for someone in the printing division, but a vital assignment and a part of the lexicographic process in which the lexicographers should have a deciding say. "The layout includes the design the cover, the entries on the spine, the title page, etc. and this constitutes an important part of the outer access structure of the dictionary", (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:19). This tells us that if the layout issue is sorted at an early stage of the lexicographic process, then time will be saved in the final stage of the conceptualisation plan.

## 2.3. Lexicographic functions

Dictionaries are practical instruments and are compiled to be used by a specific target user group and to fulfill a specific purpose and specific functions in the different situations of usage, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). According to this view, it can be said that each and every dictionary is compiled with specific functions that will fulfil the needs of certain user. Tarp (2008:81) defines lexicographic function as "the satisfaction of the specific types of lexicographically relevant need that may arise in a specific type of potential user in a specific type of extra-lexicographical situation". This means that lexicographers should compile dictionaries that cover the dictionary users' needs that may arise in particular user situations. Once the lexicographer has determined whom the target users will be, what their characteristics are and which user situations and which needs will play a role, he or she can determine the so called lexicographic functions of the planned dictionary, (Tarp, 2000).

Pienaar (2006) concurs that dictionaries, for instance, include functions in order to give the target user information on cultural differences in the same subject field. As the Oxford and Pharos Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries are intended for diverse and bigger target group, the lexicographers should include the functions to serve the needs of the whole target user group. "User needs are always need for information which can be extracted, it can be used to solve communicative problems that led to the consultation in question", (Tarp, 2008:87).

According to Niesel (2010), Tarp's definition of lexicographic function is useful as it lists three core elements lexicographers should take into consideration when planning and designing dictionary projects, whether practical or theoretical. This is because it provides lexicographers with guidelines on how to proceed when they embark on their projects.

**The three core elements as mentioned by Niesel (2010) are as follows**:

**(a). - Lexicographically relevant needs**

Dictionaries are important information tools. They contain data that the dictionary user can read and process in their minds so that as a result, they get the information that answers their questions as explained in Niesel (2008). Lexicographic relevant needs are related to the situations that forces the dictionary user to consult a dictionary and as such, (Niesel, 2010:132) directly link the concept of lexicographically relevant needs, as those needs that reflect peoples' lack of knowledge in a given situation. When dictionary users realise that they lack knowledge in a given situation, they consult dictionaries as they believe that dictionaries can assist them as they believe that they (dictionaries) can assist them as they contain information that will meet users' needs.

**\* Describing relevant user situations**

"Lexicographers should study the human activities their dictionaries are intended to address in order to identify general types of user situations", - (Niesel, 2010:132). This implies that a dictionary should be intended to address the user situations dictionary users find themselves in.

Niesel (2010:132) writes:

> "The activities may be divided into main types of actual situations in the real (extra-lexicographic) world in which users encounter problems that make them consult bilingual dictionaries in search for help. It is important to appreciate that actual user situations are not official constructs but they are out there in the real world with real people. In addition, user situations are events that have nothing to do with lexicography and dictionaries but which lead, or may lead, to dictionary consultation: they arise in an extra-lexicographic universe and prior to actual dictionary consultation".

This tells us that there are types of user situation which apply to all types of dictionaries. When people engage in oral or written acts of communication and need assistance to complete these activities, these types of situations are called communicative user situations. For example,

students who are writing assignments in a native or foreign language can choose to consult dictionaries in order to find information that can assist them in writing those assignments.

Since we are living in a multilingual society, speakers of different languages can consult a dictionary to understand or refer to what the other speaker means by a particular word. If this is the case, then Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries lexicographers must include every single word that will assist Northern Sotho speakers to interact with each other irrespective of whether they are Batlokwa, Bahananwa, Bapulane, etc. without any problem of not knowing what a particular word/lemma means.

Another type of user situation is called cognitive user situations and it is not related to ongoing communicative acts, (Niesel, 2010). For instance, this is for people who want to acquire general knowledge about a particular subject field because they have a desire to know more. In this case, translation students may want to acquire knowledge about divergence and may want to learn how it is presented in other bilingual dictionaries. People involved in these situations consult dictionaries because they have discovered that they have no or little knowledge about a particular subject field.

Niesel (2010) emphasises that people are engaged in a situation falling within a communicative or cognitive user situation and realise that they have insufficient competencies. This means that lexicographers should study which competencies their intended users possess or not possess and compile dictionaries that are intended to meet those competencies. "Whether user situations are communicative or cognitive, those who realise that they need help (i.e. information or knowledge) and that this may be solved by consulting dictionaries, means that they are potential dictionary users", (Niesel, 2010:13).

**\*Identifying types of lexicographical function**

Niesel (2010:133) asserts that "dictionaries are activated by users who need information or knowledge and dictionary functions may, therefore, be regarded as the lexicographic response to extra-lexicographic user situations". According to Tarp (2002), a lexicographic function represents the assistance that a dictionary provides to a certain type of a user to cover the needs of that user in a particular user situation. This implies that a dictionary must be able to assist the dictionary user in any situation the dictionary user finds himself or herself in. For instance, a dictionary user consults a dictionary in order to achieve information that allows him or her to solve a concrete problem or raise his or her level of knowledge; therefore, the dictionary must be able to meet the needs that arise in such situation. While this is the case, Gouws & Prisloo (2005) highlight that

the function of a dictionary is not only determined by the dictionary users but also by the usage situation and this situation in which a dictionary is used should have a definite influence on the data distribution programme and on the function of that dictionary.

Lexicographic functions, according to Niesel (2010) can be classified into general types similar to user situations as they are directly linked to user needs, and functions that try to meet user needs in communicative user situations and are called communicative functions. Tomba Moussavou (2007) asserts that a concrete dictionary can have one or more functions, it can be mono-functional or multi-functional. The user situation is the element that determine the function of the dictionary. Further, functions are frequently named after the user situations which they can correspond with. In this regard, the lexicographic functions are divided into communicative-oriented and knowledge/cognitive-oriented in correspondence with the types of user situations, (Tarp, 2000, Tomba Moussavou, 2007 and Niesel, 2010). According to Niesel (2010:133) "dictionaries can have the same types of communicative function as there are communication user situations".

The communicative-oriented functions (according to Tarp (2000:14)) are as follows:

- to assist users in solving problems related to text production in the native language;
- to assist users in solving problems related to text reception in the native language;
- to assist users in solving problems related to text production in the foreign language;
- to assist users in solving problems related to text reception in the foreign language;
- to assist users in solving problems related to text translation from the native language into a foreign language;
- to assist users in solving problems related to text translation from foreign language into the native language.

Niesel (2010) elaborates that lexicographers may also prepare dictionaries intended to fulfil user needs in cognitive situations: these functions are called cognitive functions. Tarp (2000) regards these functions as knowledge-oriented functions. Just as dictionaries can have more than one communication functions, they can also have more than one cognitive/knowledge-oriented functions.

According to Tarp, (2002) the knowledge-oriented function are as follows:

- to provide general cultural and encyclopedic data;
- to provide special data about the subject field;
- to provide data about language.

"Lexicographers may compile dictionaries that satisfy a variety of user needs", (Niesel, 2010). This means that it is possible for a dictionary to cater for most, if not all the user needs. For example, the Oxford Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionary can satisfy a wide range of user needs since it covers some if not all the communicative and cognitive user situations. Niesel (2010) is of the view that lexicographers should carefully consider the number of functions their planned dictionaries will comprise of as it is easy to plan and compile dictionaries with one or few functions, but the more the lexicographers include more functions, the more difficult it will be for them to compile dictionaries that satisfy all selected user needs.

Stressing on the issue of lexicographic functions, Tarp (2000:198) writes that:

> "The functions are the very essence of lexicography. The functions constitute the leading principle of all dictionaries. Everything in a dictionary is to a greater or lesser extent influenced by its respective functions. Neither the contents nor the form of a dictionary can be conceived without taking the functions into account. It is possible to outline an integrated model of lexicography with reference work on the basis of functions".

With this being said, it is evident that functions play a vital role in the compilation of dictionaries. This therefore means that lexicographers should take into account the functions of a dictionary they plan to compile. Niesel (2010:134) states that "lexicographic functions affect all the decisions lexicographers has to make in practical and theoretical dictionary projects". Another essential point is that, however, lexicographic functions cannot stand alone but should be used hand in hand with the 'concept of relevance' as applied in lexicography, (Niesel, 2010). This implies that the kind of data the lexicographers include in dictionaries are actually connected to the dictionary functions.

## 2.4. Dictionary typology

Niesel (1999) defines a dictionary as a lexicographic reference work compiled to fulfil one or more of its functions (its true potential) and contains lexicographic data supporting the functions and the lexicographic structures that combine and link the data in order to fulfil the functions. However, Landau (2001) states that a dictionary is a book that lists words in alphabetical order and

describes their meanings, information about spelling, syllabication, pronunciation, etymology (word variation), usage, synonyms and grammar. From Landau's definition, it is clear that a dictionary is a book that provides the meanings, pronunciation, usage and synonyms of a given lemma.

Berg (2005) gives the definition of a dictionary in the following way: "A dictionary is a systematically arranged list of socialized linguistic forms compiled from the speech community and commented on by the author in such a way that the qualified dictionary user understands the meaning of each separate form, and is informed of the relevant facts concerning the function of that form in its community". Mtuze (2011:166) states that "dictionaries play an important role in all speech communities. A dictionary serves as an important reference work and greatly enhances the standardization of a language as it tends to influence our use of language". In this case of divergence, the lexicographers should include all Northern Sotho dialects in the translation equivalent paradigm in order to cater for all speech communities.

Dictionaries are of social importance to mankind as they are sources of information regularly consulted by users to solve their uncertainties about a specific lemma. Niladri (2015) concurs with Jackson (2002) that the reasons for consulting dictionaries are to discover the meaning of a word and to check the spelling thereof. Jackson (2002:83-84) asserts that:

> "A learner, or indeed a native speaker, may consult a dictionary when engaged in one of two broad types of language tasks. On the one hand, a learner may be engaged on the task of reading and listening, and they encounter a word or phrase that makes no sense to them and whose meaning they cannot deduce from the context: the dictionary is used as an aid to 'decoding' the item read or heard. On the other hand, a learner may be engaged in a task of writing or preparing to speak, they do not necessarily need to find an unknown word, but rather to discover how a known word may be used in the appropriate context: the dictionary is used to 'encode' acceptable sentences and texts. For a native speaker, spelling is the main encoding purpose that they might consult a dictionary for; whereas learners may need to find out about spelling, pronunciation, inflexions, how a word fits into grammatical structure, what other words can appropriately accompany it (its collocations), and whether there are any social and cultural restrictions on its usage.

This sheds light that dictionary users consult dictionaries for different reasons. Their users consult them (dictionaries) for spelling purposes, pronunciation purposes, etc. Therefore, this shows us that dictionaries play a vital role in assisting users with their different needs.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) are of the view that even in this modern day, dictionaries are still seen as important tools and their users view them as correct sources of knowledge. The researcher agrees with this point because dictionary users often consult dictionaries whenever they experience challenges regarding any new word or term they come across in the everyday life.

There are different types of dictionaries namely; pedagogical, monolingual, bilingual, multilingual, etc. This study focuses only on monolingual and bilingual dictionaries yet much focus will be put on bilingual dictionaries.

### 2.4.1. Monolingual dictionaries

Barnbrook (2002), defines a monolingual dictionary as 'a dictionary designed to be used by learners of a particular language' whereas Bejoint (2004) defines monolingual dictionaries as those dictionaries whose lemmas are of the same language as the translation equivalents. This means that monolingual dictionaries are written in one language, for instance, if it is a Northern Sotho monolingual dictionary, the headwords and definitions will be written in Northern Sotho. According to Barnbrook (2002), a monolingual dictionary has two purposes which need to be taken into consideration, it is the object of lexicographers' work irrespective of whether the purpose of the dictionary is explanation, definition or description and on the other hand it is the instrument by which this work (definition, description, etc.) is done.

Landau (2001) elaborates that a monolingual dictionary, when written entirely in one language, may be intended for the native speakers of that language, for people learning it as a second language in a country where the language is widely spoken either as a native language or a lingua franca, or for people learning it as a foreign language. He adds that the chief purpose of a monolingual dictionary is to explain, in words likely to be understood, what other words mean, and, especially in a learner's dictionary, how to use them.

### 2.4.2. Bilingual dictionaries

Bilingual dictionaries register equivalence of meanings in two languages, (De Sousa, 1995). This suggests that bilingual dictionaries do not give the meaning of a lemma in another language, but supplies the user with translation equivalents of the given lemma. On the other hand, Landau (2001:8) states, "a bilingual dictionary consists of a list of words or expressions, in  alphabetical

order when in printed form, in one language (the source language) for which, ideally, exact equivalents are given in another language (the target language). The purpose of a bilingual dictionary is to be of aid to someone who understands one language and not the other. Mphahlele (2001) is of the same view that a bilingual dictionary records two languages at the same time where one language is recorded as a source language and the other as the target language. For example: Oxford Northern Sotho/English BilingualSchool Dictionary

(12). **doubt** – pelaelo; maseme (2007:332)

From the above example, *pelaelo* and *maseme* are the translation equivalents of the lemma **doubt** and not its meaning. Therefore, it can be said that English is the source language whereas Northern Sotho is the target language.

According to Landau (2001), there are two main purposes for using a bilingual dictionary, for comprehension, as in reading of the source language by a user who knows the target; or as an aid in expression, as in writing of the target language by a user who knows the source language. For example, a Northern Sotho speaker may consult a Northern Sotho/English dictionary in order to get help in understanding unfamiliar words encountered in reading, and on the other hand, the Northern Sotho speaker who must write a letter in English may consult a Northern Sotho/English dictionary in order to get help in finding the words to express him or herself.

Gouws (1996:103) indicates that a few dictionaries and dictionary types, especially bilingual dictionaries, have also dominated the South African lexicography practice. In a multilingual society, the use of bilingual dictionaries forms an integral part of the daily communication process, (Mongwe, 2006:44). This is because dictionaries are important for efficient and active communication between different cultural groups and speech communities. It is therefore the lexicographers' responsibility to compile bilingual dictionaries that will help the users in ensuring the success of multilingualism in South Africa. The problem with the dictionaries that the researcher has chosen to analyse is that the lexicographers provided only one translation equivalent to a lemma that has more than one translation equivalent. The following is an example extracted from the Oxford BilingualDictionary:

(13). **egg** – lee (2007:337)

With the above example, the lemma **egg** is given only one translation equivalent whereas different speech communities have different words to refer to the object. For instance, the Lobedu people refer to an egg as *leata/lekhopa*, therefore, the lexicographer was supposed to provide these

translation equivalents in the translation equivalent paradigm in order to cater for all Northern Sotho speakers. As the result, divergence cannot prevail.

