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Abstract

This thesis aimed at studying the perception of subtitles in terms of evoking positive or negative emotions and opinions. It looked at the relation between the participant’s fluency level of the source language and the subtitles (which was in their mother tongue; Swedish). This was done by comparing the participants’ overall ranking of the subtitles after first watching clips in either a language they were fluent in (English) or clips in a language they were not at all fluent in (Finnish and French). The clips in English were followed by a questionnaire which asked qualitative questions about whether they found the subtitles in each clip to be good or bad and if so, what they thought was good or bad. The study was a within-subjects design, meaning all the participants watched the clips both in the comprehensible version and the non-comprehensible version, although in a randomized order. The results showed that the subtitles were preferred in 4 out of 5 clips when the source language was non-comprehensible. For the one clip where the subtitles were preferred when the source language was comprehensible, the qualitative results suggests that this was due to the word-for-word accuracy of the translation.
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1 Introduction

In a world consumed by media such as series, TV and film, the demand for subtitles and other forms of translation is high and urgent (Omar & Sadeghpour, 2015 p.1995). Many claim (Bairstow & Lavaur, 2011; Omar & Sadeghpour, 2015) that the purpose of subtitles is to aid the audience to comprehend what is seen and heard on screen, the so called audiovisual. Alongside that it is often emphasised that the need for such aid lies with those who do not speak or have trouble understanding the source language (henceforth SL) or cultural references. An example of this are Hollywood movies and tv-shows which are produced in an English-speaking country, shown to a non-English speaking audience. Another example are subtitles for those diagnosed with hearing impairment, who may not hear the dialogue or additional sounds.

One could see how subtitles and even dubbing could be a great asset to those who need it, yet people who may not need it at all times are still exposed to it in various ways. According to an article from Svenska Dagbladet (Ewald, 2015), Sweden is one of few countries in the world who use subtitles rather than dubbing. Gottlieb (2004) claims that Sweden, as well as Denmark are semi-bilingual countries, meaning the majority of a population have learned, know and use a second language that is not an official language of the country, in this case it is English. However, in those countries, subtitles are still present in media where the SL is English such as movies in the cinema, on TV and when subtitles are automatically enabled on streaming sites.

A lot of discussions on forums about the quality of subtitles have occurred the past decade by media viewers in general as well as by members of translation and media text unions. An article in SVT nyheter (Fossbo, 2015) states that the quality of subtitles is no laughing matter, saying the Swedish language is suffering from this. The article states that professional translators not only work under bad conditions, but at the same time they compete with machine translation and people who create so called “fan-subtitles” for free. As an example of subtitles where the translation has gone wrong, the following subtitle snippet from the streaming site and app Netflix was brought up by Fossbo (2015): In the SL the following is said: “Brought her back” (“Tagit med henne tillbaka”). This line in the Swedish subtitles had been translated to the following: “Brytit hennes rygg” (“Broke her back”). The article finishes saying they have yet to receive a response from Netflix regarding their quality of subtitles (Fossbo, 2015).

Unfortunately, not a lot of academic studies have been done on the perception of subtitles. A lot of the studies regarding subtitles have been focused on areas such as
comprehension of the audiovisual (Lavaur & Bairstow, 2011) and language acquisition (Ina, 2014).

1.1 Aim and research questions

Using examples from Netflix, this thesis aims to study whether and why an audience finds subtitles to be bad or good depending on their fluency level of the SL. In the end, the results may give an audience perspective on the raised questions about subtitle quality which appears to have been an issue in the past decade. The main goal with this thesis is to research a part of subtitles which has not yet been studied.

The following research questions attempts to satisfy the aim of this thesis:

• Does Swedish L1 young adults perceive subtitles as worse or better if they comprehend the SL than if they did not?
• If so, what may be the reason or reasons behind this?
• Is there a recurring theme or pattern in the subtitles that the audience potentially perceive as good or bad?

2 Background

In this section different areas regarding the field of translation and specifically subtitle translation will be brought up. In section 2.1 we will look at translation by looking at Nida’s (1974) theory of equivalence.

In section 2.2 we will look at a smaller category within translation, and the focus of this thesis namely, subtitles. In that section we will look at different studies varying from subtitles’ aid in language acquisition to audiovisual comprehension as well as other works within the field.

2.1 Equivalence

Nida could be called one of the founders of modern translation. He defines equivalence as a translation which is similar in meaning between the source and the target texts, he compares this to dynamic equivalence which is defined as a translation similar in form (Nida & Taber, 1974, p. 200).

Nida and Taber (1974) speaks of the closest natural equivalent, among the things
in which a translator must strive for. By this he means one must take many things in to account such as the setting of the source. The source (setting) is very important, especially when one speaks of translating subtitles where the viewer can see the setting and compare the different channels (visual and text). Nida and Taber (1974) claims that the message which is being translated and its content must be the most prioritized. However, there are a lot of priorities the translator must take in to account. Therefore, Nida created a system of priorities. One of those priorities is that context should always be prioritized over verbality i.e instead of focusing on the small, individual parts of what you are translating, look at the “bigger picture” (Nida & Taber, 1974, pp.13-14).

Quite naturally, when one speaks of equivalence it may often be in the light of idioms or humor. Nida and Taber (1974) says that there are three ways to transfer idioms between languages. The first is from idioms to non-idioms (e.g. “the early bird gets the worm” -> “Den som går upp tidigt kan vinna på det”). The second is from idioms to idioms (e.g. “the early bird gets the worm” -> “morgonstund har guld i mund”). The third and last is non-idioms to idioms (e.g. “if you get up early, you can get a lot of work done” -> “morgonstund har guld i mund”) (Nida & Taber, 1974, p. 106).

2.2 Subtitles

In an article in Svenska Dagbladet, Ewald (2015) states how subtitle translators have gotten more workload. He says this could be due to the competitive market in which subtitle companies such as SDI Media and BTI studios compete for clients. Ewald means that these terms for the subtitle translator over the last decade have begun to affect the quality of subtitles. However, Ewald notes that this is not necessarily the case for DVD releases and the Swedish broadcasting station SVT, which are very picky about the quality of their translations (Ewald, 2015).

2.2.1 Time-and-space constraints

“The famous and infamous time-and-space constraints of subtitling, which mean that no more than some 70 (alphanumeric) characters can be fitted into one subtitle, and that- in order to give viewers enough reading time - subtitles should be exposed at a pace not exceeding 12 characters per second. This normally implies some measure of condensation of the original dialogue, something that is often not expected in translated texts.” -Gottlieb (2004, p.219)
Gottlieb (2004) describes subtitles as a *diasemiotic* translation, i.e. a translation that moves from one semiotic channel (speech) to another (writing). He puts this in contrast to *isosemiotic translation* which moves within the same channel (speech to speech=interpreting and writing to writing = written translation) (Gottlieb, 2004, pp.219-220). Gottlieb (2004) argues that on the higher level of translation (i.e. those done by people with proper education of the field) it is difficult to judge the choice of translation due to the constraints mentioned above (Gottlieb, 2004, p. 220).

### 2.2.2 Spoken-and-written constraints

In the section above, Gottlieb (2004) defines subtitles as a *diasemiotic* translation. While this is one definition, he also defines subtitles as an *intrasemiotic* translation (Gottlieb, 2001). When defining it as *intrasemiotic* he means that it is translated within the source itself (the audiovisual).

Gottlieb (2001) talks about the constraints when it comes to translating from the many-featured channel (speech) into the limited channel (written). Spoken language can contain features such as overlapping dialogue and prosodic variety (pauses, dialects, emotions). These features can be transcribed but should not be translated to subtitles according to Gottlieb (2001). He claims that viewers could find spoken discourse to be an odd and distracting element when reading. Gottlieb (2001) finishes by claiming that one cannot judge subtitles based on their translation of spoken features. Instead one should judge whether the subtitles manages to convey the spoken message as a whole (Gottlieb, 2001, pp.18-19).

