

# Review of: "Beyond the Translation of Initial Meaning: The Localization of Yoruba-bound ICT Terminologies"

Enoch Sebuyungo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Makerere University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript *"Beyond Translation of Initial Meaning: The Localization of Yoruba-Bound ICT Terminologies"* is a pertinent argument for the inclusion of lesser-documented languages in the ICT domain, which is normally the preserve of dominant European languages like English and French. The manuscript provides a broad overview of GILT and particularly emphasizes the importance of localization as a strategy to translate digital global information into lesser-documented African languages.

The abstract is comprehensive, citing the role of localization in modern technology translation, the four study objectives, the theoretical framework, and study findings. However, the study scope is not mentioned. It would be helpful to specify the corpus upon which the study was based, as well as the profile of the targeted Yoruba end users.

The introduction and background to the study are commendable, clearly highlighting the importance of ICT and the need to translate ICT terminologies, especially through the internet, in order to make products accessible to African language communities like the Yoruba in Nigeria, some of whom may not be literate in English. The theoretical framework and the concept of meaning in translation interrogate the notions of meaning and equivalence in translation in a coherent manner. Finally, a case is made for translation and new technology.

The next section focuses on *"Localization of terminologies of new technology in Yoruba language: beyond the translation of initial meaning"*. This is the engine of the manuscript as it presents selected ICT terminologies and their Yoruba translations. This is the richest part of the article because it presents original work showcasing the unique features of the Yoruba language and the cultural adaptation of Yoruba speakers regarding computer technology. Nonetheless, I would have expected this section to come after a methodology section that presents the research design, data collection, and analysis. For instance, how were the ICT terminologies identified? What was the criteria for their selection? Who were the study participants? How were the translations verified? Were the translations approved by translators and Yoruba end users in order to achieve the third objective of examining how the terminologies are understood in Yoruba? How were translation difficulties highlighted (fourth objective)? Did this involve a respondent group of translators or Yoruba speakers who identified these challenges? Did they agree on the Yoruba terms that are proposed in the manuscript? In other words, was there some form of collaborative translation in coming up with these terminologies? The abstract mentions among the study findings that: *"localizing ICT terminologies will enhance the appreciation of ICT materials by Yoruba end users"*. However, nowhere in the description are these end users described or involved in the study.

The article could also be enriched by building on previous similar studies in Africa, thereby contributing to the knowledge gap in the literature.

Another area of improvement is the inclusion of glosses to provide clarity on the meaning and structure of the Yoruba words or phrases for the benefit of non-Yoruba readers.

Finally, a number of works are cited in the text but do not feature in the list of references. These include:

Tony Hartley (2009)

Roman Jakobson (1959/2012)

Nida and Taber (1969)

Nida (1964)

Milengo (2003)

Similarly, a number of works in the reference list do not feature at all in the text:

Angelelli (2014)

Baker (2011)

Cronin (2003)

Desmet (2007)

Diki-Kidiri (2007)

Esselink (2000)

Olohan (2004)

Thelen (2012)

Overall, this manuscript has promising potential but can be improved taking into account the issues pointed out above. It is clear but needs to follow the required IMRAD structure so that the sections are logically organized and appropriately arranged.

The article's contribution to the field is original, presenting new insights, but it needs to build upon existing research in a meaningful way.

The topic is relevant and significant within the context of the field of localization. Although the article looks at translation of basic ICT terminologies, it could recommend the translation of web-based content and its related challenges and insights for Yoruba. It could also address the use of translation technologies and the issue of translating multimodal content such

as graphics, images, and videos, which are all key aspects of localisation and translation.

The methodology and analysis are lacking. The research methods need to be specified. The data collection and analysis methods need to be well described and adequately justified.

The validity and reliability of the findings can only be supported by evidence of end user involvement and approval. The conclusions need to be supported by empirical evidence from the data collected.

The article needs to engage with relevant literature and previous research. For example,

Schäler, Reinhard. 2007. "Translators and Localization." In *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 1: 119–135.

IDRC. 2008. African Network for Localization (Anloc). [http://www.idrc.ca/acacia/ev-122243-201-1-DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://www.idrc.ca/acacia/ev-122243-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html) [Accessed 27 April 2010].