The dictionary of lexicography defines a bilingual dictionary as "a type of dictionary which relates the vocabulary of two languages together by means of translation equivalents", (Hartmann, 2002:14). The problem with bilingual dictionaries is that it is not always possible to find an equivalent of a word in the other language with different cultures. Pitrowski (1989:74) is of the view that "a bilingual dictionary can never be adequate in description of meaning- entities, because the entities are language specific and the second language equivalents will be related to different entities than the first language item". Hunt (1996) states that a bilingual dictionary is 'a necessary but limited tool' and many users make mistakes as they are unaware of information about context or culture missing in bilingual dictionaries. This the reason why dictionary users end up choosing any translation equivalent and using it in the wrong context. It is the lexicographer's responsibility to provide contextual guidance on the lemmata provided in the dictionary. The problem of not providing contextual guidance is seen in Pharos Popular Dictionary where the lexicographers only provided translation equivalents of a lemma and did not show how the translation equivalents will be used. Below follows, an example extracted from Pharos Popular Dictionary:

(14). **kgoparara** – big;huge (2009:59)

From the above example, the lexicographers do not show the user how the translation equivalent can be used, therefore the user will just go with any translation equivalent and end up using it in the wrong context.

Mothiba (2012) agrees that when dictionary users consult bilingual dictionaries, they want to find the target language items for a certain source language form and they also want to find guidance on where and how to use the item they find. "Most dictionary users do not consider the fact that all dictionaries are compiled for a specific target user group, but they consult them for solving problems encountered in any particular situation of usage", (Mongwe, 2006:45). This means that no dictionary can meet all the needs of all dictionary users.

According to Mongwe (2006) and Landau (2001), bilingual dictionaries are subdivided into the following types: unidirectional (monodirectional) and bidirectional. Unidirectional dictionaries only serve the speakers of one language. There is only one source language. For instance, a dictionary where English is treated as the source language and Northern Sotho as the target language. On the other hand, bidirectional dictionary is a dictionary that consists of two    alphabetical

components, (Landau, 2001). This is to say that there are two dictionaries in one whereby the first alphabetical component is in English to Northern Sotho and the other is in/from Northern Sotho to English. The two dictionaries that the researcher has chosen are bidirectional dictionaries. Mongwe (2006) states that bidirectional dictionaries are in demand as they cater for the needs of both the speech communities and those interested in learning about the diversity of languages of a country.

**The frame structure of bilingual dictionaries**

A frame structure of bilingual dictionaries similar to monolingual dictionaries has three main components namely the front matter, central list and back matter.

**(i). - Front matter**

Mothiba (2012:12) states that this component is found in the beginning of most dictionaries, though some lexicographers may decide to omit it. It is important as it assists the user as a guide on how to use the dictionary. In addition, Yong and Peng (2007:84) assert that the front matter of the dictionary normally includes the title page, table of contents, articles written by editors and authorities, guide to the use of the dictionary, principles of pronunciation, explanation of abbreviations, and some other materials.

**\*      Title page**

The title page provides the title of the dictionary, its compiler(s) or editor(s), its date of publication and the publisher, (Yong & Peng, 2007). In most cases, the title page in bilingual dictionaries are written in both the source language and the target language.

**\*      Table of contents**

Niesel (1995:168) states that the table of contents follows the title page as it may be "considered some kind of survey article summarising the entire dictionary structure" as "it is probably the only component to contain references to all other components in the dictionary". It clarifies the mapping of all important components in the dictionary and supplies directions for quick and simple access to where the user can find the needed component and where the information the user is looking for is located.

## * Foreword

Yong and Peng (2007) are of the view that the foreword must make clear points such as the purpose of the dictionary, the intended users, lexicon coverage, compiling methodologies, access modes, etc. This implies that lexicographers must explain their methodologies, principles and philosophies about their work in a short essay written in a clear and simple language.

## * Users' guideline

According to Yong and Peng (2007:87), the purpose of this section is "to give a detailed description of how the dictionary is structured, how one structural component is related to others, how the information is organised and systematized, what information is to be found in which part. Its task is also to inform the user how to locate and access particular items of information in the quickest manner possible". Therefore, the lexicographer has the challenge of how to design the front matter well, how to raise user awareness and make full use it.

Yong and Peng (2007) raise an important issue that dictionary users are sometimes blamed for not reading the outside matter (in particular the front matter) and therefore fail to make full use of information and to recognise the full range of functions provided in the dictionary whereas there is really not much for dictionary users to read. In addition, they advise that lexicographers need to think about and seek what it is that dictionary users expect to find in the front matter and how it should be made user-friendly and easily understandable. The researcher is in support of their view because dictionary users are faced with the challenge of not knowing what to expect and where to access which information in the dictionary.

Mafela (2004) shares the same sentiments with Yong and Peng (2007) that learners of a particular language mostly use a bilingual dictionary, therefore, without users' guide, learners may find it difficult to find and interpret meaning of lexical entries in bilingual dictionaries. This is because the only way dictionary users can be able to retrieve the correct information is through the users' guide. Mafela also highlights that many dictionaries in indigenous African languages of South Africa are bilingual, but they contain very little information in the users' style guideline, and some do not have a style guide for users at all. For instance, Pharos Popular dictionary has no front matter where it can include the users' guide to assist the dictionary user. It is important to know and understand that the users' guide included in the front matter of the dictionary is not the users' guide to the front matter but to the entire dictionary

**(ii). Central list**

According to Gouws & Prinsloo (2005:63), the central list hosts the most salient structural components of a dictionary. They further add that in the field of metalexicography, research has led to the identification of a number of structural components to be negotiated in the central list of a dictionary such as the macrostructure, microstructure, access structure, mediostructure, etc. (There are many structures but only the macrostructure and microstructure are to be discussed in this study.)

Mohlala (2010) states that the central list is divided into two components namely the macrostructure and microstructure. "The macrostructure and the microstructure cannot be divorced from each other, that's because the microstructure is the addresser of the macrostructure and the microstructure is the addressee of the macrostructure", (Mohlala, 2010:2). This implies that the two dictionary components are dependent on each other. It is imperative to keep in mind that the microstructure is found on the right hand side of the macrostructure of a dictionary page. Whenever dictionary users consult their bilingual dictionaries for translation equivalents, they look up to the microstructure. That is where divergence is found, in the microstructure of a dictionary.

**\* Macrostructure**

The macrostructure is regarded as the first main part of the dictionary. According to Mohlala (2010), the macrostructure is that section of a dictionary where lemmata that are usually written in alphabetical order are found. This is where themost important information is located. Mongwe (2006) adds that the macrostructure always consists of lemmata that are in the source language. In the case of English/Northern Sotho bilingual dictionaries, it would mean that the lemmata are in English and the translation equivalents in Northern Sotho. The lemmata are always arranged in alphabetical order, written in bold, not in capital letters in the beginning except for proper names.

"The first major problem with which lexicographers are confronted with is the structure level", (Prinsloo & de Schryver, 2000:189). This is supported by Tomaszcyk (1963) who asserts that one of the basic problem in lexicography is to decide what to put in the dictionary and what to exclude. This means that it is up to the lexicographer to decide what to include or exclude in the macrostructure of the dictionary however, this depends on the nature and size of the dictionary and its intended users.

Čechovà (2015:3) asserts that the macrostructure of a dictionary is constituted by a general order of entries, that is, of words, their parts or word groups. This suggests that the key element of the macrostructure is an entry. An entry, according to Landau (2001) refers to the headword followed by its definition and other related information. The headwords of a dictionary are sometimes referred to as a lemma and it is due to the process of lemmatization, (Čechovà, 2015). This implies that another word for headword is a lemma.

**Criteria to which dictionary can be classified**

Atkins and Rundell (2008:24) report that there are various criteria to which dictionary typology can be classified: it can be according to the number of considered languages, the amount of lexical material, the dictionary size, the dictionary's medium, its organisation, the users' language and their skills or the purpose of the dictionary for its users.

**\*      Number of languages covered in a dictionary**

Landau (2001:8) writes that dictionaries differ in the number of languages they contain and the difference between a monolingual and bilingual one consists not only in the number of languages in which they are written but also in their essential purpose. Monolingual dictionaries are entirely written in one language, meaning that the headwords together with the definitions are written in the same language whereas bilingual dictionaries provide translation equivalents of the lemma in another language. Yong and Peng (2007) similarly state that dictionaries may differ in the number of languages in which they are written, which is often used as a classifying criterion for dictionary types. Moreover, these two types of dictionaries differ in not only the number of languages in which they are written, but more importantly, in their manner of handling the kind of information they present and their intended objectives.

**\*      The coverage of a dictionary**

According to Atkins and Rundell (2008) the coverage of a dictionary is the second aspect in classifying dictionaries and their focus on what kind of entries are included in them. This implies that dictionaries can only deal with business related or medicine related terminologies. In this case, it is the lexicographers' responsibility to decide on what kind of a dictionary to compile. Landau (2001) agrees that dictionaries differ in scope in respect of the subjects they cover. A dictionary that only covers a particular subject field can be referred to as special-field dictionaries and they are directed to a restricted target user group. For instance, a medical dictionary would not make any sense to someone who is not familiar with medical vocabulary. Similarly, Yong and

Peng (2007) write that both monolingual and bilingual dictionaries can choose to deal one specific field of human life and knowledge such as law, medicine, or computers. They may also choose to deal with one specific aspect of language like spelling, pronunciation, usage, collocations, and so on. Whether special-field dictionaries should be monolingual or bilingual depends on their intended leadership and purpose.

**\* The size of the dictionary**

Landau (2001:28) asserts that dictionaries differ in how fully they cover the lexicon and since the size of the lexicon varies from language to language, the number of entries in the dictionary is a measure only of its relative size compared with other dictionaries of the same language. This means that the size of a monolingual and bilingual dictionary will never be the same. The researcher believes that a bilingual dictionary should be bigger than a monolingual dictionary since it (bilingual dictionary) consists of two languages but this is not the case, bilingual dictionaries are always smaller in size. This means that bilingual lexicographers are not doing enough when compiling dictionaries.

**\* The medium of a dictionary**

According to Atkins and Rundell (2008) there are three mediums of dictionaries namely print, electronic (for example, DVD or hand-held) and web-based medium. The dictionary is regarded as a system for communication between the compiler and the user, and the medium through which lexicographic massage (such as the dictionary text) is transmitted has become an important factor to consider, (Yong & Peng, 2008:27). Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries do not display any difference as far as the medium for lexicographic communication is concerned as they both employ printing and multimedia technology.

Čechovà (2015) highlights that the non-print mediums bring many advantages rather than print mediums. This is because in non-print mediums there is no limitation of space whereas there is limitation of space in print dictionaries. In support of Čechovà's view, Yong and Peng (2008:27) add that:

> "Multimedia dictionaries have several advantages over printed dictionaries. Electronic dictionaries, for example, have features of being information compact, multifunctional, user-friendly and easy to carry. Internet dictionaries are highly commended for their dynamism of the medium, which is represented by its flexibility in editing the text and in encouraging the user to feel free to add and

revise. Paper dictionaries once printed, are impossible to correct and revise, unless a new edition is planned, but that requires time, sometimes so much as to make the revised edition out of date when it comes out. In terms of internet dictionaries, the compiler may edit, add, delete, modify and update any part of the text anytime he feels appropriate to do so…"

This indicates that print dictionaries are at the edge of being replaced by hand-held electronic dictionaries.

According to Landau (2001), in bilingual lexicography, hand-held electronic dictionaries are already showing an impact of growing in popularity as they get more powerful and as their pricing gets more competitive with books. As the result, these dictionaries are increasingly popular tools in learning a foreign language and as travelers' aids, doing the service of pocket bilingual dictionaries. In many online dictionaries, accessibility is in most cases limited to looking up particular words and this kind of access is a selling tool rather than information services created to entice the user to buy a book, CD, or electronic access to text in on the internet, (Landau, 2001).

## * The organisation of a dictionary

Atkins and Rundell (2008) asserts that the most common dictionary's organisation is the organization from word to meaning whereas the other one is word to meaning to word (where looking up one word leads to other semantically related words). An example of a word to meaning dictionary is the dictionary that provides the headword followed by the definition or an equivalent translation. For instance, an Oxford Monolingual Dictionary. A thesaurus is an example of a word to meaning to word organization.

## *The users' language

Atkins and Rundell (2008:25) classify three kinds of dictionaries according to this criterion, namely, the dictionaries meant for:-

- a group of users who all speak the same language
- two specific groups of language speakers
- learners worldwide of the dictionary's language

This criterion means that a group of users who all speak the same language needs a monolingual dictionary, two specific group of language speakers uses a bilingual dictionary and lastly learners worldwide of the dictionary's language need a multilingual dictionary.

**\* Users' skills**

With regard to users' skills, Landau (2001:25) argues that dictionaries differ in the age of the intended user: some are aimed at children, others at adults. This suggests that children's dictionary reference skills would not be the same as the reference skills possessed by the adults, therefore the lexicographer should keep her or his target users' reference skills in mind when compiling a dictionary. It is advisable that before starting a dictionary project, lexicographers must decide whom their target audience are and what purpose they want to fulfil with their dictionary project. If the dictionary is for children, then it should meet their standards. For instance, Landau (2001:26) states that:

> "There are various levels of 'picture dictionaries' for children who are in the process of learning to read; these are often thoughtful introductions to dictionary use, but until users have acquired the skills necessary to look up a word independently and to read its definition, they are not using a dictionary, whatever it may be called. These skills required to use a dictionary are often taken for granted by adults; teachers, however they know very well that they must be taught and are not easily mastered by everyone".

Therefore, a dictionary for children would not be of use to literate adults or even for students. As a result, there are dictionary for language learners, dictionary for students and even dictionary for linguists or professionals.

**\* What the users use the dictionary for**

Atkins and Rundell (2008) maintain that a dictionary can either be used for encoding or decoding. Decoding may refer to the understanding of a word whereas encoding refers to using a word correctly. For instance, Landau (2001) believes that a monolingual dictionary is for explaining, in words likely to be understood, what other words mean and how to use them- this is what decoding means. Yong and Peng (2008) emphasise that dictionaries contain different kinds of words and some of those words are common while some are uncommon and as the result, this is the reason why dictionary users consult dictionaries. The activity of 'reading' is the most important reason for dictionary use, and the meaning of words is the most often sought kind of information. It follows that difficult words are the most frequently visited word entries because they are most likely to be encountered in the course of reading, (Yong and Peng, 2008:35). At times, dictionary users consult dictionaries in order for them to be able to use a certain word correctly – or even in the correct context: this is what encoding means. Lexicographers should therefore decide whether to

compile dictionaries of encoding and decoding purposes, since Yong & Ping (2008) believe that a dictionary for all purposes is a dictionary for none.

The above-discussed criteria assist the lexicographer in compiling a dictionary that is relevant for the target users' in mind.