### 2.2.3 Language acquisition

A study was done by preschool teacher Lekkai Ina (2014) with the goal to see if her students (native Greek speakers) would “incidentally” pick up on vocabulary of another language when watching cartoons with Greek subtitles. She divided the students into two groups. The first group would watch a cartoon in Italian with Greek subtitles. The second group watched the same cartoon without subtitles. The results from this study showed that the first group, which watched the cartoon with Greek subtitles achieved better scores on an Italian vocabulary test than those who watched without subtitles (Ina, 2014, p.81)
2.2.4 Audiovisual comprehension

Lavaur’s work on subtitles have mostly been focused on audiovisual comprehension. A study has been done by Lavaur and Bairstow (2011) to test the comprehension of the audiovisual in relation to the participants fluency level of the SL. The study was done by using native French students with three different levels of fluency in English: low, intermediate or high. The different leveled students were later shown a clip in English, randomized either with French subtitles, English subtitles or no subtitles, creating 9 groups in total. After the participants had watched the clip, they were asked to fill out a comprehension questionnaire with questions related to the dialogue and the images of the clip.

The study showed that subtitles were distracting to the advanced students. This was determined by looking at the score of the advanced students who saw the clip without subtitles compared to those who saw with subtitles. The advanced students who scored worst were those who saw the clip with interlingual subtitles. They explain in the discussion that this could be due to automatic reading behavior (henceforth ARB) where someone automatically focuses on text on screen if it is present although not necessarily needed. The study also hinted that ARB can lead to the viewer comparing the two semiotic channels presented to them (written and spoken). If the subtitles happen to be interlingual then this would require even more focus from the viewer than if they were intralingual (translated within the same language) (p.461).

3 Method

Many aspects of the method such as the choice and limitations of the participants and the developing of the questions, was done according Enkätboken (Trost 2007). Trost (2007) defines all combinations of qualitative and quantitative studies by stating the three steps of the procedure; data collecting, analysis and interpretation. Each of these steps can be done either in qualitative or a quantitative way, giving eight possible combinations in total (Trost, 2007, pp.20-21). Since this thesis would be a qualitative study for the most part, Trost’s (2007) combination A was used for the qualitative questions and combination E was used for the quantitative question. (combination A= 1. data collecting: qualitative, 2. analysis: qualitative, 3. interpretation: qualitative. Combination E= data collecting: 1. quantitative, 2. analysis: qualitative, 3. interpretation: qualitative). Since this thesis aims to study people’s opinion and how they reason, a qualitative study would be deemed most suitable according to Trost (2007, p.23).
The method for this study was inspired by the study done by Lavaur and Bairstow (2011). Much like their study, this study consisted of participants of a specific mother tongue watching clips in a language different from their mother tongue with subtitles and then filling out a questionnaire related to the clips they had just watched (For full details about the method see section 3.2).

In section 3.1 the two pilot studies that were performed will be presented by describing the purpose of them followed by participants, materials, procedure and finally the results. In section 3.2 the main study will be presented which will be in a similar order as the pilot study (excluding results, including design): participants, materials, design and procedure.

3.1 Pilot study

Two separate pilot studies were performed. Pilot study 1 (henceforth PS1) aimed to check if the questions were adequate in order to attempt to answer the research questions. The aim with pilot study 2 (henceforth PS2) was to see if the design of the study worked and if the meta data was enough as well as if the given information was understandable. Also, much like PS1, PS2 worked as a double check to see if the new questions (edited after performing PS1) were adequate or if they needed even further editing.

3.1.1 Participants

PS1 consisted of one female Swedish L1 university student aged 22. The participant was diagnosed with hearing impairment. She also had prior experience with translation theory and was advanced in English. PS2 consisted of two females, they were Swedish L1 university students aged 23, advanced in English. All participants for PS1 and PS2 were friends through university. All were asked if they wanted to partake either face-to-face or through the Facebook messenger app.

3.1.2 Materials

For PS1, a 20 sec long clip from the cartoon Voltron: The legendary defender was used. The clip was found on the app Netflix and was shown with source language: English (henceforth SLE) with Swedish subtitles on a Lenovo Yoga touch-pad. This clip was chosen due to it being dense in dialogue, which would give the participant more content to evaluate even though the clip was short. A questionnaire containing four questions was given (one quantitative and three qualitative questions). The questions were formed according to Trost’s (2007) description of
quantitative and qualitative questions (p.19). The quantitative question was what Trost (2007) would define as a ranking scale. It asked the participant to rank the subtitles of the clip from 1 to 10 where 1 was deemed “very bad” and 10 was deemed “very good”. Trost (2007) warns about having open questions, saying one should aim to not have any, as well as not have any open follow up questions (Trost, 2007, p.76). Since this study was done using a questionnaire and not an interview, I did not follow his warning when it came to open questions. However, I made sure the qualitative questions were adequate by testing them twice, once in PS1 and once in PS2.

For PS2, the participants were shown five 30-40 sec clips in SLE with Swedish subtitles on the app Netflix. The clips were shown on a Lenovo Yoga touch-pad and were taken from the following cartoon shows: *She-Ra: Princess of power, Voltron: The legendary defender* (A separate clip than the one used in PS1), *Lego: Elves, Disenchantment* and *The Hollow*, the same clips that had been chosen to be in the main study. Much like PS1, these clips were chosen due to them being dense in dialogue (see more details about the clips in section 3.2.2).

3.1.3 Procedure

PS1 took place during daytime by the dining table in the participant’s living room. After filling out a consent form, the participant watched the chosen clip. Afterwards she was asked to fill out a short questionnaire with questions regarding the subtitles.

PS2 took place in the afternoon in a university cafeteria. The participants were asked to fill out a consent form, as well as their information such as name, gender and age. They were then given verbal information about the aim of the study and a short description of how the study would proceed. After being given verbal information about the procedure they were asked to check a final box in the consent form if they had understood the given information. After that they watched one clip and filled out the section of the questionnaire appurtenant to the clip. This process was repeated four more times, once for each clip.

3.1.4 Results

When PS1 was finished several things came to mind which had to be edited before PS2 could take place. Firstly, more questions would have to be added since there was not enough information given in the participant’s answers to aid the attempt to answer some of the research questions.

Secondly, the participant for PS1 answered that subtitles were always helpful due to her being diagnosed with hearing impairment. Due to this, a criterion was added that the
participants for PS2 and the main study should not be diagnosed with hearing impairment since the study wanted to research the opinions of those who might not necessarily be in the need of subtitles. Nor should they be diagnosed with visual impairment as they would need to be able to read the subtitles.

Finally, after PS1 it was concluded that the study would need longer clips or alternatively, clips with more dense dialogue because the clip that was chosen did not contain enough dialogue to form a possible opinion on.

After having done PS2 it was concluded that more things would have to be edited. In contrast to PS1, the questionnaire for PS2 was deemed to contain too much or too confusing information, both in the meta-data section as well the actual questions. The questions in PS1 were not necessarily too few, but rather the wrong questions. PS2 showed that participants were confused by what to write for the qualitative part.

3.2 Main study

The biggest change from the PS1 and PS2 was that the main study was decided to be of a within-subjects design. Meaning the participants would not be divided in different groups but rather partake in every aspect of the study (Alferes, 2012) (see details in section 3.2.3).

3.2.1 Participants

The main study consisted of the participation of 7 Swedish L1, university students aged 23-27 (M= 23.9). Out of the participants 4 out of 7 (≈57%) were males (henceforth referred to as M1, M2, M3 and M4) and 3 out of 7 (≈42.9%) were females (henceforth referred to as F1, F2 and F3).