## * Microstructure

Svensen (1993:210) describes the microstructure as "the structure of individual dictionary entries: their various parts and the mutual relationship of these including the typographical convention used". The microstructure of a bilingual dictionary consists of the translation equivalent paradigm which include the translation equivalents and the examples, (Mothiba, 2012:15). This implies that in the microstructure of a bilingual dictionary we only find the translation equivalents and their examples. The microstructure can be regarded as the second main part of the central list. EbanEga (2007) states that all data presented in an article as part of the lexicographic treatment of a lemma has microstructural status and this includes the description of meaning, translation equivalents, morphological data, illustrative examples, pronunciation as well as the spelling of a lexical item and the stress indication.

According to Yong and Peng (2007), the macrostructure of a dictionary specifies the way the lemma articles are composed yet semantic description is the most vital aspect. Mohlala (2010) argues that it is true that semantic description is key in the microstructure of a dictionary but semantic description alone will not make the dictionary a complete reference book. Further, in most cases, translation equivalents and definition of lemmata alone in dictionaries do not solve the users' problems, hence it is important that lexicographers should include more aspects such as part of speech, pronunciation of certain headwords and cross-reference in the microstructure. In this regard, the researcher feels that the lexicographers of Pharos Popular Bilingual dictionary could have done a better job if they had included one of the aspects proposed by Mohlala (2010) rather than providing only the translation equivalents for the given lemmata.

In bilingual dictionaries, there is a variety of equivalent relations that can hold between the lemma and its equivalence, (Mongwe, 2006). This implies that divergence is one of the equivalent relation that are found in the microstructure of the dictionary. According to Landau (2001), the microstructure of a dictionary must among others provide definitions which are arranged by parts of speech, definitions which are numbered, and cross-references that must be clearly shown. If the microstructure does not meet the above requirements, that implies that it is not well arranged

and as a result it becomes doubtful  whether the same dictionary will help the user to solve his/her problem.

**(iii). Back matter**

Mongwe (2006:61) claims that "the back matter, although regarded as optional and not a compulsory component of a dictionary, is a part of a dictionary that accommodates the following text segments – bibliography, appendix, addendum, explanation of abbreviations, pictures and references associated with the postures and relevant literature that can be consulted regarding extra information on the dictionary". Some of this information include days of the week, names of provinces, countries, etc. This information provided in the back matter can be helpful to the dictionary user.

Dictionary users are sometimes blamed for not making full use of their dictionaries and one of the supposed reasons for this is that they fail to read the front and back matter of their dictionaries, (Yong & Peng, 2007). This suggests that dictionary users should be encouraged to read the front and back matter of their dictionaries.

**2.5. Dictionary use**

According to Herbst and Stein (1987), a dictionary is a reference book, hence its users requires specific reference skills to retrieve information from it. Moreover, for a language learner to be able to use it successfully requires specific competence as it contains a wide range of information. In support of Herbst and Stein (1987), Mdee (1997) states that skills in dictionary use are rarely taught to language students and many students know very little about dictionaries they use, for example, the information the dictionary can offerand how such information can be retrieved.

So prevalent in modern-day metalexicography, the user-perspective forces lexicographers to compile their dictionaries according to the needs and research skills of well-defined target user groups, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). This means that lexicographers should keep in mind the needs and reference skills of their target users when compiling dictionaries. This is because the dominant role of the user has a certain effect on the compilation of dictionaries as well as on the assessment of their quality.

**2.5.1. The purpose of the dictionary**

Gouws (2001) states that there is only one genuine purpose for all dictionaries and then provides such a definition of a genuine purpose: "the genuine purpose of a dictionary should therefore be to ensure successful dictionary consultation procedure. A successful dictionary  procedure

depends on the way in which the needed linguistic information can be retrieved." Considering Gouws definition of the genuine purpose, it can be concluded that if the user's dictionary consultation leaves him or her more puzzled, then the dictionary did not serve its purpose. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) add that good dictionaries are products that can be used as linguistic instruments by their respective target users. Lexicographers are therefore expected to present divergence in a manner which the user would be able to choose the translation equivalent and use it in the correct context.

Dictionaries are defined as "utility articles – dictionaries are produced with the purpose of aiding their potential users in reaching a certain context," (Wiegand, 1998:298). This means that dictionaries are compiled with the aim of assisting the user, and the lexicographer should keep that in mind. Dictionaries have to fulfil a specific purpose in order to be a functional tool. This purpose has to be identified and formulated before the compilation process can begin, since the compilation process must proceed in such a way that its ultimate aim is the purpose of the specific dictionary project, (Pienaar, 2006:9).

According to Wiegand (1984:15) the "general purpose of monolingual, bilingual and multilingual dictionaries is derived from the communicative and cognitive needs of the society or societies". In support of Wiegand (1984), Al-Kasimi (1997) states that dictionaries are practical tools to which their users refer in order to satisfy practical communicative and cognitive needs. As this is the case, it means that dictionaries should serve the purpose of fulfilling these communicative and cognitive needs.

Smit (1996) emphasises that it is notable that different types of dictionaries will have different purposes. This implies that a bilingual dictionary can never work as a substitute for a monolingual dictionary since they do not serve the same purpose. Similarly, Gouws (2001) states that dictionaries are practical instruments which are compiled with a specific, target user group in mind and have to fulfil a specific purpose in order to be a functional tool. For that reason, Pienaar (2006) suggests that the purpose of a dictionary has to be identified and formulated before the compilation process can begin, since the compilation process must proceed in such a way that its ultimate aim is the purpose of the specific dictionary project. Thus, the lexicographer should identify the purpose of his or her dictionary project before compiling it.

Dictionaries empower the language users because they (dictionaries) help to improve communication by providing users with the necessary vocabulary they need, (Klein, 2009:423). In the same way, Mongwe (2006) states that bilingual dictionaries assist the source and   target

language users in reading with understanding and also in writing and expressing themselves so that they in turn will be understood. From both Klein and Mongwe's points of view, dictionaries serve the purpose of assisting language users with language related problems but in this case, the dictionaries to be analysed by the researcher are part of the problem since they are poorly compiled and the users end up learning the wrong thing instead of the correct one.

Below is an example extracted from the Pharos Popular Dictionary to elaborate the researcher's point of view,

(15). **baagi** – builders, citizens (2007:5)

The lexicographer provided builders and citizens as the translation equivalents and separated them with a comma whereas they cannot replace each other in all context and the dictionary user does not know that. As a result, the dictionary user, who is not familiar with the English language might choose and use any translation equivalent between the two and end up expressing himself or herself in the wrong manner. Therefore, with this kind of presentation, it cannot be said that this type of bilingual dictionary can assist the user in reading with understanding, writing and expressing herself or himself so that he or she can be understood. This can only cause communication embarrassment.

According to Mongwe (2006), there is no doubt that the purpose of compiling a bilingual dictionary is for it to act as a tool for effective communication amongst speakers of different language groups. An advantage of a good compiled dictionary is to provide information on both the source and target language as this assists the user to learn the other language hence it is in the hands of the lexicographer to compile dictionaries that will serve the correct purpose to the dictionary user without causing any misunderstanding.

## 2.5.2. The user-perspective

Prinsloo (2011) demonstrates that modern lexicography is focused on the user-perspective and aimed at the compilation of dictionaries according to the needs and dictionary skills of well-defined target user groups. This means that lexicographers should compile dictionaries which are practical and user-friendly. In terms of Gouws and Prinsloo (1998:103), the lexicographer is the mediator between linguistics and everyday dictionary user. Dictionaries are compiled for real users and they must be regarded as useful tools, this is the reason why lexicographers should make sure that their users are able to retrieve information from their dictionaries, (Mongwe, 2006).

In other words, it is very essential for lexicographers to know their target users before they can work on a dictionary project.

Lexicographers should know their target users because the character of a dictionary and the nature of material presented in it should be determined by who the target users are, (Lombard, 2002). For instance, in terms of compiling Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionary, the lexicographers should think of all people using the Northern Sotho language, this include the Balobedu, Batlokwa, Bahananwa, Babupalana, etc. in this regard, it means translation equivalents should also be given in the aforementioned dialects.

Mdee (2011:98) believes that a good dictionary is user-friendly. According to Mdee, such a dictionary is one which (1) enters all lexical items the expected user would want to look up, (2) puts every lexeme selected for the dictionary in its appropriate place where the user can easily find it and (3) provides at the point of the entry the lexicographical information that the user needs. This means that a dictionary without the points Mdee (2011) highlighted is not regarded as user-friendly, yet it should be considered that a dictionary could have all the things mentioned by Mdee and still not be user-friendly to some users. In support of Mdee (2011), Gouws (2004:68) writes:

> "The average dictionary user does not judge a book by its cover, even a dictionary, by its cover. To these users the success of a dictionary is not determined primarily by its extent, the layout or the quality of the printing but rather by the way in which they manage to achieve a successful procedure of dictionary consultation by retrieving from the dictionary the kind of information they need and been looking for".

### 2.5.3. Users' needs

According to Haas (1962:48), a good dictionary is one in which you can find the information you are looking for - preferably in the very first place you look. Hence, the information should be easily accessible and readily available for the user. This can be seen as a way of meeting the needs of the users. Complementary to this, Lew (2015) is of the view that there are several ways one can go about accommodating the needs of the users in designing and perfecting dictionaries. One approach is to try to predict what the user might need by taking time to think about what they need to do, what they do, and what skills they possess, (Lew, 2015:2).

Lexicographers should not only assume what they think their target users need but should also identify their needs. Tarp (2008) emphasises that dictionaries are utility tools and that

lexicographers should design them on the basis of their assumptions about the users existing knowledge, the usage situations in question, and the types of needs arising for a user in a given situation. In this manner, lexicographers will produce dictionaries that satisfy the needs of their users. The position of the user is so important that Hartmann (1989:103) hypothesises that an analysis of users' needs should precede the dictionary design. This implies that the design of a dictionary in terms of both its microstructure and macrostructure should be determined by the needs and reference skills of the intended target user. Gouws (2001) agrees that the use of bilingual dictionaries in a multilingual society necessitates a comprehensive profile of the target user, needs and reference skills. Divergence therefore, compels the lexicographer to present the target language information in such a way the intended user will be able to make an unambiguous choice of the correct equivalent for any specific context.

Different types of dictionaries are compiled focusing solely on the needs of their target users, because a single dictionary cannot serve all the requirements of the users, (Mphahlele. 2001) in addition, Mothiba (2012) asserts that every dictionary user can choose to use any dictionary, sometimes even more than one. This tells us that an ideal dictionary for a one user cannot be an ideal dictionary to all users. Pienaar (2006:18) writes that 'often the users' needs are very simple and can be satisfied with only one or a few lexicographical data whereas in other situations users' needs might be very complex and can only be met with a combination of different kinds of lexicographical data. Since dictionaries are known to present great access to the users, when a dictionary user consult a dictionary, he or she does so to gain information that allows him or her to solve a specific problem. For that reason, a dictionary must be able to meet the needs that arise in that situation.

### 2.5.4. User situations.

Bergenholtz and Tarp (2003:172) assert that user situations may be understood as "the human activities or the social situations in which the users' experiences problems which are solved by consulting a dictionary". These situations are extra-lexicographic in that they exist independently from dictionary use or its availability as presupposes that without consulting a dictionary, the problems may not be solved. The scarcity of dictionary culture among the majority of dictionary users results in a situation where these users do not realise that the success of a dictionary consultation procedure does not only depend on the data being included in the dictionary, (Gouws, 2004). This implies that one of the situations that dictionary users find themselves in, is the scarcity of culture where they end up not realising the success of consulting a particular

dictionary. Therefore, the lexicographer should at least have some knowledge about his or her target groups' cultural background.

According to Tarp (2009:278), dictionary consultation takes place when users with a specific type of need occurring in a specific type of extra-lexicographical situation think that this type of need can be satisfied by consulting a dictionary and therefore take action in this direction. In most cases, dictionary users do not just consult dictionaries for the fun of it, but they are often forced by the lexicographic situations that they find themselves in. It is clear that, if this type of users consult dictionaries designed to provide assistance in the respective situation, then they are likely to have their needs met than if they consult dictionaries which are not designed for this kind of assistance. In addition, Tarp (2009:278) asserts:

> "…It is also necessary to distinguish between two entirely different situations relevant to lexicographical user research, i.e. the user situation which is an extra-lexicographical or pre-lexicographical situation where the need to consult a dictionary occurs for a potential user, and the usage situation where the user, now turned in to an actual user, takes action to satisfy his/her needs by consulting a dictionary or another lexicographical tool".

This implies that it is important for the lexicographer to research on his or her target audience to know why, where and when do they consult a dictionary. As a result, the lexicographer will learn and understand under what circumstances dictionary users consult a dictionary, when do they consult it and their experiences during and after consulting a dictionary.

## 2.6. The Role of theory in the study

This study is underpinned by the function theory of lexicography. The function theory considers dictionaries to be tools that are constructed for assisting specific users with punctual needs in specific usage situations, e.g. communicative-oriented situations and cognitive-oriented situations, (Tarp,2008). There are two main reasons for choosing this theory. Firstly, is its transformative nature. Tarp (2008:84) explains that this theory is transformative because it does not only lead to improved dictionary concepts, but it also lays a solid theoretical foundation for reviews and criticism of dictionaries that do not optimally perform their role as utility tools. Its transformative nature also means that it does not rely on the solutions offered by current dictionaries but strives to produce new and better solutions to lexicographical problems. Secondly, it focuses on the dictionary users. This theory is relevant to the study because the dictionary users are affected by how lexicographers present divergence in bilingual dictionaries. This is because

lexicographers do not make a profile of the intended user group and the user situations where problems or needs may pop up that can be solved by providing lexicographic data in a dictionary.

If lexicographers were to follow this theory when compiling their dictionaries, their dictionaries would be user-friendly, serve their intended purposes, fulfil their functions and meet most if not all the needs of their users. With regard to the two dictionaries to be analysed by the researcher, it can be said that they were compiled without taking the function theory of lexicography in to consideration, hence their presentation of divergence and use of structural markers are not of much aid to the dictionary users.

## 2.7. Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the literature related to this study whereby it is evident that most scholars believe that a lot can be done to improve how lexicographers compile their dictionaries. It is evident that all scholars mentioned in this study together with the researcher are all striving for a dictionary project that will accommodate, meet and satisfy the needs of the users. The next chapter discusses the methodology of this study.

# CHAPTER THREE

# RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1. Introduction

In order to interpret and analyse the presentation of divergence in bilingual dictionaries, the researcher needed to select and use a certain research methodology in her study, therefore this chapter outlines the research methodology of this study.

## 3.2. Research Methodology

Research methodology is the scientific way of solving the research problem. It is a science of studying how researchers conduct research scientifically (Rajasekar et al, (2013:50). This study employed a qualitative research method. The researcher chose this research method because this study aimed to get the meaning, the feeling and describe the situation dictionary users find themselves in when consulting bilingual dictionaries.

According to Meriam (2009:13), qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed. Similarly, Cresswell (2009) states that qualitative research is "a means of exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem". This study therefore needed to understand how the issue of divergence affected the users of Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries.

Holloway and Wheeler (2002) indicate that some qualitative researchers do not only concentrate on the individual's experience but also the environment they (individuals) find themselves in. They describe qualitative research as "a form of social enquiry that focuses on the way people interpret and make sense of their experience and the world in which they live". For instance, in this study the qualitative method helped the researcher to gain insight on the dictionary users' experiences when consulting and using the dictionary. Meso (2016) also adds that qualitative research is mostly associated with words, language and experiences and is not limited to numerical results or statistics.

"The purpose of qualitative research is discovering underlying means and patterns of relationships and these patterns and the underlying meaning of social phenomena are analysed through language", (Babbie, 2007:378). In addition, Durrheim (1999:43) outlines that qualitative data is collected in the form of 'language' whether it is written, spoken or visual translated into 'language', as opposed to data collection in numerical form within qualitative research. An analysis of

divergence is then, by definition, grounded within the interpretivist paradigm, as Crotty (1998:87) states that a characteristic of interpretivism is the study of texts in order to gain an understanding of the meaning within texts. As a result, this study is using 'language' not only as a tool to 'read' and make sense of the text but also as to collect the data as to interpret the text. The main focus of qualitative research is meaning andinterpretation.

An advantage of qualitative research method lies in its descriptive or exploratory nature and it stresses the importance of context and the subject's frame of reference (Burns & Grove, 2000:388).

### 3.2.1. Research Design

A research design is "an action plan for getting from here to there, where 'here' may be defined as the initial set of research questions to be answered, and 'there' as some set of conclusions or answers about these question", (Yin, 1994:19). The research design creates the foundation of the entire research work, (Rajeskar et al. 2012:22). Parahoo (1997:42) holds the same view that describes research design as a strategic plan of conducting research. In other words, the research design articulates what data is required, what methods are being used to collect data and analyse these data, and how all of these answer the researchquestions.

This study employed a descriptive research design. This is because the main aim of descriptive research design is to provide an accurate and valid presentation of the factors that are relevant to the research question, and in this case, divergence. According to Du Plooy (2002:49), descriptive research design requires that the result of the study include a description of the "characteristics of a phenomena, or relations between a number of variables, as accurately as possible". In this study, the description was between the four types of divergence whereby the researcher compared and analysed the two bilingual dictionaries she had chosen. Du Plooy (2002:9) further states that it is not enough to just describe the relations between variables, one must also describe the degree of difference between the two. With reference to what Du Plooy (2002) suggests, the researcher also intended to describe the degree between all the types of divergence analysed in this study.

### 3.2.2. Population and sampling

Population refers to the entire or full set of elements, data or group of people that are of interest to a researcher and from which sample is selected, (Beins, 2009). Similarly, Brink, Van der Walt and Van Rensburg (2012) states that the study population is the entire group of persons or objects that are of interest to the researcher and that meet the criteria that the researcher is interested in

studying. In this study, the population comprised of all the articles that were extracted from the Northern Sotho/English Pharos Popular Dictionary and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Bilingual School Dictionary.

Sampling can be defined as the act, process, or technique of selecting suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population, (Mugo,2002). In the same way, Burns and Grove (2003:31) refer to sampling as a process of selecting a group of people, events or behavior with which a study a is conducted. Polit et al (2001) confirm that in sampling a portion that represents the whole population is selected.

The researcher used purposive sampling when choosing the sampling of the study. This is because it allows the researcher to select decisively those texts from the population that fit the parameter required for the study, (Du Plooy, 2004:114). In this study, purposive sampling allowed the researcher to select articles that presented lexical divergence, semantic divergence, homogenous and polydivergence. Purposive sampling implies that "the researcher's intentionally select participants who have experience with the central phenomenon or the key concept of being explored", (Cresswell & Clark 2007:112). In this study, divergence was the concept being explored.

A sample is a finite part of statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole, (Webster, 1985). On the other hand, Polit et al (2001:234) define a sample as "a proportion of a population". The sample size of this study was twenty lexical articles: five articles that present examples of lexical divergence, five that present semantic divergence, five that present homogenous and five that present polydivergence. However, Holloway and Wheeler (2002:128) assert that sample size does not influence the importance or quality of the study and note that there are no guidelines in determining sample size in qualitative research. During qualitative research, the sample size may change in size and type, this is because qualitative researchers do not normally know the number of people in the research beforehand. Sampling goes on until saturation has been achieved, namely no new information is generated, (Holloway, 1997:142).

In this study, the total number of dictionaries that were listed were two, namely the Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2009) and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo (2007). However, the researcher used one more dictionary to try to emphasise the need for

dictionaries that presents divergence correctly and that additional dictionary is the Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

### 3.2.3. Data collection

Data collection is the process of collecting information from all the relevant sources to find answers to the research problem, test the hypothesis and evaluate the outcomes, (Dudovskiy, 2016). Data collection methods can be divided into two categories: primary method of data collection and secondary method of data collection. This study used the secondary method of data collection. This means that data was collected through textual analysis technique, it was collected from two dictionaries namely the Northern Sotho/English Pharos Dictionary and the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionary.

### 3.2.4. Data analysis

According to Kubayi (2013:113), once data have been collected, they must be analysed, interpreted, findings made and conclusions drawn. "Data analysis is a process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data, Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data", (Marshall and Rossman, 1990:111). On the other hand, Polit & Beck (2008:69) define data analysis as "the process of separating data into smaller and manageable parts with the intention of finding meaningful answers to the research questions and objectives to disseminate the findings". Data analysis involves making sense of text data in order to understand them and do an interpretation of their meaning since data analysis and interpretation goes hand in hand, which means one cannot analyse data without interpreting it.

In this study, the researcher used textual analysis to analyse and interpret data once identified. Textual analysis as defined by Mckee (2003:1) is when a text is analysed, and an educated guess is made as to some of the most likely interpretations of that text. Frey et al. (1999) states that the purpose of textual analysis is to describe the context, structure, and functions of the messages contained in the text. In a similar note, Larsen (2002:119) demonstrates that textual analysis is used to discover 'meaning' in a text and how that 'meaning' has been constructed. Therefore, in this study, the researcher extracted twenty lexical articles, five representing each type of divergence. A textual analysis of the twenty lexical articles was an attempt to ascertain how divergence is presented in the two chosen dictionaries.

### 3.3. Quality criteria

Quality criteria refers to the list requirements a certain product conforms to, (Chandrupatla, 1989). In this study, quality criteria are the criteria in which the researcher used or followed in order to make sure that this study meets the expectations of its future users.

**Credibility**

According to Polit et al (2001:32), credibility refers to the confidence of the data. Credibility establishes whether the research findings represent the correct information drawn from the participants' original data and is the correct interpretation of the participants' original views (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It examines the matter of 'fit' between what the participants say and the researcher's representation of those viewpoints. Credibility asks if "the explanation fits the description and if the description is credible", (Tobin & Begley, 2004).

**Dependability**

Polit et al (2001:315) assert that dependability refers to the stability of data over time and over conditions. Dependability raises questions about whether the research findings 'fit' the data that have been collected, (Carpenter & Suto, 2008). According to Tobin and Begley (2004), dependability is gained through an auditing process, which requires the researcher to ensure that 'the process of research is logical, traceable and clearly documented". Lincoln and Guba (1985:161) state that a dependable study should be accurate and consistent. Two methods to assess dependability of data include stepwise replication and inquiry audit.

Stepwise replication: This approach involves several researchers who can be divided into two teams to conduct separate inquiries with a view to comparing data as well as conclusions.

Inquiry audit: refers to data relevant supporting documents being scrutinised by an external reviewer.

**Transferability**

Holloway and Wheeler (2002:255) writes that transferability means that the findings of the research project can be applicable to similar situations or participants. Similarly, Tobin and Begley (2004) state that transferability refers to the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be transferred to other contexts with other respondents. In other words, it means that a study must be able to be compared to other studies.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability refers to the degree to which other researchers can confirm or corroborate the outcome of an inquiry, (Baxter & Eyles, 1997). In this study, confirmability tried to show that the findings and the interpretations of the findings were not derived from the imagination of the researcher, but linked to the data. "Confirmability is the degree to which findings are determined by the respondents and conditions of the enquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests or perspectives of the inquirer", (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:290). Holloway and Wheeler (2002) suggest that an inquiry audit can be used to trace the data to their sources. As a result, the researcher's way of arriving at the constructs, themes and interpretation can be traced.

## 3.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will benefit lexicographers, translation students, Northern Sotho students, translators, language practitioners and any other person who would like to consult the Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries. This is because this study will assist them make the correct choices of translation equivalents whenever consulting their Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries and serve as a guide for lexicographers on how to present divergence in bilingual dictionaries.

## 3.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study relied on textual analysis, therefore there was no need to interview respondents. Yet, all the sources that formed part of this study were fully acknowledged. The researcher also applied for ethical clearance from the Turfloop Research Ethics Committee.

## 3.6. CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the research methodology of this study wherein the researcher outlined which research design was used, how data was collected and analysed. The researcher also explained the quality criteria of the study, the ethical considerations and how the study will be of significance to the users. Chapter 4 discusses the presentation and interpretation of data.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

### 4.1. Introduction

This chapter focuses on the presentation, analysis and interpretation data collected on the topic "An Analysis of Divergence in the Selected Northern Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionaries". Data were analysed according to how they were presented in the selected dictionaries. The main aim of consulting the dictionaries was to analyse how divergence was presented in bilingual dictionaries and come up with a better way to present it.

### 4.2. Data Management and Analysis

The researcher consulted two bilingual dictionaries and selected 20 articles where the four types of divergence prevail and analysed them individually.

### 4.3. Research Results

Bilingual dictionary users in most cases have problems in selecting the correct translation equivalent for a provided occurrence of the source language form and this could be due to lack of entries indicating the relevant context and cotext of the translation equivalents, (Gouws,2002). This suggests that lexicographers are compelled to provide contextual guidance for the translation equivalents provided, in order to help the user to choose the correct translation equivalent.

According to Zugsta (1977:537), the task of the bilingual lexicographer is to find such lexical units in the target language as equivalent to the lexical units of the source language, and to coordinate them. Therefore, the lexicographer must ensure to accommodate all the speech communities under the Northern Sotho language so that they all can be well presented in the dictionaries. This will ensure the correct presentation of divergence.

### 4.3.1. The relationship between a lemma and translation equivalents.

According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:153) translation equivalents are presented as part of the treatment of the lemma, functioning as guiding elements of a particular dictionary article. In other words, the translation equivalents function as guiding elements for a particular dictionary article, therefore lexicographers must present these translation equivalents as adequately as possible since they are treatment of a lemma. One of the lemmatic addressing is the most dominant addressing procedure in the articles of a bilingual dictionary. "Between the lemma as address and the translation equivalent paradigm as a collection of entries addressed at a lemma, a relation of

translation equivalence exist", (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:153). This presupposes that the relation between translation equivalents and a lemma is seen in the translation equivalent paradigm. Various types of translation equivalents can be presented in one article and structural markers are used to indicate in detail the difference in translation equivalents.

### 4.3.2. Translation equivalents.

When users consult a dictionary they often work with the assumption that this type of dictionary offers them data to be regarded as the meaning of the source language item, represented by the lemma, (Gouws a& Prinsloo, 2005:152). In the same way, Louw (1991) concurs that when people consult a bilingual dictionary they seldom realise that the information provided is no essentially a statement about meaning, but a list of translation equivalents. This implies that dictionary users still have the mindset that bilingual dictionaries provide the meaning of the source language item rather than the translation equivalents.

Translation equivalents is a target language (TL) item which can be used to substitute the source language (SL) item in a specific occurrence, depending on specific contextual and cotextual restrictions, (Gharahei et al. ,2013). These translation equivalents are found in the translation equivalent paradigm as stipulated by Mphahlele (2002) who states that a position in an article where translation equivalents are found is known in lexicographic terminology as translation equivalent paradigm.

In both sections of the Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries, the equivalents are the main categories given in the comment on meaning slot. Al-Kasimi (1977:60) differentiate two types of equivalents that are normally provided by bilingual dictionaries, namely translation equivalents and explanatory equivalents. According to Nkomo and Mafela (2010:319) a translation equivalent is "a lexical unit which can be immediately inserted into a sentence in the target language" and an explanatory equivalent is one "which cannot always be inserted into a sentence in the target language." In terms of both translation equivalent and explanatory equivalent, the latter explains the lemma in the source language into the target language in a form of a sentence whereas the former in a form of a word. For instance, an example of a translation equivalent as presented in Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo is as follows:

(16). **boetše** – went back to; returned to (2007:19)

From the above example, 'went back to' and 'returned to' are translation equivalents in a form of a word. The following is an example of explanatory equivalent derived from the same dictionary.

(17). **Cylinder** – silintere (*sebopego (gantši se swana le tšhupu) sa go ba le dididko tša bogolo bja go lekana mo mafeleleong ka bobedi.)*(2007:317)

Although an important task of a bilingual lexicographer is to provide users with appropriate translation equivalents, preparing a list of translation equivalents is not sufficient, (Gharahei et al. , 2013). Therefore, this means that it is the lexicographer's duty to find translation equivalents in the target language that carry the same value as the lemma in the source language. Wiegand (2002:241) states that equivalence means that a unit in the source language has the same value as the target language unit, however, this does not mean that they are identical. Complementary to this, Zugsta (1971:249) emphasises that the basic purpose of a bilingual dictionary is to coordinate the lexical units of one language with those lexical units of another language which are equivalent in their lexical meaning.

**Types of translation equivalents**

Translation equivalents are presented as part of the lemma, functioning as guiding elements of a particular dictionary article, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:153). Hosana (2009:54) adds that translation dictionaries have two types of translation equivalents namely, synonym translation equivalents and polysemous translation equivalents.

**• Synonym translation equivalents**

Mphahlele (2001) states that these are translation equivalents that have the same meaning to each other. Palmer (1971) defines synonymy as words used to mean "sameness of meaning". This means that in bilingual dictionaries words that have the same meaning are synonymous to each other. These kinds of translation equivalents can replace each other in all or some context.

**• Polysemous translation equivalents**

A polysemous lexical item is a single item with more than one sense and these senses are related, (Mongwe, 2006:58). In other words, polysemous translation equivalents are polysemous senses of a lemma. These kinds of translation equivalents have meanings that are nearly related to each other but cannot replace each other in any context.

**4.3.3. Structural markers**

Mphahlele (2001) states that structural markers are features that ensure communicative equivalence between the source and the target language. Gouws (2003) concurs with Mphahlele and asserts that the purpose of a structural indicator as a functional entry in a dictionary article is to help the user to identify and differentiate items and, to find them as quickly as possible. This means that an incorrect presentation of these structural markers lead the dictionary users to retrieve the wrong information. Therefore, lexicographers should use them consistently and systematically in their dictionaries because if this is not done, it would be difficult for the users to retrieve the correct information. Hence, Mphahlele (2001:49) concludes that:

"This accurate and consistent use of structural markers must be used in translation dictionaries so that a user can have a good use of synonyms and polysemous senses of the lemma. The lexicographers must know that commas and semicolons represent one way of making the specific values".