The participants did not have a diagnose of hearing or visual impairment. As for their language knowledge, all of them were deemed fluent in English. Their English-fluency level was determined by them being of an age where they should have taken and passed English 6/B in Swedish gymnasium grade 10-12 as well as by a word translation test (see below) which they scored at least 50% in., the participants’ language level of French or Finnish was low or non-existent. The participants did not have prior experience with translation theory.

The participants were asked how often they use Swedish subtitles in English media by being given the following alternatives: never, seldom, sometimes, often and always. 1 participant answered never, 2 answered seldom, 1 answered sometimes and 3 answered often. All participants were friends or acquaintances either from university or earlier education. They
were all recruited via Facebook’s messenger app. The message that was sent out contained the following questions; if they were interested in participating and if so, when and where they could participate. Information such as the criteria mentioned above was also included in the message (for more detail about the selection process see section 6.1.1).

3.2.2 Materials

Clips
For the study five 30-40 sec clips from the streaming site Netflix were shown. The clips were taken from the following cartoon shows (with the number and name of the specific episode in parenthesis): 1. She-Ra: Princess of power (S1E1: The sword - part 1), 2. Voltron: The legendary defender (S2E7: The Space-mall), 3. Lego: Elves (S1E1: An uninvited guest), 4. Disenchantment (S1E1: A princess, an elf and a demon walk into a bar) and 5. The Hollow (S1E1: The room). The study demanded the same clips to be shown in different languages which is why cartoons were the best choice considering they provide a good number of re-voicings. As one can see, all clips but one were taken from the first episode of the first season. This is because the cartoons themselves were chosen at random, while the clips were chosen due to them being dense in dialogue. The only clip which diverts from being the first episode of the first season is Voltron: The legendary defender, where the episode is taken from season 2 episode 7. This is because this specific episode is a so called “filler” episode of sorts, meaning it is not crucial to the story line of the series’ story arc.

Languages
The clips were shown in two different versions; one version comprehensible to the participant, SLE, and one non-comprehensible version which was with source language Finnish or French (henceforth SLFF). Four of the clips were shown in Finnish and one was shown in French due to it (Disenchantment) not being available with a Finnish re-voicing.

Questionnaire SLE
Just like the clips, two versions of a questionnaire were used: one for the clips in English (See appendix 1) and one for the clips in Finnish and French (See appendix 2). The questionnaire for the clips in English contained one control question per clip which asked if the participant had seen the clip prior to the beginning of the study. If they had then their results would not be counted. The questionnaire contained one quantitative question per clip, asking them to rank their overall opinion of the subtitles on a ranking scale from 1 to 10 (Trost, 2007, p.19) where 1 stood for Very bad and 10 stood for very good.
The questionnaire contained two qualitative questions per clip. With each qualitative question a follow up question was asked. For the two qualitative questions, the participants were asked to highlight the subtitles, which had been written in the questionnaire. In one question they were asked to highlight if and what they thought was bad/distracting in one colour. In the second question they were asked to highlight if and what they thought was good/helpful in another colour. The follow up questions asked the participants to motivate why they had highlighted the specific parts if they had chosen to do so. These qualitative questions were asked in order to see what had caught the participant’s attention in a positive or negative way. This would also help in order to see patterns in either the participant’s opinions or in specific types of subtitles in the clips. This would be aiding the attempt to answer the second and third research questions.

*Questionnaire SLFF*

The Finnish and French version of the questionnaire also contained the control question, asking if the participant had seen the clip prior to the study or not. The reason for this is due to the randomization process (see section 3.2.3) and the same quantitative question (1 per clip) as the English version. The purpose of the quantitative question and the clips in SLFF were to easily compare the overall ranking of the subtitles in SLE to SLFF. This would aid in the attempt to answer the first research question.

*Technology*

The participants watched the clips one or two at a time on an Asus Laptop with or without headphones, depending on the surroundings and the preference of the participant. The change from touch-pad to laptop was due to the screen of the touch-pad being deemed to be too small and scratched, something that became a distraction during PS2.

*Translation test*

A translation test containing 20 words was used to determine the English skill of the participant. This was used as an inclusion criterion for the study. 10 words were to be translated from Swedish to English and 10 words were to be translated from English to Swedish. The translation test was self-made with the help of 2 different sets of words. The first set of words were taken from a wordlist of words likely to appear on an English-sentence completion test in *Högskoleprovet*³ (Holmegaard & Holmegaard, 2011). These words were to determine if their

³ A test done in Sweden to test skills in math, Swedish and English, which, if given good results, could aid in getting accepted to University. Comparable to the American SAT test.
English skill in general was advanced enough. 10 words in total were taken from Högskoleprovet (5 words in Swedish to be translated in to English and 5 words in English to be translated in to Swedish). The other 10 words (5 words in Swedish to be translated in to English and 5 words in English to be translated in to Swedish) were taken from the clips the participants had just watched. This was to see if they could comprehend the words they had heard, and therefore be able to develop a possible opinion about the translation.

3.2.3 Design
The main study was changed from a between-subjects design to a within-subjects design after PS2. Alveres (2012) defines within-subjects design like this:

"A within-subjects design is an experimental design in which two or more units (subjects) are exposed to two or more treatment levels (or treatment level combinations) over two or more periods and outcome measures are recorded after each exposure." -Alveres (2012, ch.3 p.2)

Alvares’ (2012) definition is more applied to experimental studies. However, I interpreted it to fit this study. This meant that for the main study all participants watched the clips in all languages and answered both versions of the questionnaire. Not one participant went through the exact same procedure as another. There were three factors where at least one was alternated for each participant:

1. The order of whether the participant watched SLE or SLFF first.
2. The order in which the clips were shown in each version.
3. The order of the qualitative questions, meaning if they answered the questions about negative opinion or positive opinion first.

The questionnaires were designed so that each clip would be seen first at least once. What was randomized was which participant that would get which questionnaire.

3.2.4 Procedure
Due to the randomization factors described above, details of the procedure changed for each participant. Therefore, the procedure will be described in broader terms.

Where the study took place was up to each participant. For the most part it took place by the table in their kitchen or living room, but there were instances where the study took place at a coffee shop or in a classroom. The time that the study took place was also varied. Most instances took place around dinner time when the participant was winding down from a day of work or studying. Other times the study took place in the middle of the participant’s
school day or right after the participant had gotten off work for the day.

For both the English and the Finnish and French part of the study, the participants were first given a consent form (See appendix 1 and 2). For the consent form for the English part of the study they were asked if they had Swedish as their mother tongue and if they were fluent in English. They were also asked how often they used Swedish subtitles on English media. They were given written information on how their information would be used and their right to withdraw their information from the study. They were given verbal information about how the study would proceed. The consent form for the Finnish and French part of the study was very similar, except they were asked if they were fluent or were on some level skilled in Finnish or French.

Both the questionnaires had five parts each, one for each clip (see appendix 1 and 2). When the participant had watched a clip, they filled out the appurtenant section of the questionnaire. The participants saw 10 clips in total (5 clips with SLE and the same 5 clips with SLFF). After the participant had watched all the clips with SLE they were asked to do the translation test (see section 3.2.2).

4 Results

First the quantitative results will be presented which attempted to answer the first research question. Secondly the qualitative results will be presented which attempted to answer the follow up question to the first research question as well as the second research question. They will be presented with a section for each clip, going through the comments written by the participants in the questionnaire.

4.1 Quantitative results

These results were given by the quantitative question, where participants were asked to rank the overall subtitles for each clip from 1 to 10. 1 being the lowest score and 10 being the highest. First the results from each participant will be presented, then after that a diagram will be presented showing the mean score of each clip in an easily comparable manner.