This means that commas and semicolons as structural markers are very important in bilingual dictionaries and this is because they ensure clear and easy transfer of linguistic meaning.

With regard to the presentation of these structural markers in bilingual dictionaries, Gouws (1999:12) opines:

"The choice of commas and semicolons is not done arbitrarily. They are also structural markers which make a definite contribution on microstructural level to ensure the transfer of semantic information, i.e. polysemy and synonymy".

This implies that lexicographers should make it a point that they do not use these structural markers inconsistently. Gouws (2003) adds that the misplacement of commas and semicolons greatly influences the order and arrangements of the items included in the article.

Usually, commas are used to separate synonyms whereas semicolons are used to separate polysemous senses in bilingual dictionaries. This is emphasised by Al-Kasimi (1977:70) who contends that "synonyms or near synonyms are separated by a comma and different meanings (polysemy) by semicolons". However, it is important to note that if translation equivalents in a bilingual dictionary are separated by a comma, it does not necessarily mean that these translation equivalents provided are synonyms. Again, if a semicolon separates translation equivalents, it does not necessarily mean that the translation equivalents provided are polysemous senses. This is because, in many cases, lexicographers just use commas and semicolons haphazardly. Sometimes one will find a comma used to separate polysemous senses whilst a semicolon is

used to separate synonyms. This is a lexicographic problem because dictionary users will retrieve the incorrect information.

Mphahlele (2001) demonstrates that dictionaries would be easier to use if the structural markers are all in the correct places. Dictionary users would not experience problems in retrieving the required information since a correct structural marker would be used in its correct place. Hence, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) conclude that the use of commas and semicolons in dictionaries should not be taken lightly. This is because their absences could result in a misunderstanding or even worse, communication embarrassment. It is wrong to think that structural markers are not important to be included in the front matter of a dictionary, as they ensure communicative equivalence between the source and target language, (Nkhumeleni, 2005). The lexicographers should not make a mistake of thinking that dictionary users know the different uses of these structural markers.

### 4.3.4. Contextual guidance

According to Hosana (2009), contextual guidance is the information in the microstructure of a dictionary, which shows how a certain lemma is used in a language. On the other hand, Letsoalo, 2012:35) asserts that contextual guidance is when every translation equivalent is followed by guide words, words that emphasise the meaning equivalence or which show the dictionary user how and in what context the lemma can be used. This is the most important information that the lexicographer should include in his or her dictionary project.

The average language user depends on the authority of the dictionary for communication, (Mongwe, 2006). The researcher concurs with Mongwe because dictionary users are often confronted with a list of translation equivalents from which they have to select one equivalent out of the few or many equivalents provided by the lexicographer for their specific need. For that reason, lexicographers should consistently provide contextual guidance on how the given translation equivalents can be used. Mongwe (2006:69) proposes that "in order to achieve communication equivalence the lexicographer should consistently give guidance, since omissions of contextual guidance confronts the user with a list of equivalents and leaves him or her stranded when it comes to the choice of appropriate target language form". For instance, Pharos Popular Dictionary (2007) gives translation equivalents without contextual guidance.

For example:

(18). **find** – bona, hwetša, topa (2007:231)

Considering the above example, it can be concluded that there is no way in which the dictionary user can be able to achieve communicative equivalence. Lack of contextual guidance leads the user into confusion. Therefore, it is wise for lexicographers to include contextual guidance in their dictionary.

Malange (2005:27) emphasises that contextual guidance assists dictionary users to understand the presented lemmata in dictionaries. It assists the users to understand the information about translation equivalents they retrieve and understand their meanings. It is the lexicographers' duty to ensure that every entry in the dictionary is clearly understood and should not confuse the user. This is where extra information about the translation equivalent should be properly explained in order to help the user to choose the correct translation equivalent.

### 4.3.5. Divergence

Divergence, also known as partial equivalence, is one of the types of equivalent relations that are used to build-up a user-friendly dictionary. The classification of equivalent relations is rough but vital, in the sense that it may determine the manner in which a translation equivalent is presented, (Svenson, 2009). Hayashi (2011) believes that among all the equivalent relations, divergence is the most noteworthy because equivalent differentiation has to be implemented in the dictionary description in some way, and the relevant information should be extracted. Gouws (2002) argues that divergence is the most typical equivalent relation in bilingual dictionaries because in a case where more than one translation equivalent prevails for a lemma, the equivalent relation is that of divergence. In addition, Gouws (1999:23) states that "divergence is a prevailing equivalent relation where one lemma has more than one translation equivalent". This implies that divergence prevails when a lemma has more than one translation equivalent in the translation equivalent paradigm.

According to Mphahlele (2001), the equivalent relation of divergence can be divided in two sub-categories: an article of a polysemous lemma which shows a relation of 'semantic divergence' and the occurrence of the target language synonym paradigm which shows a relation of 'lexical divergence'. In a case where an article shows a relation of semantic divergence, the lexicographer is obliged to include contextual guidance.

In a case of divergence, there should not be a mere listing of translation equivalents but a higher density of information is needed in order to assist the dictionary user to retrieve the required information easily. This is supported by Gouws (1999) who asserts that lack of contextual guidance is troublesome in articles especially those that are showing an equivalent relation of

semantic divergence. Therefore, lexicographers should expand the semantic comment in a bilingual dictionary in order for the target user to be able to achieve communicative success.

There are four types of divergence in bilingual dictionaries, namely lexical, semantic, polydivergence and homogenous divergence.

**The presentation of lexical divergence in bilingual dictionaries**.

Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:156) assert that lexical divergence prevails where a monosemous lexical item, functioning as a lemma sign, has more than one translation equivalent. These translation equivalents are mostly partial synonyms in the target language. With this type of divergence, a comma, which is a structural marker, is used to separate synonyms.

To illustrate, the following example is extracted from the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo:

(19). **car** – koloi; sefatanaga; mmotoro (2007:291)

The above article is an example of lexical divergence. The problem is that the lexicographer used an incorrect structural marker, which is a semicolon to separate the translation equivalents instead of a comma. Gouws (2002) states that where lexical divergence prevails, the lexicographer needs to ascertain whether the translation equivalents are full or partial synonyms. This means that lexicographers have to find all the relevant information about the translation equivalents and find out whether they are full or partial synonyms and in what context can they be used. Therefore, the above example is an example of full synonyms because the translation equivalents provided can substitute each other in all contexts.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(20). **car** – koloi, sefatanaga, mmotoro

The presentation in (20) tells us that the translation equivalents provided are synonyms and can be used to substitute each other in all context.

Another example presenting full synonyms derived from the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo:

(21). **smile** – myemyela; nywanywa (2007:493)

As stated by Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) that lexical divergence is typically indicated by a means of a comma as a structural marker to separate synonymous translation equivalents, the compiler

of the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo only used a semicolon to separate all translation equivalents provided in the dictionary. This poses a problem because the dictionary user would not know whether the translation equivalents given are synonyms or polysemous senses.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(22). **smile** – myemyela, nywanywa

The translation equivalents *myemyela* and *nywanywa* can substitute each other in all contexts, therefore they are full or absolute synonyms. According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) where these translation equivalents are full synonyms, they constitute a relation of full equivalence.

More often than not, an equivalent relation of lexical divergence displays equivalents which are partial synonyms, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:157). In a case where the translation equivalents are partial synonyms, the lexicographer should not only inform the user about the fact that partial synonyms can substitute the source language word, but should also notify the user that the target language equivalents cannot substitute one another in all contexts. For instance, let us look at the example below extracted from the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo:

(23). **kgolo** – large; big (2007:90)

From the above example, large and big are partial synonyms and the lexicographer was supposed to use a comma as a structural marker to separate them as they can only substitute each other in some context, as it can be seen below:

(24). She bought a big house – she bought a large house.

(25). She is a big girl – she is a large girl.

In example (24) large and big can substitute each other and still maintain the same message, but as for example (25) big and large cannot replace each other since there is nothing like a 'large' person. It is evident that partial synonyms can substitute each other in some but not all contexts. Therefore, the lexicographer has to include information about how the translation equivalents can be used.

Below is another example extracted from the same dictionary:-

(26). **nnyane** – small; few (2007:169)

The above example, the translation equivalents provided can only substitute each other in some but not in all context. If this is the case, Gouws & Prinsloo (2005) suggest that the lexicographer should enter some kind of either contextual or cotextual guidance to show the typical environment where the common semantic value of the translation equivalent is activated. In addition, they emphasise that lexical divergence does not demand a sophisticated system to ensure an optimal retrieval of information but it does require a consistent application of a well-devised model. The correct presentation should be asfollows:

(27). **nnyane** – small, few

The comma separating the translation equivalents in example (27) implies that the translation equivalents are synonyms unlike how the lexicographer presented them in example (26), using a semicolon as a structural marker as if they are polysemous senses.

In most cases, it appears that lexicographers compile dictionaries without considering the needs of the users. This is because at times, a lemma has more than one translation equivalent but the lexicographer just provides only one translation equivalent and as the result, this hinders divergence to prevail. This means that lexicographers do not consult with their target users before compiling bilingual dictionaries because one translation equivalent does not really cover all the users of the Northern Sotho language.

A critical look at the following examples extracted from Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo is required:

(28). **tea** – teye (2007:513)

(29). **thirst** – lenyora (2007:519)

Looking at the above articles, it implies that the lexicographer considers no other words to refer to the lemma provided. Yet, it is impossible that all Northern Sotho speakers can refer to the headword provided using the same word as the translation equivalent whereas we have different dialects under the Northern Sotho language. There are other words that can be used as translation equivalents for the headwords mentioned, however, the lexicographer might have disregarded to consult the Northern Sotho speakers to try to find other translation equivalents of the headwords. The following words that can be used as translation equivalents of the above mentioned headwords below:

(30). **tea** – teye, foofoo

(31). **thirst** – lenyora, mogau

The researcher used a comma as a structural marker to separate the translation equivalents because the above articles are examples of full synonyms. It is therefore evident that the lexicographers sometimes compile dictionaries that do not to meet the needs of the dictionary users.

**The presentation of semantic divergence in bilingual dictionaries.**

Semantic divergence happens where the source language lemma is a polysemous lexical item (Gharahei et al., 2013). Similarly, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) contend that semantic divergence occurs when a source language item has more than one translation equivalents with polysemous senses. According to Gouws (2002), since cases of semantic divergence are language specific, and since the chances are minimal that a single target language item will have the same semantic load as the source language item, a translation equivalent needs to be introduced for each sense of the source language word.

According to Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:158), "semantic divergence can be regarded as the most typical occurrence of partial equivalence". A semicolon is used as a structural marker to separate translation equivalents with polysemous senses, yet different dictionaries use different methods to mark the occurrence of semantic divergence such as the numbering of each sub-comment on semantics.

The following example is extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(32). **sega** – laugh; cut (2007:142)

From the above example, the lemma **sega** has two translation equivalents representing the different senses of the source language item. Gouws (2002:199) believes that "no lexicographer may assume that the user of the dictionary will intuitively know which translation equivalent to choose for a given situation". This suggests that lexicographers should provide an explanation of how the equivalents can be used and in which context. The problem with the above presentation is that the lexicographer did not provide contextual guidance on how the translation equivalents given can be used, therefore the user could choose any equivalent without thinking twice.

Below is another example extracted from the same dictionary;

(33). **baagi** – builders, citizens (2007:5)

Looking at the above example, the translation equivalents provided are both polysemous senses, yet the lexicographer used a comma as a structural marker instead of a semicolon. Seeing the comma separating the translation equivalents, the dictionary user will choose any translation equivalent and use it in any context.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(34). **baagi** – builders; citizens

The use of a semicolon above tells the dictionary user that the translation equivalents builders and citizens are polysemous senses. Therefore, the lexicographer should provide contextual guidance on how to use both translation equivalents or even define them.

Let us look at another example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(35). **fola** – recover from a disease, become cool(2007:33)

Looking at the above example, this is a wrong presentation because 'recover from a disease' and 'become cool' are polysemous senses and cannot replace each other. The lexicographer useda comma to separate the translation equivalents instead of asemicolon.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(36). **fola** – recover from a disease; become cool

If the correct usage of a semicolon was understood and well implemented by lexicographers, the dictionary user would not be constantly lost or even experience any communication embarrassment.

Below follows another example derived from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007):

(37). **fihla** – hide, bury (2007:33)

The above example shows an incorrect presentation because 'hide' and 'bury' cannot be used to substitute each other since they are polysemous senses and the lexicographers used a comma to separate them.

According to Letsoalo (2012) a semicolon as a structural marker is one of the most confusing marker, therefore one has to be vigilant in using it. It would be best if the semicolon and its use were written in the users' guide in the front matter of a dictionary in order to assist the user.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(38). **fihla** –hide; bury

Regarding the above presentation, the dictionary user can be able to tell that the provided translation equivalents are polysemous senses. The lexicographer can even present it in the following manner

(39). **fihla** – hide (in a secret place); bury (if dead)

The example in (39) gives the dictionary user an idea on how to use the provided translation equivalents.

Below is a critical look at another example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(40). **apoga** – become undressed, (open) clear (2007:4)

On the above presentation, the lexicographer used a comma to separate the translation equivalents whereas 'become undressed' and 'clear' are not synonyms. The correct structural marker that was supposed to be used is a semicolon.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(41). **apoga** – become undressed; (open) clear.

The above presentation is able to assist the user to select the correct translation equivalents. This is because a semicolon tells the user that the translation equivalents provided are polysemous senses.

Let us look at another example extracted from the Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2009):

(42). **dihlare** – trees, medicine (2009:19)

The above example is separated by a comma while it is not a synonymous sense but a polysemous sense. As a result, the user would choose the wrong equivalent assuming that they are synonyms because the lexicographer used the wrong structural marker to separate the translation equivalents.

The correct presentation is shown below:

(43). **dihlare** – trees; medicine

With the above presentation, the user can be able to tell that the translation equivalents provided are not synonyms but polysemous senses. Yet, the use of structural markers alone will not be of total assistance to the user, so the best way to assist the user is for the lexicographer to also include some contextual guidance.

At times, lexicographers are able to use the correct structural marker at the correct place as indicated in the following example derived from the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo (2007):

(44). **fega** – hang up; suspend (2007:49)

The above example displays the correct presentation of semantic divergence. The lexicographer did a good job of using the correct structural marker to separate the translation equivalents in the translation equivalent paradigm. The user will choose the wrong translation equivalent on his or her own account without putting the blame on the lexicographer.

**The presentation of polydivergence in bilingual dictionaries.**

According to Gouws (2002), it happens very often that both lexical and semantic divergence prevail in the translation equivalents offered for a source language item. This means that the co-occurrence of synonymous and polysemous senses result in a case of polydivergence. Again, Gouws (1999:23) indicates that "polydivergence is the result of heterogeneous divergence, i.e. where both lexical and semantic divergence prevail in the same article". The occurrence of polydivergence as an equivalent relation calls for a well-developed and consistently used system of contextual and cotextual guidance, (Gharahei et al., 2013). The researcher agrees with the authors because lack of contextual and cotextual guidance will confuse the dictionary user even more.