Table 1. In this table the result of each clip (1-5) is represented in the rows while the result from each participant is represented in the columns (F=Female, M=Male). This table shows the results of the clips in SLE. In the last column, the mean (M) result of each clip is written, rounded to 1 decimal.
Table 2. In this table the result of each clip (1-5) is represented in the rows while the result from each participant is represented in the columns. This table shows the results of the clips in SLFF. In the last column, the mean result of each clip is written, rounded to 1 decimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 1</th>
<th>9.4</th>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clip 2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Qualitative results.

Firstly, it is important to mention that in the presentation of the qualitative results; the participant’s comments have been translated to English for the purpose of this thesis. All their original comments can be found in appendix 3. Secondly, it should be mentioned that despite having all the comments in the appendix, some are not brought up in the results which is why some fields may be empty. This is due to the comments being irrelevant to the study. Finally, it should be mentioned that not all participants answered every question. Some participants did highlight sentences but did not always give a motivation to why or vice versa, which is also why some fields are empty. All clips in SLE has been transcribed and can be found along with the subtitles in appendix 4.

4.2.1 Clip 1: The sword

Table 3. This table shows the relevant comments made about the subtitles in clip 1: the sword from She-Ra: Princess of power. The first column presents which participant that made which comment. The second and fourth column presents which subtitles that were highlighted due to either a positive or a negative reason. The third and fifth column presents the motivation behind the highlighting of the subtitles as well as additional comments. Column 2-5 are direct reflections of the qualitative questions in the questionnaire for SLE (see appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 1 &quot;Hon är vaken.&quot;</td>
<td>1-4 - I highlighted those lines of text that I remember were directly translated from what was said in the clip</td>
<td>1 &quot;…längt in i skogen?”</td>
<td>1-I think they said ”Whispering forest”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;-Vad hände?”</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot;-Tyst spion. Jag ställer frågorna.”</td>
<td>2 &quot;Du råkade bara befinna dig i Viskande skogen,”</td>
<td>2 &quot;Du råkade bara befinna dig i Viskande skogen,”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;Jag gick bara in. Och jag är ingen spion.”</td>
<td>4 &quot;Vi tar spionen till Månslottet där hon kan förhöras.”</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot;Vi tar spionen till Månslottet där hon kan förhöras.”</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.”</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. This figure shows the results in a comparative diagram so one can easily see the mean results compared in both languages for each clip. Note that clip 4 is the only clip in French while the other four are in Finnish.
then these were direct translations from the original language

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>“Du råkade bara befinna dig i Viskande skogen, och råkade försöka stjälja vårt svärd.”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M4 | -  | -  | 1 “Hur kom du så långt in i skogen?” | 1-Why not use ‘Whispering woods’ in this instance?
- No subtitles to all sentences.

### 4.2.2 Clip 2: The space-mall

Table 4. This table shows the relevant comments made about the subtitles in clip 2: The space-mall from *Voltron: The legendary defender*. (For details about the design of the table see table 3 in section 4.2.1)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 ”...unilu” 2 ”Teladuvlinserna.”</td>
<td>1+2- I wasn’t familiar with these words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1 “Coran?” 2 “Den här unilumärkningen ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum.” 3 ”Det verkar vara lite renare här än jag minns det.” 4 ”Så håll händerna på pengavåskorna.” 5 ”Mina väskor är tomma.” 6 ”Nu får vi det överstökat.” 7 ”Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en vaga”</td>
<td>1-7-I reason the same way as in clip 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>“Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in.”</td>
<td>- I noticed the subtitle because the translation was good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5. This table shows the relevant comments made about the subtitles in clip 3: The earth elf from *Lego: Elves*. (For details about the design of the table see table 3 in section 4.2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1 “Snyggt! Så du är jordälva.” 2 ”Du också, eller hur? Stenhårt.” 3 ”Jag heter Azari. -Och jag heter Naida.” 4 ”…att få träffa er.” 5 ”Ni två är inte härifrån, eller hur? 6 ”Nej…Ser du inte våra små öron?” 5 ”Jag heter Emily och det här är min syster.” 6 ”Vilket vacker halsband, Emily.”</td>
<td>1-7-Direct and god translations – easy to understand.</td>
<td>1 ”Det är en ynnest…” 2 ”Världsvant!” 3 ”Var inte så oförskämd, Sophie.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1 ”Den här unilu-marknaden ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum.” 2 ”Nu får vi det överstökat.” 3 ”Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en Vaga.”</td>
<td>1-I didn’t understand if ”unilu” was a name or not. 2-I thought this sentence was clumsily formulated. ”Låt oss få det överstökat”, would have been better. 3- ‘En vaga?’ Is that presumed to be a commonly known word?”</td>
<td>1+2-Contains words I haven’t seen before and the subtitles changed so fast that it was difficult to form a big picture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F3 - - “Världsvant!” - The word was distracting because it made me think about what other word could've been used.

M1 - - “Världsvant!” - “Världsvant” is not an accurate translation of "smooth".

M2 “Var inte oförsäkram, Sophie.” - A more literal translation would have put the name first, but I thought the move of the name made the reading process easier.

M3 - - “Världsvant!” - Very strange translation. Would have been better by using "wow" or "heh, snyggt".

M4 - - "Det är en ynnest..." - Use the right word "Ynnest" is not a commonly used word so why include that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F3 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 1 “Sov vid mina fötter, ni två. Det är 'vänzonen'.” 2 &quot;Bästa att du vänjer dig. Längre kommer du aldrig.” 3 &quot;I helvetet säger vi: 'Hoppas innan du doppas.'”</td>
<td>1-3-The translations helped me understand the jokes. However, the translations might have a different meaning in English. Maybe now that I think about it, the text might have distracted me.</td>
<td>1 &quot;I helvetet säger vi: 'Hoppas innan du doppas.'” 2 &quot;Sån är jag. Beklagar det.”</td>
<td>1-Look at the last part of my my last response (the positive answer from the same clip). 2-Bad translation, the speech was very informal while the translation was very formal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 &quot;Bästa att sova lite.”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 “Sån är jag. Beklagar det” -This was correct, I think.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Clip 4: Hope

Table 6. This table shows the relevant comments made about the subtitles in clip 4: Hope from Disenchantment. (For details about the design of the table see table 3 in section 4.2.1)
4.2.5 Clip 5: The room

Table 7. This table shows the relevant comments made about the subtitles in clip 5: The room, from The Hollow. (For details about the design of the table see table 3 in section 4.2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2</strong></td>
<td><em>Highlighted all the subtitles</em></td>
<td>-Almost exact translations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>“Lita inte på honom!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;Lita inte på honom!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Discussion

In this section the results will be discussed in relation to previous studies in an attempt to explain them. In section 5.1 the quantitative results will be discussed, although shortly seeing as it builds solely on numbers. In section 5.2 the qualitative results will first be discussed in the chronological order of the clips and in the end, the most interesting finds from the clips will be discussed together in an attempt to find patterns.

5.1 Quantitative results

According to a previous study (Lavaur & Bairstow, 2011) subtitles were shown to be distracting to the viewer if they were fluent in the SL. That was not necessarily the case in this study which came as a surprise. It cannot be claimed in the most general terms but from what the results show, in clip 5 the subtitles were preferred in the clip with SLE rather than the SLFF. Clip 1 was the clip with the biggest difference between SLE (7,1) and SLFF (9,4) in terms of score.
The lowest scoring clip in SLE was clip 3 and lowest scoring in combination of both SLE and SLFF was clip 2. Possible reasons for these scores will be discussed in section 5.2 below.

5.2 Qualitative results

In this section the qualitative results will be discussed and attempted to be related to the quantitative results. Each clip will be presented in chronological order and will be presented by bringing up the positive comments first and negative comments last. The relevant results for each clip will be brought up in its own subsection while the patterns found throughout the clips will be gathered together. Note that clip 5 does not have a subsection, this is because all relevant information for this clip will be brought up in section 5.2.5.

5.2.1 Clip 1: The sword

For clip 1, two participants mentioned how the subtitles didn’t translate the word “Whispering” as in “Whispering woods” (see appendix 4 for full transcription of the clips) when highlighting the subtitle “Hur kom du så långt in i skogen?” The same two participants also commented how not all the sentences in SLE were translated to the subtitles; “They missed to translate everything that was said.” (F1) and “No subtitles to all sentences” (M4). This could be due to several reasons. The working conditions of subtitle translators, which is brought up in an article by Ewald (2015) could contribute to missed lines and mistakes. One must also bear in mind that the show was a children’s show, and although most Swedish children might watch with the Swedish re-voicing, some might watch with SLE for the purpose of language acquisition. The study done by Ina (2014) showed that Greek elementary students incidentally picked up on Italian vocabulary just by watching cartoons with Italian SL and Greek subtitles. Skipping certain lines could therefore be a deliberate choice by the translator seeing as kids might not read as fast and therefore the translator summed up the most important dialogue.

One participant mentioned the lack of exclamation points in the subtitles for clip 1, meaning the subtitles failed to emphasize how the characters were upset. Another participant highlighted the sentence “Du råkade bara befinna dig i Viskande skogen, och råkade försöka stjäla vårt svärd.” with the following motivation:” The sentence sounds more like an explanation of how she came to the Whispering woods, rather than the irony that the character wants to express.” While both participants bring up instances where the subtitles have supposedly failed to convey spoken features, only the first instance is possible in subtitles. Gottlieb (2001) claims that prosodic features (such as a sarcastic tone) in spoken language is
very difficult to convert to a written language. Especially a written language that has to be translated within the confines of the spoken language.

5.2.2 Clip 2: The space-mall

Clip 2 stood out as the lowest ranked clip in the combined score of SLE and SLFF. Participant F2 highlighted all the subtitles she considered directly translated from the original language. F3 made a similar comment about the sentence “Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in.” with the motivation “I noticed the subtitle because the translation was good”. However, she did not specify why she thought it was good. She might have a different reason for her motivation because interestingly enough, participant F2 highlighted a lot of sentences but not the one highlighted by participant F3.

For the negative comments, (and my interpretation of why this clip got the lowest overall score) a lot of them focused on specific words. “Unilu, unilu-marknaden, vaga and teladuvinserna” were words which were given negative attention by the participants. “I wasn’t familiar with these words” F1 said referring to “unilu” and “teladuvinserna”. “I didn’t understand if ‘unilu’ was a name or not” and “‘En vaga?’ Is that presumed to be a commonly known word?” Was commented by participant M2. “These sentences contain words I’ve never seen before and the subtitles disappeared so fast that it was difficult to get the full context of what was going on” M4 said referring to the following sentences; “Den här unilu-marknaden ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum” and “Sprid ut er och leta efter teladuvinserna.” This could be related to Nida’s priority of context over verbal continuation (1974). If having seen the whole series and specifically this episode, one would have been given the context of these words, this was a possible error for this study (for more details see section 6.1.2). These specific words were made up space-lingo and were given context in the episode as stated above. However, for the purpose of discussion, let us say they had not been given context, such as in the clip the participants got to see. Here it is very clear that it would be helpful to give context to the meaning of the words instead of prioritizing the words being a more direct translation. This could however cause a problem for the time-and-space constraints brought up by Gottlieb (2004). Participant M4 commented that the subtitles disappeared too fast, if one were to add on explanations or extra context to the words in the already limited time and space of the subtitles, it might do more harm than good. Another thing the translator could do (to give context) would be to replace the space-lingo with words which would make more sense to a general audience (e.g. “alien-marknaden” instead of “unilu-marknaden”, “rymdskeppslinserna” instead of “teladuvinserna” and “timme” instead of “vaga”).
5.2.3 Clip 3: The earth elf
The opinions divert between participant F2 and M2. They both highlighted the subtitle “Var inte så oförskämd, Sophie.” Participant F2 highlighted it as negative with the motivation that the word-order was different than in the SLE. Participant M2 highlighted the subtitle as positive with the motivation that the new word-order made the reading process easier.

5.2.4 Clip 4: Hope
A comment was made by participant F2 about the subtitle translation of the rhyme “Hope’s for dopes”. She said the subtitle “Hoppas innan du doppas” made her understand the joke, but she could understand that the meaning was different in the SLE. “Hope’s for dopes” is basically saying that Hope is for stupid people, while the Swedish translation “Hoppas innan du doppas” (“Hope before you are dipped”), gave the implication that hope is useless. The character refers to a saying said in hell, which could be interpreted as; why have hope, you are in hell. When you put the interpretations beside each other (hope is stupid, and hope is useless) they could be seen as similar. This is something a viewer might pick up on if given time to analyse the two channels. However, the comments were not that many or thorough about the rhyme which makes it difficult to analyse. Participant F2 commented that the character spoke informally but the subtitles sounded very formal. We can relate this back to Gottlieb (2001) like we did in clip 2. He claims that written language is rigid and limited, especially when it comes to subtitles.

5.2.5 Patterns
When looking at patterns among the participant’s comments, one could see that in a lot of the clips the participants reacted positively when the subtitles seemed to correspond accurately to the SLE. For the positive comments left for the subtitles of clip 1, the participants took the opportunity to highlight the fact that more literal translations, or more accurately word-for-word translations should be praised. Saying that from what they could remember, their highlighted subtitles were “directly translated from what was said in the clip” (F1) and “these were direct translations from the original language” (F2). Participant F2 was very thorough in highlighting everything she deemed to be a “direct translation” in clip 2, 3 and 5 as well. In clip 4 participant M3 highlighted “Så klär jag. Beklagar det” as positive with the motivation; “This was correct, I think...”.

In clip 2, 6 out of 7 participants gave negative comments towards “odd” word
choices in the subtitles (e.g. “ynnest” and “världsvant”). Participants claim that “ynnest” is a very old-fashioned and forced word and that “världsvant” was not a proper translation of the SLE (“smooth”). In the same clip, participant M2 highlighted the subtitle:” Nu får vi det överstökat” as negative with the following motivation; “I thought this sentence was clumsily formulated. ‘Låt oss få det överstökat’, would have been better”. In clip 3 participant M2 highlighted the subtitle: ”-Och jag heter Naida.” as negative and commented; ”Och”? She said ”I’m Naida”. In clip 4 participant highlighted the subtitle: ”Bäst att sova lite.” as negative with the comment; “’We’d better get some shut eye’= ‘Bäst vi får oss en blund.’” In clip 5, 2 participants highlighted the subtitle: “Lita inte på honom!” (SLE: “I wouldn’t trust him…”) as negative. The participants suggest that the sentence could have been translated to “Jag skulle inte lita på honom” instead.

The participant seemed to value what they claim to be “direct translations”. This was very evident in the qualitative results for several clips (as seen above). The participants reacted positive to everything deemed “almost exact translations” and negative to subtitles which could have been translated better. One could relate these instances to ARB which was brought up by Lavaur & Bairstow (2011). Since the participants were fluent in the SL as well as the language of the subtitles a bigger part of their focus could be on the comparison of the two channels. If the participants heard a word in one language and saw the corresponding word in another language, then they reacted positively. If the corresponding word in the subtitles diverted from their view of what that word “should be”, or if the word is missing or a word is added then they reacted negatively. Participant F1 even suggested in her comment to clip 5 (“It was annoying that the subtitles were there because they force my brain to read the text even though I understand what is said, which was distracting.”) that ARB made her unfocused to what was happening on screen.