In the case of polydivergence, the translation equivalent paradigm consists of synonyms separated a comma and polysemous senses separated by a semicolon. This means that both commas and semicolons will be found in one article to separate the translation equivalents.

The following presentation is extracted from the Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo (2007):

(45). **hide** – khuta; uta; utama; fihla (2007:376)

The above example is an example of polydivergence, the problem is that the lexicographer uses a semicolon as a structural marker to separate all translation equivalents, whether synonyms or

polysemous senses. In the translation equivalent paradigm, the translation equivalents *khuta* and *utama* can substitute each other in all contexts. U*ta* and *fihla* can replace each other in all contexts but *khuta/utama* cannot substitute *uta/fihla* in any context. Therefore, the correct presentation is as follows:

(46). **hide** – khuta; utama; uta,fihla

The comma that separate *khuta* and *utama* tells us that the two translation equivalents can substitute each other in all contexts, the same as the comma that separates *uta* and *fihla*, the semicolon in between indicates that the first two translation equivalents cannot replace the last two translation equivalents.

In this regard, contextual guidance is important to assist the user in choosing the accurate translation equivalents. Mphahlele (2001) is of the view that a mere listing of translation equivalents without translation equivalents is problematic, as it does not help the user to achieve communicative success. The researcher agrees with Mphahlele because a mere listing of translation equivalents cannot be of any assistance to the dictionary user to obtain communicative success or fluency.

Next is another example derived from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(47). **kganya** – detest, abhor, cry; be bright, shine, proud (2007:93)

According to Pharos Popular Dictionary, the above presentation is an example of polydivergence/ heterogeneous divergence. The researcher does not dispute that, but the problem is that the lexicographer used the structural markers to separate the translation equivalents in the wrong manner because the user will think that the translation equivalents separated by a comma are synonymous senses whereas they are not. The lexicographer just presented a mere listing of translation equivalents and this would not be of any help to the dictionary user.

Mphahlele (2001) claims that translation dictionaries that consist of a mere listing of translation equivalents are currently abandoned by their users who have to seek assistance elsewhere. Furthermore, the functions of these dictionaries should be restored and this could be done by compiling translation dictionaries that include entries giving contextual guidance in the semantic comment. Therefore, the envisaged corrections of example (47) are as follows:

(48). **kganya** – detest, abhor (hate e.g. bad behavior); be bright, shine (e.g. light); cry (e.g. spoilt brat); proud (pride)

The presentation by the researcher is likely to assist the dictionary user in choosing the correct translation equivalent since the user will have a clue on how to use the translation equivalents. A mere listing of translation equivalents will not serve any purpose because the translation equivalents provided cannot replace each other in some or all context.

The following is another example extracted from the same dictionary:

(49). **dula** – sit down, live, stay, dwell (2007:29)

In the article presented above, the lexicographer used a comma to separate all the translation equivalents whereas only 'live' and 'stay' can replace each other in all contexts. 'Dwell' can only replace 'live' and 'stay' in some contexts, so it is a partial synonym. Then, 'sit down' cannot substitute any of the other translation equivalent in any context. The correct presentation is as follows:

(50.) **dula** – sit down; live, stay, dwell

Since a presentation of the translation equivalent paradigm with only a mere listing of translation is not much helpful, a presentation with contextual guidance is as follows:

(51). **dula** – sit down (on a chair); live (reside), stay (reside), dwell (reside)

The above presentation shows a comprehensive way of dealing with a relation of polydivergence and it is user-friendly because it gives contextual guidance in the semantic comment. Gouws (1999:49) asserts, "The translation equivalents that are given should be supported by contextual guidance, enabling the dictionary user to utilise the dictionary in an encoding manner". The researcher agrees with this because lack of contextual guidance does not assist the user because he or she will not know which translation equivalent to choose for a specific context.

The following example is also derived from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007):

(52). **baeng** – guests, strangers, visitors (2007:6)

The above article presents an example of polydivergence, the problem is that the lexicographer only used a comma to separate all the translation equivalents whereas they are not all synonymous senses. We cannot assume that the dictionary users know which ones can replace each other and which ones cannot. Therefore, it is lexicographer's responsibility to avoid using the structural markers haphazardly and since the translation equivalents are not in the first language of the user, it is advisable that the lexicographer include more information regarding the translation equivalents.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(53). **baeng** – guests, visitors; strangers

The comma separating 'guests' and 'visitors' implies that the two translation equivalents are synonyms and can substitute each other in all contexts and the semicolon indicates that the translation equivalent cannot substitute any of the aforementioned translation equivalents. If lexicographers could place the structural markers in their correct places, dictionaries would be very useful tools to turn to when one needs help regarding a certain word.

Mphahlele (2001) suggests that where heterogeneous/polydivergence prevail, lexicographers should ask themselves whether their presentation of articles displaying this type of divergence could assist a dictionary user to obtain communicative success. This is because in most cases, lexicographers do not use the correct structural markers to separate translation equivalents or even provide contextual guidance. Moreover, Mphahlele (2001) argues that the current translation dictionaries expect and demand more from the target users and these expectations and unnecessary demands end up confusing and frustrating the users.

It seems like lexicographers may be reluctant to research more about their target users, this is because some of the words that should be included as translation equivalents are not included and as the result, this type of divergence cannot prevail.

The following example is extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007):

(54). **mohlolo** – wonder, miracle (2007:100)

From the above presentation, the researcher does not dispute that the translation equivalents provided by the lexicographer are correct and that the correct structural markers were used, but the lexicographer should have provided all possible translation equivalents for the lemma **mohlolo** in order for polydivergence to prevail. For instance, let us look at the researcher's suggestion below:

(55). **mohlolo** – wonder, miracle; widower

Since there is a translation equivalent 'widower' in the translation equivalent paradigm, polydivergence/heterogeneous divergence prevails. This implies that the article consists of both lexical and semantic divergence. Looking at the suggestion made by the researcher, it can be concluded that lexicographers do not make time to gather all the necessary information to present in their dictionary projects.

Though lexicographers sometimes present the wrong information, there are times where they make the correct presentation and we have to acknowledge that. Let us look at the following presentation extracted from the Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(56). **thaba** – mountain; be glad, rejoice, be cheerful (2007:157)

The article above is correctly presented by the lexicographer, this is because the correct structural marker has been placed at the correct place to separate the translation equivalents. The dictionary user can be able to choose the correct translation equivalent and use it in the correct context. This is a job well done by the lexicographer.

**The presentation of homogeneous in bilingual dictionaries.**

Mothiba (2012) states that this type of divergence is proposed by Mphahlele (2002). Homogeneous divergence is also known as mono-equivalence. This occurs when the translation equivalents paradigm of a lemma consists of either lexical or semantic divergence and not the mixture of the two. This means that the translation equivalents paradigm will only consist of synonyms or polysemous senses.

Below follows an example extracted from Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo:

(57). **fear** – letšhogo; poifo; bofšiega (2007:351)

The above article is an example of mono-equivalence, meaning that the translation equivalent paradigm consists of only synonyms. The problem with this article is that the lexicographer used a semicolon to separate the translation equivalents provided instead of a comma. The correct presentation is as follows:

(58). **fear** – letšhogo, poifo, bofšiega

The above article displays the correct presentation that was supposed to be done by the lexicographer. It can be seen that the translation equivalents are synonyms since a comma is used to separate them. Even the dictionary user can be able to choose an equivalent without any difficulties or confusion.


Next is another example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary:

(59). **koma** – initiation/circumcision school, secret, truth, song of triumph (2007:64)

Looking at the above article, the translation equivalents provided could be correct but they really cannot replace each other in any context, and another problem is that the lexicographer used the incorrect structural marker to separate the translation equivalents. The lexicographer was supposed to use a semicolon to separate the translation equivalents provided since they are polysemous senses. This is because the translation equivalent 'secret' cannot replace any of the translation equivalent provided in the translation equivalent paradigm in any context, so is those other translation equivalents provided. Hosana (2009) suggests that lexicographers should include contextual guidance in order to help dictionary users to select the most appropriate translation equivalent and this will help to achieve communicative success. The researcher is in support of Hosana's suggestion because the above presentation would not assist the dictionary user in anyway, especially if the users are not familiar with the target language, therefore, an inclusion of contextual guidance would aid the user in choosing the correct translation equivalent and use it in the correct context.

Below follows the correct presentation:

(60). **koma** – initiation/circumcision school (cultural practice); secret (something not to be revealed); truth (not lying); song of triumph (because of great success)

Looking at example (60), the use of a semicolon to separate the translation equivalents indicates that they are polysemous senses and cannot substitute each other in any context. Again, the inclusion of contextual guidance helps the user choose the most relevant translation equivalent for the correct context. Therefore, the lexicographer should make it a point that the structural marker used is presented in the correct manner so that a dictionary user knows whether he or she is facing a synonymous or polysemous sense as well as including contextual guidance to make the dictionary more user-friendly.

Another example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(61). **tema** – paragraph, plot, passage (2007:156)

Looking at the above article and other articles used in the previous examples, it is clear that the lexicographer of the Pharos Popular Dictionary uses a comma in most cases to separate the translation equivalents regardless of whether they are synonyms or polysemous senses. Therefore, the problem with the above presentation is that the lexicographer used a comma to separate the translation equivalents in the translation equivalent paradigm instead of a semicolon since the translation equivalents provided are polysemous senses. This could lead the user in

choosing any translation equivalent, even the wrong one, and that could result in communicative embarrassment.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(62). **tema** – paragraph; plot; passage

The semicolon used to separate the translation equivalents provided in the translation equivalent paradigm indicates that the translation equivalents provided are polysemous senses and cannot replace each other in any context. This means that a dictionary user can choose the correct translation equivalent and use it in the correct context.

If bilingual dictionaries were supplied with the correct presentation of translation equivalents and correct use of structural markers, it would be much easier for dictionary users to use the target language successfully. Bilingual dictionaries should be of assistance to the dictionary users to meet their needs but unfortunately, they do not meet the needs of well-defined target users because of the stereotyped approach that is found in them.

Following is another example derived from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007)

(63). **gaša** – broadcast, scatter, sprinkle (2007:36)

The above article consists of only polysemous senses, and a semicolon was supposed to be used by the lexicographer to separate the translation equivalents instead of a comma. This is because a comma is used to separate synonyms and not polysemous senses. The lexicographer should not assume that the dictionary user would be able to know that the provided translation equivalents are polysemous senses whereas he or she (the lexicographer) used the wrong structural marker to separate the provided translation equivalents.

The correct presentation is as follows:

(64). **gaša** – broadcast; scatter; sprinkle

The presentation in example (64) can assist a dictionary user to choose the correct equivalent since the correct structural marker has been used. The lexicographer can even include contextual guidance to assist the user to select an accurate translation equivalent. This is to support Zugsta (1971:294) on the view that the listing of translation equivalents does not assist the target user in his or her choice of the equivalents because coordination of the lemma and translation equivalents cannot always convey the necessary semantic, pragmatic and communicative values. Therefore, the presentation with contextual guidance would be as follows:

(65). **gaša** – broadcast (news); scatter (seed); sprinkle (water)

The above presentation gives the user an idea on how to use the translation equivalents provided in the translation equivalent paradigm. Therefore, the lexicographer should try to fulfil the needs of the users by providing them with information that will help them in their times of need.

It is important to mention that in order for a dictionary user to achieve communicative success, the lexicographer must enter the translation equivalent that is frequently used as the first equivalent and to also provide contextual guidance. Dictionary users often know a translation equivalent that is frequently used, and this will persuade them to comprehend the remaining translation equivalents that are found in the translation equivalent paradigm.

Al-Kasimi (1977) suggests that the research for equivalents should be preceded by a contrastive analysis of the source and target language in order to determine the ranks in grammatical hierarchy, to determine corresponding grammatical categories and to determine reciprocal parts of speech. If this research is conducted, the lexicographer would have the best and accurate presentation of translation equivalents and their usage information.

However, some lexicographers do not research about their target users, they just provide them with translation equivalents which they (lexicographers) could think of. Northern Sotho is an official language that is comprised of various dialects, therefore, it would not hurt if the lexicographer could provide translation equivalents in all those dialects.

Let us critically analyse the following example extracted from the Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007).

(66). **fool** – setlaela, lešilo (2007:233)

Looking at the above article, the lemma consists of only lexical divergence and the correct structural marker has been used. The problem is that, the lexicographer did not provide even half of all the translation equivalents that are found to refer to the lemma **fool** in almost all dialects. The researcher believes that the lexicographer should include the translation in all those dialects and inform the dictionary user on how they (dialects) will work in the users' guide. This is supported by Mafela (2014:4) who asserts that:

> "Like any other language in the world, indigenous South African languages comprise dialects. Dialects in some indigenous language may cause confusion on the part of dictionary users if not explained in the users' style guide. The various dialects in a language should be explained, and their distribution commented on in the users' style

guide. This will help the learner to differentiate between the standard language and the dialects before looking for the information. This will further help the learner to know about the origin of the dialect. Further, a learner will be in a position to know how to identify a particular dialect in the dictionary".

This means that the dictionary user will be able to use the correct translation equivalent in the right context when interacting with a particular speech community. Therefore, the inclusion of dialects in bilingual dictionaries will make the dictionary more user-friendly. There are different words to refer to the lemma **fool** by different speech communities, such words are *sethotho*, *setlala*, *seota*, *lešilelapuleng, ledhekere*, etc. Therefore, the lexicographer should include those in the translation equivalent paradigm. If this was the case, the presentation as suggested by would be as follows:

(67). **fool** – setlaela, lešilo, setlatla, seota, ledhekere, lešilelapuleng

With this kind of presentation, a dictionary user will have a vast choice of translation equivalent that work best when interacting with a specific speech community. For instance, a person visiting the Balobedu will choose the translation equivalent *ledhekere* if the dictionary includes the origin of all the dialects under the Northern Sotho language. The translation equivalents provided can substitute each other in all context. Therefore, the dictionary user can rely on the dictionary in order to achieve communicative success. If that is done, the dictionary will be considered user-friendly.

With many mistakes found in our bilingual dictionaries, there are some articles that are well presented by the lexicographers. For instance, let us look at the following presentation derived from Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo (2007):

(68). **bothata** – problem; difficulty; trouble

The translation equivalents provided are correct and the correct structural marker is in its correct place. This article displays a lemma which consists of only semantic divergence and this tells us that the translation equivalents given are polysemous senses. This is because the translation equivalents given cannot substitute each other in any context. This is a job well done by the lexicographer because the presentation would not pose any problems to the dictionary user.

Another example as extracted from the same dictionary.