6 Method discussion

The method was always going to be participants watching clips with subtitles and filling out a questionnaire, that part was clear. However, a lot of details surrounding the method were changed along the way up until the last minute before the beginning of the main study. In this section we will discuss how the choice of participants, materials and procedure could potentially have affected the results. What could have been better or different in the study will also be discussed.
6.1 Participants

When it came to the selection of participants, I was inspired by chapter 3 in the book *Enkätboken* (Trost, 2007). Trost (2007) describes an instance where one would have to ask oneself a series of questions in order to limit the selection. When I was first starting the study, my goal was to look at the opinions and reasoning of the general Swedish population. This would quickly be limited to those deemed fluent in English since that was critical to the research questions. To assure they had the level of fluency that was needed, I decided the participants had to have graduated Swedish *gymnasium* (grade 10-12). If they had not, then they would not be asked to participate in the study in the first place. This limited the selection to those who would be turning 20 this year. Trost (2007) says that not all Swedish adults speak very good Swedish and therefore I limited the selection to those who had Swedish as a mother tongue (Trost, 2007, p.27). In the end the selection of participants was Swedish young adults (age 20-30). The motivation for that choice was what Trost (2007) calls *convenience*. I asked friends and acquaintances, all whom were young adults and either current or former university students) if they wanted to participate in the study (Trost, 2007, p.31).

The biggest problem with the choice of these participants was that it was not an accurate representation of young adults seeing not all young adults are or have been university students. This limitation also drifted quite far from the original intent of looking at the general Swedish population.

The study had 7 participants in total. This meant that I had 7 different combinations of the factors mentioned in section 3.2.3 for the questionnaires. If one had more participants and thereby more possible combinations than one could be more sure that the results were not affected by this.

6.2 Material

Participants seemed affected by the lack of context in some of the clips. In clip 2 the participants seemed confused about words such as “unilu”, “vaga” and “teladuv”. In context they would know that those words were space lingo, one for an alien species, one for a measure of time and the last a material needed for a space-ship, all of these explained in the episode. This was not something I thought would be an issue. Had I known this would affect the participants then I would have formed the study differently or chosen a different clip.

These instances clearly showed that perhaps giving context or maybe explaining
the context beforehand would give the viewer a different perspective. Something more optimal would be to have participants watch an entire episode and from there answer a questionnaire. Perhaps even more optimal would be to measure reaction in some way simultaneously as they are watching the episode.

When choosing clips, the study demanded a language that was non-comprehensible to the participants. Finnish seemed like the best choice seeing it was a language quite far from Swedish and English. The problem was that it was not available for one clip. That clip had to be in another language which would be non-comprehensible to the participant and available for the clip which is why French was chosen. Why French was not used for all the clips is because it was something that only occurred to me once the main study had already begun. If the study had been done with all clips in French for the study, maybe the results would have been different.

The qualitative questions in the questionnaire were often left empty when the participant did not feel like they had anything to answer. However, the quantitative question suggested otherwise. If there was nothing that bothered the participant in a negative way then the ranking should be 10, which was not always the case. Had the quantitative question added the word indifferent to the box which read 5, then giving no answer would be fine. If the answer was anything but 5 then they would have had to motivate their ranking.

### 6.3 Procedure

This study attempted to capture the first impression of ordinary viewers, in my own opinion it failed to do so, at least to some extent. The participants only got to see clips in the middle of episodes and therefore lacked the real viewing experience they would normally have. By the time they watched the 2nd clip of the SLE they already knew the procedure and might have focused more attention to the subtitles than what they normally would have done.

The subtitles were written in the questionnaire for the clips with SLE for the participant to highlight. If the SLE had been transcribed and written in the questionnaire as well then deeper and more analyzed answers would certainly been given about the translations. However, the thesis aimed to study the first impression of the subtitles, and if something stood out to the participant when they watched the clip, then hopefully, they would remember it when they answered the questionnaire. Of course, this added the risk of them forgetting their initial reaction and opinion.
6.4 Suggestion for future research

The three major flaws that were mentioned above were the length of clips (or lack of context), the reliance on participant memory and the number and age of the participants. The study presented above is very flawed in this regard. For future research this would all be kept in mind. In this section these issues will be addressed with how they could have been done differently.

A future study which would be interesting to make is to measure the participants reaction simultaneously to watching a clip. This could be done by having the participant press a button whenever they react to something they read in a positive or negative way. This way one could capture their first impression of the subtitles. However, having them do this might make them pay more attention to the subtitles than they normally would have.

An interesting find in the results was the difference between the answer rate between males and females when it came to positive comments. The three female participants left positive comments to almost all the clips while the male participants often left these questions empty. A future study based on this could be if males and females view subtitles differently. Another could be to see if females are more accepting towards potentially bad translations than males.

Something that is mentioned by Gottlieb (2001) is how viewers would find transcribed spoken language to be odd as subtitles. If we look at the negative comment and subtitle brought up by participant M2 (see section 5.2.2), he claims that the irony that the character is conveying is not represented in the subtitles. It would be interesting to study which spoken features would be perceived as negative or positive in subtitles.

7 Conclusion

The aim of the study was to see if the content in subtitles were perceived as negative or positive depending on the participant’s fluency level if the SL and try to find out why that is. In this section we will attempt to answer the research questions by bringing up the most relevant parts from the discussion.

- Does Swedish L1 young adults, perceive subtitles as worse or better if they comprehend the source language than if they did not?

The results showed that 4 out of 5 times the subtitles were preferred when the SL was non-comprehensible to the participant. The subtitles were preferred one time when the SL was
comprehensible which was a surprising outcome. Previous studies had suggested for subtitles to be distracting when watching two comparable channels (Lavau & Bairstow, 2011). However, when looking at the quantitative results one can see that the clip (clip 5) in SLE scored 8.9 while the clip in SLFF scored 8.7. This score was the lowest difference in terms of margins (0.2). In the other clips where the subtitles were preferred in a non-comprehensible the margins were at least 0.4 (clip 4) and going as high was 2.3 (clip 1).

The following two research questions will be answered together

- If so, what is the reason or reasons behind this?
- Is there a recurring theme or pattern in the subtitles that the audience potentially perceive as good or bad?

In some of the clips the participants reacted negatively towards the written not conveying spoken features such as emotion, sarcasm and informality. When looking at patterns among the participant’s comments, one could see that in a lot of the clips the participants reacted positively when the subtitles seemed to correspond accurately to the SLE and negatively when it did not. Another thing that reflected badly on the subtitles in several clips was the lack of context for certain words. These comments would might not have been made if the participants had seen full episodes. However, it does emphasize the importance of context.
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Appendix 1

(Note that in the questionnaire for SLE below there’s only one clip represented. However, the questions were all the same for each clip. The original questionnaire was 12 pages.)

Formulär: ___________________

Namn: ________________________  Ålder: ______

Kön:  □ Man  □ Kvinna  □ Annat

Kryssa i allt som stämmer om dig.

□ Jag har svenska som modersmål.

□ Jag förstår engelska väl

Hur ofta använder du dig av/har på svenska undertexter på engelsk media?

□ Aldrig

□ Sällan

□ Ibland

□ Ofta

□ Alltid

□ Jag förstår att jag kan avbryta mitt deltagande och ha min information och mina svar borttagna från studien när helst jag vill utan förklaring.

□ Jag förstår att mitt namn kommer vara anonymt i studien och kommer endast vara synligt för skaparen av studien, dess handledare och examinator.

□ Jag godkänner att mina uppgifter (förutom namn) samt mina svar och åsikter i denna studie kommer användas och presenteras offentligt.