(69). **grateful** – lebogela; thabela; lebogile

This article presents a lemma consisting of only semantic divergence. The lexicographer presented this type of divergence in the correct manner. The correct structural marker, which is a semicolon, is used to separate the translation equivalents indicating polysemous senses. This implies that if the user consults the above article, he or she will be able to see that the translation equivalents provided cannot replace each other in any context.

Lexicographers have an obligation towards users in ensuring a presentation and treatment of translation equivalents that will enable an unambiguous retrieval of information from the data on offer in the comment on semantics of bilingual dictionaries, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005). The correct presentation and treatment of translation equivalents needs a clear understanding of the various types of equivalent relations. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:154) further add that the lexicographer's attempt to co-ordinate source language items with target language items that can be used to replace the source language form in a translation, leads to the recognition of three major types of equivalent relations such as full equivalence, partial equivalence and zero equivalence. Therefore, the lexicographer should be well aware of the different types of equivalent relations occurring within the dictionary.

Since divergence is one of the equivalent relations that are used to build-up a user-friendly dictionary, the other equivalent relations are congruence and zero equivalence.

**Congruence**

Gouws (2002:196) asserts that an equivalent relation of congruence is characterised by a one-to-one relation on lexical, pragmatic and semantic level. On the other hand, Gouws and Prinsloo (2005:154) state that full equivalence prevails where a source language item, represented by the lemma sign is co-ordinated with a single target language item, represented by a translation equivalent, and this one relation exists on both lexical and semantic levels. In this case, both the source language and target language forms comprise of exactly the exact meaning. Congruence is also known as full equivalence. This type of equivalence does not pose serious problems to the user or lexicographer because the user does not have to choose between translation equivalents. The following example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2009) illustrates this:

(70). **hwa** – die, pass away (2009:44)

With reference to the above example, the translation equivalent 'die' can replace 'pass away' in any or all contexts. Since the source and target language have exactly the same meaning, the

lexicographer does not have to include many entries to help the user in choosing the right target language item for the provided source language item. According to Gharahei et al. (2013), the existence of full equivalence is limited to very rare cases. This is supported by Podolej (2009:31) who states that:

> "…instances in which bilingual dictionaries offer equivalents that fully match SL lexical units (with respect to denotational and connotative meaning, registers, etc.) are infrequent, the simple reason being that such full equivalence between units of two different language system is rare. And yet the majority of cases bilingual dictionaries do provide some form of TL rendering on the right-hand side of the headword."

This means that the equivalent relation of congruence is a rare type of equivalence to be found in bilingual dictionaries.

**Zero equivalence**

Zero equivalence prevails where the target language item has no item to be co-ordinated as a translation equivalent with a lemma representing a source language item, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:158). In the same way, Mphahlele (2001:53) asserts that zero equivalence is a case where a lemma or the source language form does not have an appropriate and immediate translation equivalent in the target language. This means that zero equivalence is when the target language does not have a direct translation equivalent for a lemma. In this case, it can be said that a particular lemma cannot be translated into the target language.

In most cases, the problem of zero equivalence is caused by the fact that languages are different and even people and cultures differ. For instance, the source language may have a lexical item which is only used in that language and an object, or concept which is referred to in the source language is not found in the community of the target language users. According to Mphahlele (2001), in this case it can be said that the object that is not known in the target language is culture-bound. Gouws and Prinsloo (2005) state that when one language acquires a word for a provided concept it does not mean that the next language will also acquire a word for that concept.

"There are some of the most challenging problems that confront lexicographers during the process of compiling bilingual dictionaries", (Mothiba, 2012:56). These problems arise when lexicographers have to provide translation equivalents for culture-bound words and technological terms. Therefore, lexicographers opt to use borrowed words as translation equivalents for scientific or technological terms.

The following example extracted from Oxford Northern Sotho/English Pukuntšu ya Sekolo (2007):

(71). **computer** – khomphutha (2007:305)

The above example cannot help a dictionary user to understand the meaning of the source language. Translating the technological headword **computer** as *khomphutha* does not make any difference but rather this is the duplication of the represented information. This is transliteration and it cannot help the user to understand the meaning of the source language word and in this case, the lexicographer should have at least included a brief definition if such word is known by the speakers of the target language. The lexicographer should make it a point that if the word unknown, he or she should give a comprehensive definition for the given lemma. This will assist the user to retrieve the required information.

According to Mothiba (2012), in a country like South Africa, there are many cultures that are all vital due to them being official and there are many things that stand out in those cultures. Yet, lexicographers at times only provide translation equivalents which do not help the user to understand what they refer to.

The following is an example presenting a culture-bound term extracted in Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007)

(72). **setsiba** – crupper, drawer worn by men, patch (2007:150)

Looking at the above article, the translation equivalents provided by the lexicographer does not assist the dictionary user in any way but further adds to the confusion of the user.

Mphahlele (2001) writes that in the case of zero equivalence, the fact that the lexicographer does not have an immediate translation equivalent does not necessarily mean that he or she has to borrow the source language item since borrowing does not always serve any semantic purpose to the dictionary user. Further, what can serve an important purpose is when the lexicographer opts for surrogate equivalence so that the user could understand the meaning of the source language form.

Surrogate equivalence is when the lexicographer includes a phrase or sentence in the target language as an equivalent for the lemma, (Mphahlele, 2001). Moreover, Kromann (in Gouws, 1989:174) in support of Mphahlele (2001) opines that surrogate equivalence is present when there is neither an absolute nor partial synonym in the target language for a specific lemma of the source language. This means that the lexicographer has to create a replacement for the translation equivalent.

According to Mongwe (2006:54), zero equivalence is also known as surrogate equivalence. The researcher disputes this because zero equivalence is a problem of non-equivalence whereas surrogate equivalence is a solution to that problem. Mongwe (2006) adds that surrogate equivalence is the response of the lexicographer to a relation of zero equivalence holding between the source language and the target language. Therefore, Mongwe (2006) assertion that zero equivalence is also known as surrogate equivalence is incorrect since these two are different things.

The nature of the lexical gap which leads to the inclusion of a surrogate equivalent, determines the extent of the description offered as a surrogate equivalent, (Gouws, 1999:27). In other words, the explanation of the lemma is dependent on the nature of the lexical gap that prevails in the target language. Gouws (1999) states that the distinction between linguistic and referential gap plays a vital role in this regard.

Referential gap is identified where the speakers of both languages are familiar with a certain concept but where the one language does not have a word to refer to it, whereas the other language does have such word for it, (Gouws & Prinsloo, 2005:159). For instance, given the lemma computer is known to the speakers of both language (English and Northern Sotho) there is a linguistic gap. Referential gap is established when the referent is known to the speakers of one language while the speakers of the other language are unfamiliar with it, (Gouws, 1999). For instance, *kgodu*. The referent *kgodu* is known to the speakers of Northern Sotho and if it is translated into English, a comprehensive definition will be required so that the native speaker of English will get all the necessary information regarding the lemma **kgodu**.

The following example extracted from Pharos Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary (2007)

(73). **kgodu** – pumpkin broth (2007:58)

Since the lemma **kgodu** is culture specific, the translation equivalent provided by the lexicographer does not aid the user (whose native language is English) in anyway. A comprehensive definition is needed in order for the user to have an idea of what the lemma **kgodu** refers to.

In this case, since only the first speakers of the source language are familiar with the word and its meaning, it poses as a challenge in bilingual dictionaries because the target language users do not know and understand them if they are just given without an explanation. Mothiba (2012) is of the view that lexicographers should include additional information in bilingual dictionaries when

dealing with culture-bound terms in order for foreign users to understand them. Furthermore, suggests that a lemma such as **kgodu** should be translated as follows:

(74). **kgodu** – pumpkin porridge (a porridge that is cooked using pumpkin, sugar and maize meal, 2012:57).

The researcher agrees with Mothiba (2012) suggestion because the dictionary user will have an idea of what the lexicographer refers to with the lemma **kgodu**. This is the most comprehensive meaning that can help the user of the bilingual dictionary to understand meaning of the source language form. In this regard, the lexicographers should always be able to identify whether an article features a linguistic or referential gap.

## 4.4. Overview of Research Findings

The research findings indicate that lexicographers compile dictionaries without taking into considerations the needs of the target users. This is because structural markers are used haphazardly, leading to divergence not being properly presented and lack of contextual or cotextual guidance of how the headwords provided can be used. In some instances, when lexicographers provide translation equivalents, they do not start with words that are frequently used. Therefore, dictionary users are faced with challenges when consulting dictionaries. In this case, lexicographers have to come up with a better way to compile dictionaries that would not confuse the users.

## 4.5. Conclusion

This chapter discussed the presentation and interpretation of findings such as data management and analysis, research results where a comprehensive description of structural markers, contextual guidance and other equivalent relations. Divergence was further explained and examples indicating how it is presented in bilingual dictionaries were provided in order to emphasise how the correct presentation could meet the needs of dictionary users. The following chapter outlines the summary, recommendations and conclusion of the study.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

## 5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, recommendations and conclusion of the study.

## 5.2. Summary of the findings

This research reveals that when compiling bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers do not conduct enough research to try to find out more about their target users, their needs and the challenges they come across when consulting bilingual dictionaries.

Lexicographers do not follow the lexicographic principles of using the correct structural marker at the correct place in the dictionaries.

Lexicographers of Pharos Popular Dictionary do not provide any contextual guidance for the translation equivalents they provide in the translation equivalent paradigm. This means that it is possible for the users to choose any equivalent and use it in any context.

Sometimes divergence is not well presented because the lexicographer only provides one or two translation equivalents instead of trying to provide the entire possible translation equivalents for a lemma.

Dictionary users are confronted by many problems which leave them confused and hinders them from achieving communicative success.

## 5.3. Recommendations

- Since there are so many mistakes in the current dictionaries, it is advisable that new dictionaries that will be user-friendly be compiled.

- Lexicographers should include all words used by different speech communities as translation equivalents of a lemma, either synonyms or polysemous senses in order to enable divergence to prevail in bilingual dictionaries.

- Structural markers should be consistently used in order to assist dictionary users to choose the appropriate structural markers and how they are going to be used should be discussed in the front matter of the dictionary.

- Lexicographers should include contextual guidance when providing translation equivalents in order to assist the dictionary user in using them (translation equivalents) in the correct context.

- With regard to zero equivalence, lexicographers should provide comprehensive description where the referent is not known by the target users.

- It is advisable that before compiling bilingual dictionaries, lexicographers should make thorough research about their target users, identify their needs, situations and try to compile a dictionary that will solve all the problems dictionary users come across when consulting bilingual dictionaries.

## 5.4. Conclusion

This study relied on textual analysis whereby data was collected in dictionaries. As the result, it became evident that dictionaries play a vital role in learning a new language and assisting language users to bridge the gap between languages or even solve language barriers. Therefore, their treatment should not be taken for granted. Lexicographers are obliged to compile dictionaries that will meet the needs of the users.

# REFERENCES

Atkins, S. and Rundell, M. 2008. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University

Al-Kasimi, A. 1977. *Linguistic and bilingual dictionaries*. Leiden: E.J. Brill

Babbie, E. 2007. *The basics of social research*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Barnbrook,G. 2002. *Defining Language: A Local Grammar of Definition Sentences*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Barnhart,C.L. 1962. Problems in Editing Commercial Monolingual Dictionaries. In Householder, F.W. & S. Saporta (Eds) 1962:161-181.

Baxter, J and Eyles, J. 1997. Evaluating Qualitative Research in Social Geography: Establishing "Rigor" in interview analysis. Transactions of the British Geographers, 22 505-525.

Beins, B. C. 2009. Research Methods: A Tool for Life: (2nd Ed.). Ithaca College: Pearson.

Bejoint, H. 2004. *Modern Lexicography: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bergenholtz, H. 1990. Lexikographisch Instruktionen für ein zweisprachiges Wörterbuch. In Zeitschrift für phonetic, Sprachwissenschaft and Kommunikationsforschung *43:19-37.*

Bergenholtz, H & Tarp, S. 1995. Manual of specialized lexicography. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Bergenholtz, H & Tarp, S. 2003. Two opposing theories. On Wiegand's recent discovery of lexicographic functions. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 31:171-196.

Bergenholtz, H & Tarp, S. 2010. Lexicography or terminography? The lexicographer's point of view. In Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. 2010. *Specialised Dictionaries for Learners*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Brink, H.V., Van der Walt, C. & Van Rensburg, G. 2012. Fundamentals of Research Methodology of Health Care Professionals, (2nd Ed.). Cape Town: Juta.

Burns, H. S. & Grove, S.K. 2000. Understanding Nursing Research. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Carpenter, C. & Suto, M. 2008. *Qualitative research for occupational and physical therapists: A practical guide*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Čechová, Z. 2015. *Microstructure of Learner's Dictionaries*. Bachelor Thesis: Masaryk University.

Chandrupatla, T.R. 1989. Quality and Reliability in Engineering. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cresswell, J.M. 2009. Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. California. Sage Publications.

Cresswell, J.M & Clark, V.L. 2007. Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. 1998. *The foundations of social research, meaning and perspective in the research process*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

De Scryver, G.M & Prinsloo, D.J. 2007. Oxford Pukuntšu ya Sekolo. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Sousa, M. 1995. Diccinario De Lexicrografia Práctica Barcelona: Biblograf.

Dudovskiy, J. 2016. *The Ultimate Guide to Writing a Dissertation in Business Studies*: A Step-by-Step Assistance. Lansdowne: Juta.

Durrheim, K. 1999. Research design. In Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences .Cape Town, SA: University of Cape Town Press. Pages 29-53.

Du Plooy, G. M. 2002. *Communication Research: techniques, methods and applications*. Lansdowne: Juta.

EbanEga, G.E. 2007. A Microstructural Programme for Dictionaries in Fang: Mphil Study Guide. Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch University.

Emejulu, J. dup. (Ed.). 2003. *Éléments de lexicographie gabonaise.* Tome 11: 7-35. New York: Jimics-Hillman

Frey, L. Botan, C. & Kreps, G. 1999. *Investigating Communication: An introduction to research methods*. (2nd Ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fuertes-Olivera, P.A. 2010. *Specialised Dictionaries for Learners*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Gharaei, Z., Moinazadeh, A & Barati, H. 2013. *Meaning Discrimination as a Function if Equivalent Relation and Part of Speech: The Case of Hezaareh English-Persian Dictionary*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 4 (3)511-519.

Gouws, R.H. 1989. *Leksikografie*. Cape Town: Academica.

Gouws, R.H. 1996. Bilingual Dictionaries and Communicative Equivalence for a Multilingual Society. *Lexikos, 6(2): 14-31*.

Gouws, R.H. 1999. *Equivalent Relation in Translation Dictionaries*. Cape Town: University of Stellenbosch.

Gouws, R.H. 2000. Strategies in equivalent discrimination. In Mogensen, J.E. et al. (Eds.) 2000. *Symposium on Lexicography IX*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: (Pp. 99-111).