- Vänta på instruktioner –
Jag har tagit del av och förstått informationen

Klipp: Rymdgallerian

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja ☐ Nej ☐

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ (Mycket bra)


   Coran?
   Den här unilu-marknaden ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum.
   Det verkar vara lite renare här än jag minns det.
   Men var på er vakt. Uniluerna är hänsynslösa myglare.
   Så håll händerna på pengaväskorna.

   Mina väskor är tomma
   Bra.
   Nu får vi det överstökat.
   Just det.
   Sprid ut er och leta efter teladuvlinserna.
   Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en vaga.
   Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in.


   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
Fortsätter på nästa sida...

5. Var där någonting som stack ut som dåligt/distraherande i undertexterna? Om ja, stryk över de undertexter du tycker är dåliga/distraherande med ORANGE överstrykningspenna här nedanför. Du får stryka över hur mycket och hur lite du vill.

Coran?

Den här unilu-marknaden ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum.

Det verkar vara lite renare här än jag minns det.

Men var på er vakt. Uniluerna är hänsynslösa myglare.

Så håll händerna på pengaväskorna.

Mina väskor är tomma

Bra.

Nu får vi det överstökat.

Just det.

Sprid ut er och leta efter teladuvlinserna.

Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en vaga.

Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in.


_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
Appendix 2

Formulär:____________________

Namn: ____________________________ Ålder: ______

Kön: □ Man    □ Kvinna   □ Annat

Kryssa i allt som stämmer om dig.

□ Jag har svenska som modersmål.

□ Jag talar/förstår inte finska eller franska.

□ Jag förstår att jag kan avbryta mitt deltagande och ha min information och mina svar borttagna från studien när helst jag vill utan förklaring.

□ Jag förstår att mitt namn kommer vara anonymt i studien och kommer endast vara synligt för skaparen av studien, dess handledare och examinator.

□ Jag godkänner att mina uppgifter (förutom namn) samt mina svar i denna studie kommer användas och presenteras offentligt.

- Vänta på instruktioner –

□ Jag har tagit del av och förstått informationen
Klipp: Svärdet

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja □ Nej □

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ (Mycket bra)

Klipp: Rymdgallerian

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja □ Nej □

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ (Mycket bra)

Klipp: Jordälvan

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja □ Nej □

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7 □ 8 □ 9 □ 10 □ (Mycket bra)
Klipp: Hopp

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja □ Nej □

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □  8 □  9 □  10 □ (Mycket bra)

Klipp: Rummet

1. Har du sett klippet innan?
   Ja □ Nej □

2. Vad är din översiktliga åsikt om undertexterna i detta klipp på en skala 1 till 10?
   (Mycket dåligt) 1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □  8 □  9 □  10 □ (Mycket bra)
### Appendix 3

#### Clip 1: the sword

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.&quot; 2 &quot;Vad häände?&quot; 3 &quot;Tyst spion. Jag ställer frågorna.&quot; 4 &quot;Jag gick bara in. Och jag är ingen spion.&quot; 4 &quot;Vi tar spionen till Månslottet där hon kan förhöras.&quot;</td>
<td>1-4: Jag strök över de texter och ansåg vara direkt översatta ifrån vad de sa i klippet.</td>
<td>1 &quot;...långt in i skogen?&quot; 2 &quot;Viskande skogen skyddas av rebellerna.&quot;</td>
<td>1-Tror de sa &quot;Whispering forest&quot;. 2-Vet inte vad som störde mig men något gjorde mig distraterad av att läsa texten, blev ofokuserad på vad som hände. 3-Tyckte de missade att översätta allt som sades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1 &quot;Hon är vaken.&quot; 2 &quot;Du råkade bara befinner dig i Viskande skogen,&quot;</td>
<td>1+2-Det kan säkerligen vara så att fler av undertexterna hade varit bra, men om jag minns rätt så var dessa direkta översättningar från originalspråket. 1-Jag uppmärksammade att undertexterna på många andra ställen hoppade över irrelevanta partier.</td>
<td>1 &quot;Och råkade försöka stjäla vårt svärd.&quot; 2 &quot;Du har tur som kom ända hit.&quot;</td>
<td>1+2-Min motivering bygger på föregående resonemang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>1 &quot;-Vad hände?&quot; 2 &quot;Tyst spion. Jag ställer frågorna.&quot; 3 &quot;Jag gick bara in. Och jag är ingen spion.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;Vi tar spionen till Månslottet där hon kan förhöras.&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-Hade varit mer levande med några utropstecken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M4</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>&quot;Hur kom du så långt in i skogen?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Clip 2: The space-mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 1 &quot;Men var på er vakt. Uniluerna är hänsynslösa myglare.&quot; 2 &quot;pengaväskorna.&quot;</td>
<td>1-Tyckte de talade lite otydligt, så det var bra att där var undertexter så att man hängde med 2-Just ordet för &quot;pengaväskor&quot; han jag inte uppfatta så det var också bra att det stod i undertexten.</td>
<td>1 &quot;...unilu&quot; 2 &quot;Men var på er vakt. Uniluerna är hänsynslösa myglare.&quot; 3 &quot;teladuvlinserna.&quot;</td>
<td>1+3-Orden var inga jag var bekanta med och undertexen försvann lite snabbt så jag blev lite distraherad. 2-Hörde inte alls vad de sa och de få ord jag hörde verkade inte korrelera med översättningen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Nu får vi det överstökat."
"Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en Vaga.
"Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in."

litet 'u' gjorde mig förvirrad.
3-En vaga? Förutsätter man att det är ett allmänt känt ord?
4- "…försök [att] smälta in"

---

**Clip 3: The earth elf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-I detta klipp kändes det onödigt med undertexter då allt som sades var lättförståligt.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>1 &quot;Snyggt! Så du är jordälva.&quot; 2 &quot;Du också, eller hur? Stenhårt.&quot; 3 &quot;Jag heter Azari. -Och jag heter Naida.” 4 &quot;…att få träffa er.” 5 &quot;Ni två är inte härifrån, eller hur? 6 &quot;Nej…Ser du inte våra små öron?” 5 &quot;Jag heter Emily och det här är min syster. ” 6 &quot;Vilket vacker halsband, Emily.” 7 &quot;Det är bara en släktklunod.”</td>
<td>1-7-Direkta och bra översättningar – Lätt att förstå.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>1 &quot;Det är en ynnest…” 2 &quot;Världsvant!” 3 &quot;Var inte så oförskämnd, Sophie.”</td>
<td>1-Ynnest är ett gammeldags ord 2-Detta ord var dåligt översatt – smooth är inte alls kopplat till detta 3-Nästa var en annorlunda ordföljd</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
-Inget jag generellt la märke till, utan texten flöt på bra i övrigt. **“Världsvant!”**

-När klippet spelades distraherade ordet mig och funderade på vilket annat ord som skulle kunna användas.

1 **“Världsvant!”**
2 **”Nej…”**

1- **”Världsvant!”** är inte en träffsäker översättning av ”smooth”, registerbyte.
2- **”Nej”**, i sin tur är en ganska träig översättning av ”duh” som egentligen poängterar att du inte vet någonting som du borde veta. Eftersom **”nej”** bara besvarar frågan ”rakt”, missar man en del av det pragmatiska innehållet där.

**”Var inte oförskämd, Sophie.”**

-En bokstavlig översättning kanske hade satt namnet först, men jag tyckte att topokaliseringen av namnet (flytten) underlättade läsningen.

1 **”Snyggt! Så du är jordälva.”**
2 **”Och jag heter Naida.”**
3 **”Det är en ynnest…”**
4 **”Världsvant!”**

1-Här kanske”så” står som ett förtydligande, men det är inte vad som sades i klippet. Karaktären visste att det var en jordälva (”You’re an earth elf”), och gissade alltså inte, vilket isåfall skulle inneburt att ”så” förtydligat det.
2- **”Och”**? Hon sa ”I’m Naida”. (om jag inte hörde fel)
3- **”Ynnest”** är nog det mest forceade ordval jag sett…
4- **”världsvant”,** likaså.