Gouws, R.H. 2001. Strategies in Equivalent Discrimination. In: Zettersten, A. et al. (Eds) *symposium on lexicogeaphy IX*. Tübingen: Max Neimeyer: (Pp. 99-111).

Gouws, R.H. 2002. Equivalent Relations, Context and Cotext in Bilingual Dictionaries. *Hermes Journal of Linguistics,* 28:195-209

Gouws, R.H. 2003. Towards the Formulation of a Theoretically Motivated Model for the National Lexicography Units in South Africa. Hartmann, R.R. (Ed.) 2003. *Lexicography Critical Concepts*: London/New York: Routledge. 218-246.

Gouws, R.H. 2004. Outer Texts in Bilingual Dictionaries: *Lexikos 14:67-88*
Gouws, R.H. & Prinsloo, D.J. 1998. Cross-referencing as a lexicographic Device. *Lexikos 8:17-36.*

Gouws, R.H. & Prinsloo, D.J. 2005. *Practices and Principles of South African Lexicography*. Stellenbosch: Sun Press.

Haas, M.R. 1962. What belongs in the bilingual dictionary? In: Householder, F.W. & S. Saporta (eds.) 1962: 45-50.

Hart, C. 2018. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Research Imagination*. British Library. UK

Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed). 1984. LEXeter 83 proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9 – 12 September 1983:23-80. Lexicographica. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Hartmann, R.R.K. and James, G. 1989. *Dictionary of Lexicography*. Britain: T.J. International Ltd. Padstow Conwall.

Hartmann, R.R.K. 2002. Thematic Network Project in the Area of Languages. Subproject9: Dictionaries. Exeter.

Hayashi, Y. 2011. A Representation Framework for Cross-lingual/Interlingual Lexical Semantic

Correspondences. Japan: Osaka University.

Herbst, T & Stein, G. 1987. Dictionary-using skills: a plea for a new orientation in language teaching. In Cowie. A.P. (Ed.). *The Dictionary and the Language Learner*. Tubigen: Niemeyer. (Pp. 115-127).

Hosana, N.A. 2009. The Primacy of Semantic Comments in Xitsonga/English dictionary. Unpublished Masters' Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Holloway,I. 1997. Qualitative Research in Health Care. Open University Press.

Holloway, I. & Wheeler, I. S. 2002. Qualitative Research in Nursing. (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Hunt, A. 1996. Dictionaries and Vocabulary learning: The Roles. *Lexikos 6:27-29.*

Jackson, H. 2002. *Lexicography: An Introduction*. London. Routledge.

Klein, J. 2009. South Africa's New African Language Dictionaries and their Use for the African Speech Communities. *Lexikos 19:423-435.*

Kriel, T.J. 2007*. Pharos: Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary*. Cape Town: Pharos Publishers.

Kriel, T.J. 2009. *Pharos: Popular Northern Sotho Dictionary.* Pretoria: Pharos Dictionaries.

Kubayi, S.J. 2013. *Address forms A Socio-Pragmatic Perspective in Xitsonga.* Unpublished DLitt dissertation. University of South Africa.

Landau, S.I. 2001. *Dictionaries the Art and Craft of Lexicography*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen, P. 2002. Mediated fiction. In K.B Jensen (Eds). *A handbook of media and communication research: qualitative and quantitative methodologies.* London: Routledge: 117-137.

Letsoalo, A.M. 2012. *An Evaluation of Structural Markers in some Northern Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionaries: A Lexicographic Perspective*. Unpublished Masters' Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Lew, R. 2015. Dictionaries and Their Users. International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography. Adam University: Poznan.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E.G. 1985. Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lombard, F.J. 2002. Course in General and Computer Lexicography. Unpublished Training Course Notes. Stellenbosch.

Louw, J.P. 1991. *Semantisie Norme in die Leksikokrafie S.A*. Tydskrif vir Taalkunde 4:115-118

Madiba, M & Nkomo, D. 2010. The Tshivenda-English Thalusamaipfi/Dictionary as a product of South African Lexicographic processes. *Lexikos, 20:307-325.*

Mafela, M.J. 2004. Bilingual dictionary and meaning discrimination in Venda. *Euralex 2004 proceedings*: 501-509.

Malange, S.A. 2005. *Otensive Addressing as an Approach in Tshivenda. Translation Dictionary: An Analysis.* Masters' Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Marshall, C & Rossman, G. 1990. Compare to what? Analytical thinking and needs assessment. Newbury Park: Sage.

McKee, A. 2003. *Textual analysis: a beginner's guide.* London: Sage Publications.

Mdee, J.S. 1997. Language Learners' Use of a Bilingual Dictionary: A Comparative Study of Dictionary Use and Needs. University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 7: 94-106.

Meriam, S. 2009. Qualitative research: *A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meso, T.P. 2016. *Language Dynamism in English-Northern Sotho/Northern Sotho-English Bilingual Dictionaries:* A case of Translation Equivalence. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Mongwe, M.J. 2006. *The Role of South African National Lexicography Units in the Planning and Compilation of Multifunctional Bilingual Dictionaries*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Stellenbosch.

Mphahlele, M.C. 2001. *A Model to Achieve Communicative Equivalence in Translation Dictionaries*. Unpublished M.Phil Thesis. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch

Mphahlele, M.C. 2001. *The Use of Lexicographic Definitions in a Case where Zero-Equivalence Prevails*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

Mphahlele, M.C. 2002. *The Dictionary of Lexicographic Terms*. Unpublished Dictionary. Sovenga: University of the North.

Mpofu, N. 2001. *Problems of Equivalent in Shona-English Bilingual Dictionaries. Lexikos 11:242-251.*

Mohlala, M.B. 2010. *The Role of Microstructure, With Reference to Northern Sotho-English Dictionaries: A Comparative Lexicographic Analysis*. Unpublished Masters' Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Mothiba, T.I. 2012. *The Application of Reversibility Principle in Northern Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionaries: A Lexicographic Analysis*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Mtuze, P.T. 2011. A Critical Survey of Xhosa Lexicography 1772-1989. Lexikos 1:165-177.

Mugo, F. W. 2002. Sampling in Research: UK. Blackwell.

Niesel, S. 1999. Mediostructure in Bilingual LSP Dictionaries. In Lexicographica: *International Annual for Lexicography, 15: 90-113*.

Niesel, S. 2008. *The Effects of Lexicographical Information Costs on Dictionary Making and Use*. *Lexikos: 18: 170-189.*

Niesel, S. 2010. The Relevance of Lexicographic Functions. *Lexikos 2:132-135.*

Niladri, S.D. 2015. Linguistic Divergences in English to Bengali Translation. INFOCOMP International
*Journal of English Linguistics, 3(1): 31-40.*

Nkhumeleni, A. A. 2005. *The Front Matter Text as an Important Component of a Dictionary (Tshivenda Bilingual Dictionaries).* Unpublished Masters' Dissertation. University of Limpopo.

Palmer, F.R. 1971. Grammar: New York: Penguin Book Ltd.

Parahoo, K. 1997. Nursing Research: Principles, Processes, and Issues. London: McMillan

Pienaar, S. 2006. *A Critical Evaluation of WOORDEBOEK/WöRTERBUSCH with Regard to Source- and Target-Language Forms*. Unpublished MPhil dissertation. University of Stellenbosch.

Pitrowski, T. 1989. "Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries: Fundamental differences". In M.L Tickoo (Ed) *Learners' Dictionaries: State of the Art*. Anthology Series 23. SEAMED Regional Language Centre. Singapore.

Polit, D.F. & Beck, C.T. 2006. Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods Appraisal and Utilization: (6th Ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Polit, D.F., Beck, C.T. & Hungler, B.P. 2001. Essentials for Nursing Research Methods. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Podolej. M. 2009. Culture in bilingual dictionaries: Analysis of cultural content and culture-specific vocabulary in E-P-E dictionaries. Unpublished Dissertation: Uniwesytetium. Adama Mickiewicza.

Prinsloo, D. 2011. A bilingual dictionary for a specific user group: Supporting Setswana speakers

in the production and reception of English. Pretoria. University of Pretoria.

Prinsloo, D.J. & de Schryver G-M. 2000. The Concept of Simultaneous Feedback as Applied to the South African Context, with special reference to the Sepedi Dictionary Project (SeDiPro). 5th International Conference of the African Association for Lexicography, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa: 3-5.

Rajasekar, S., Philominathan, P. & Chinathambi, V. 2013. *Research Methodology*. Tamilnadu. Bharathidas University.

Sčerba, L.V. 1940. Towards A General Theory of Lexicography. *International Journal of Lexicography* 8(4):315-350.

Smit, M. 1996. *Wiegand's metalexicography as a framework for multilingual, multicultural, explanatory music dictionary for South Africa*. Unpublished DLitt dissertation. University of Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch.

Svensėn, B.O. 1993. *Practical Lexicography: Principles and Methods of Dictionary-Making.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Svensėn, B.O. 2009. A handbook of Lexicography. The theory and practice of dictionary making. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. OUP.

Tarp, S. 2000. Theoretical Challenges to Practical Specialised Lexicography. *Lexikos 10: 189-208.*

Tarp, S. 2002. Translation dictionaries and bilingual dictionaries. Two different concepts. *Journal of Translation Studies* 7: 59-84

Tarp, S. 2002b. Basic Elements of Lexicographic Theory. In Emejulu, J. dup. (Ed.). 2003. *Éléments de lexicographie gabonaise.* Tome 11: 7-35. New York: Jimics-Hillman

Tarp, S. 2008. *Lexicography in the Borderland between Knowledge and Non-knowledge. General Lexicographical Theory with Particular Focus on Learner's Lexicography.* Lexicographica. Series Maior 134. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Tarp, S. 2009. "Homonym and Polysemy in a lexicographical perspective". In Bergenholtz. H and Thomas, H. (Eds.). 2009. Classifications in Linguistics and Lexicography. Special Issue of Zeitschrift für Angilistik Und Amerikanistik 57(3): 289-306.

Tobin, G A., & Begley, C.M. 2004. Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 48(4), 388-396. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2684.2004.03207.x.(11.03.2018).

Tomaszcyk, J. 1963. "Lexico-Semantic featyre of official Polish-English". Paper presented at the international conference on Polish-English contrastive projects. Brazejewka, Poland, December 1983.

Tomaszcyk, J. 1983. HE Case for Bilingual Dictionaries for Foreign Language Learners. In R.R.K. Hartmann (Ed). 1983:41-51. *Lexicography: Principles and Practice*. London: Academic Press.

Tomba Mossovou, F.T. 2007. Metalexicographic Criteria for a Monolingual Descriptive Dictionary Presenting the Standard Variety of Yipunu. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Stellenbosch. Stellenbosch.

Webster, M. 1985. Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary. Meriam – Webster Inc.

Wiegand, H.E. 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. In Hartmann R. R. K. (Ed.) 1984. *LEXeter: 83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9-12 September 1983: 13-80*. Lexicographica. Series Major 1. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Wiegand, H.E. 1984. On the structure and contents of a general theory of lexicography. In Hartmann,RRK (Ed.) 1984, 13-30.

Wiegand, H.E. 1998. *Wörterbuchforschung*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Wiegand, H.E. 2002. "Equivalence in Bilingual Lexicography Criticisms and Suggestions." *Lexikos 12: 237-255.*

Yin, R.K. 1994. Evaluation: A Singular Craft. In C.S. Reichardt & S.F. Rallis (Eds). The Qualitative-quantitative debate: New Perspectives. San Francisco: Jessey-Bass. (Pp.71-84).

Yong, H. & Peng, J. 2007. Bilingual Lexicography from a Communicative Perspective. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zugsta, L. 1971. Manual of lexicography. Prague. Academia

**To**      Research Development and Administration Director, Dr T. Mabila

**Via**      Executive Dean, Professor RS. Maoto

**From**     Research Professor

**Date**    16 March 2020

**Subject:**   Faculty endorsement of a mini-dissertation proposal approved by School for M.A. coursework qualification - Makwala M.R.(student number 201206173)

Dear Dr Mabila

This is to confirm that the proposal of the specified student should serve at TREC. It was approved by the School of Languages and Communication Studies, authorised to do so by and on behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). The name of the student is Makwala M.R. (student number 201206173).

I thank you in advance for your support.

----\ ----------------------------
**P rof.' R.S. Maoto**

**Executive Dean**

University of Limpopo
Faculty of Humanities
Office of the Director
School of Languages and Communication Studies
Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727, South Africa
Tel: (015) 268 2684, Fax: (015) 268 2868, Email: Johannes.rammala@ul.ac.za

13 March 2020

NAME OF STUDENT: Makwala MR
STUDENT NUMBER: 201206173
DEPARTMENT: Linguistics, Translation and Interpreting
SCHOOL: Languages and Communications Studies
QUALIFICATION - MA Coursework

Dear Student

SCHOOL APPROVAL OF PROPOSAL  (Mini Dissertation)
I have pleasure in informing you that your MA proposal served at the School Senior Degrees meeting held 13 November  2019 and your title was approved as  follows:

TITLE: An analysis of divergence in selected Northern Sotho English Bilingual dictionaries
Note the following:

| Ethical Clearance | Tick One |
|---|---|
| In principle the study requires no ethical clearance, but will need a TREC permission letter before proceeding  with the study | -./ |
| Requires ethical clearance (Human) (TREC)  (apply online) Proceed with the study only after receipt of ethical clearance  certificate | |
| Requires ethical clearance  (Animal) (AREC) Proceed with the study only after receipt of ethical clearance  certificate | |

Yours faithfully


**Director:    c      'o'rtarigutges and Communication  Studies**
Supervisor: Ms MJ Mothiba
Co-supervisor :

## University of Limpopo
### Department of Research Administration and Development
**Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727, South Africa**
**Tel: (015) 268 3935, Fax: (015) 268 2306, Email: Anastasia.Ngobe@ul.ac.za**

---

### TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

### PERMISSION LETTER

---

**Date:**          **24 April 2020**


**PROJECT NO:**          **TREC/07/2020 [NEI]**

**Title:**          An Analysis of Divergence in Selected Northern  Sotho/English Bilingual Dictionaries

**Researcher:**          MR Makwela

This serves to confirm that the abovementioned study involves  secondary use of data and has no ethical implication. After review of the study protocol, the Turfloop Research Ethics Committee (TREC) hereby grants the researcher permission to proceed with their research.


**PROF P MASOKO**
**CHAIRPERSON: TURFLOOP RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE**

**University of Limpopo**
**Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727,**
**South Africa Tel: 015 268 2502**
**Email:valery.mashiane@ul.ac.za**

18 July 2020

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**


 **RE: RESEARCH REPORT EDITING**


This serves as proof and confirmation that the research report entitled: **"An analysis of divergence in selected Northern Sotho/English bilingual dictionaries"** by **Matlala Rivonia Makwala,** student number **201206173** has been edited by me and that unless further changes have been effected after me, I am content that all grammatical and technical errors of this report have been eliminated.


Yours Faithfully

………………………

Mrs M. V. Mashiane
(Editor)