**Ytterst konstig översättning. Hade varit bättre med bara ”wow” eller ”heh, snyggt”**

-**”Världsvant!”**

-Ytterst konstig översättning. Hade varit bättre med bara ”wow” eller ”heh, snyggt”

**”Det är en ynnest…”**

: **”Vilket vackert halsband, Emily.”**

1-Använd rätt ord. Ynnest använder jag inte själv och det gör nog inte de flesta andra svenskar så varför inkludera det i undertexterna.

---

**Clip 4: Hope**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 <strong>“Längre kommer du aldrig.”</strong></td>
<td>1-4-Jag fann undertexten väldigt irriterande, det var svårt att läsa texten och</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clip 5: The room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 5: The room</th>
<th>Positive-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Negative-highlighted subtitles</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F1               | -                              | -          | Det var lätt att lyssna på konversationen samtidigt | -          | Eftersom att det var väldigt lätt engelska var
som man läste undertexten. Tyckte det korrelerade rätt bra, inget som direkt störde mig. Dock kändes det onödigt med undertext.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highlightade alla undertexter*</th>
<th>Exakta översättningar i princip.</th>
<th>Det lite störigt att undertexten var där för det tvingar min hjärna att läsa texten även fast jag förstår vad som sägs och det leder till att man inte fokuserar så mycket på vad som händer på skärmen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td><em>Highlightade alla undertexter</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>1 &quot;Sänk nävarna. Vi sitter i samma båt.&quot; 2 &quot;Säger den andra killen som jag aldrig har sett förut!&quot;</td>
<td>1+2-Det var dessa undertexter som jag läste märke till extra mycket (på ett bra sätt) resterande undertexter reflekterade jag inte över, utan det flöt bara på naturligt.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 4

## Clip 1: the sword

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcribed SLE</th>
<th>Swedish subtitles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bow:</strong> Hey! She’s awake!</td>
<td><strong>Hon är vaken.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adora: What happened?</td>
<td>-Vad häände?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> Quiet, Horde spy! I ask the questions!</td>
<td>-Tyst spion. Jag ställer frågorna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> How did you make it this far in to the Whispering woods?</td>
<td>Hur kom du så långt in i skogen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adora:</strong> I just walked in? And I’m not a spy!</td>
<td>Jag gick bara in. Och jag är ingen spion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> Sure...sure. You just so “happened” to find yourself in the Whispering woods, like you just so “happened” to try and steal our sword!</td>
<td>Du råkade bara befinna dig i Viskande skogen, och råkade stjälja vårt svärd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adora:</strong> uh, it’s not yours? I found it first!</td>
<td>Jag hittade det först.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> The Whispering woods is under the rebellion’s protection.</td>
<td>Viskande skogen skyddas av rebellerna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> you were lucky to make it as far as you did.</td>
<td>Du har tur som kom ända hit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glimmer:</strong> Come on Bow! Let’s get this spy back to Bright-moon where she can be interrogated.</td>
<td>Vi tar spionen till Månslottet där hon kan förhöras.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Clip 2: The space-mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcribed SLE</th>
<th>Swedish subtitles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pidge: ...uhh, Coran?</td>
<td>Coran?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pidge:</strong> This unilu-swap meet looks an awful lot like... a regular mall.</td>
<td>Den här unilu-marknaden ser ut som ett vanligt köpcentrum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> Well it does seem to be a little cleaner than I remember...</td>
<td>Det verkar vara lite renare här än jag minns det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> Still, be vigilant! The Unilu are cut-throat wheeler dealers!</td>
<td>Men var på er vakt. Uniluerna är hänsynslösa myglare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> So keep your hands on your coin-satchels!</td>
<td>Så håll händerna på pengaväskorna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunk:</strong> uh, my satchels are empty.</td>
<td>Mina väskor är tomma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> eh, good!</td>
<td>Bra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keith:</strong> Let’s just get this over with...</td>
<td>Nu får vi det överstökat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> Yes, right!</td>
<td>Just det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> Everyone, let’s fan out! Search the area for teladuv-lenses.</td>
<td>Sprid ut er och leta efter teladuvlinserna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> We’ll meet by the giant ticking clock here in one vaga.</td>
<td>Vi ses vid den stora tickande klockan om en vaga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coran:</strong> Don’t be late and try to blend in...</td>
<td>Kom inte för sent och försök smälta in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Clip 3: The earth elf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcribed SLE</th>
<th>Swedish subtitles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farran:</strong> ooooh, nice! You’re an earth elf!</td>
<td><strong>Snyggt! Så du är jordälva.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronan:</strong> You, too right? Rock solid!</td>
<td>Du också, eller hur? Stenhårt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Azari: uhh, I’m Azari. -Jag heter Azari.

Naida: I’m Naida. -Och jag heter Naida.

Cronan: And I’m delighted... to meet you both. Det är en ynnest... att få träffa er.

Farran: Wow! That’s smooth! Världsvant!

Cronan: You too aren’t from around here, are you? Ni två är inte härifrån, eller hur?

Sophie: Duh! We have little ears? Nej...Ser du inte våra små öron?

Emily: Sophie! Don’t be so rude! Var inte så oförskämd, Sophie.

Cronan: What a charming necklace, Emily. Vilket vackert halsband, Emily.

Emily: It’s... just a family heirloom... Det är bara en släktklenod.

Clip 4: Hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcribed SLE</th>
<th>Swedish subtitles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bean: Alright, we’ve got a long journey in the morning. Let’s get some shut-eye.</td>
<td>Vi har en långresa imorgon. Bäst att sova lite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean: you two sleep down by my feet. I call it the “friend-zone”.</td>
<td>Sov vid mina fötter, ni två. Det är ”vänzonen”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean: What’s this weird feeling I don’t want to drink away?</td>
<td>Vad är det för märkelig känsla som jag inte vill supera bort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfo: That’s hope. That’s hope!</td>
<td>Det är hopp. Hopp!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demon: You know what we say in hell; “Hope’s for dopes.”</td>
<td>I Helvetet säger vi: ”Hoppas innan du doppas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luci: Well, good night everybody.</td>
<td>God natt, allihop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luci: Hah! I’ll be entering your dreams tonight in the form of a laughing skull.</td>
<td>Jag ger dig mardrömmar i form av en skrattande dödskalle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luci: Yeah...that’s me...that’s me. I’m sorry, hah, I’m sorry about that...</td>
<td>Sån är jag. Beklagar det.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clip 5: The room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcribed SLE</th>
<th>Swedish subtitles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kai: Hey! Who are you? Where am I?</td>
<td>Vilka är ni? Var är jag?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: Yeah, those are the top two questions...</td>
<td>Det är de två viktigaste frågorna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: Put the fists down, dude. We’re all in the same boat.</td>
<td>Sänk nävarna. Vi sitter i samma båt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai: We’re in a boat?</td>
<td>Är vi i en båt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira: so, all three of us woke up in this place?</td>
<td>Så vi vaknade upp här alla tre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: uhh, yeah... That’s what it looks like.</td>
<td>Ja, så verkar det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai: uh...This is definitely not a boat!</td>
<td>Det här är definitivt inte en båt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai: I wouldn’t trust him...</td>
<td>Lita inte på honom!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira: urgh... Says the other guy I’ve never seen before!</td>
<td>Sager den andrakillen som jag aldrig har sett förut!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira: So, where are we? And why are we here?</td>
<td>Var är vi? Och varför är vi här?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: No idea...</td>
<td>Ingen aning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>