

Coherence and Audience Reception in Subtitling

with Special Reference to Connectives

by

Huan-Li Kao

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Integrated)

School of Modern Languages

Newcastle University

March 2011

Acknowledgements

This thesis owes its existence to the efforts of many people. First, I am indebted to my supervisors, Francis Jones and Richard Waltereit, for their patience, careful supervision, and encouragement throughout the duration of this research project. It has been both a privilege and a pleasure to have the opportunity to be supervised by two supportive and inspiring scholars.

I would like to thank the teachers and students at Chang Jung University for their cooperation and participation in this study. My special thanks go to Ms. Liang-Show Chen for her assistance in coordinating the questionnaire survey. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to all my colleagues and friends from whom I received help and support during my PhD studies, particularly Dr. Yu-Su Lan at Chang Jung University, Dr. Fred Wu and Dr. Yalta Chen at Newcastle University, and Dr. Sheryl Chang at National Taiwan University for being supportive throughout the years, as well as Ms. Vivien Zheng and Ms. Jill Wang for their help along the way.

Last but not least, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family. I thank my parents for their unfailing support and my beloved nephews and nieces Justin, Ray, Sabrina, Jefferson, and Kerry for giving me warmth and inspiration throughout the long journey.

Abstract

Due to time and space constraints, subtitling is often subject to reduction, which in turn may lead to information loss and hamper comprehension of subtitles. However, little research has been done to investigate the potential conflict between subtitle reduction and comprehension. Therefore, with the aim of exploring both ‘cohesion in text’ and ‘coherence in mind’, a two-phase study was designed to investigate textual reduction and audience reception with particular reference to connectives (e.g. *moreover*, *but*, *because*, and *at first*). More specifically, the present study aims to find out how connectives are translated in different genres of factual TV programmes and whether and to what extent their reduction may affect audience comprehension. The first part of this study involved textual analysis of source texts and target texts of two TV genres: scripted documentaries and ‘spontaneous’ (i.e. unscripted) travel programmes. The occurrences of connectives in STs and TTs were manually counted and statistically analysed. The results showed that the addition or omission of connectives was related to the difference between these two genres: documentaries were translated more explicitly with more connectives translated and added, while a travel programme were translated more implicitly with more connectives omitted. The second part of this study involved a questionnaire survey using four English clips (two scripted documentaries and two spontaneous travel programmes from Discovery Channel) to test the perception of 158 participants on the reduction of connectives in Chinese subtitles. The results of the survey showed the participants seemed to have no difficulty comprehending Chinese subtitles when most English connectives were intentionally not translated. That is, the omission of connectives did not seem to affect their perception on the coherence of subtitles, which may be explained by contextual factors such as register (field, tenor, and mode), pragmatic principles (e.g. the cooperative principle and Gricean maxims), and multi-semiotic features of subtitling (e.g. co-presence of subtitles, image, and sound). In other words, the present study shows that reduction in subtitling could be justified from the perspective of context in subtitling. These findings can be further applied to the teaching and assessment of subtitling.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 The rise of audiovisual translation	2
1.1.2 Subtitling and reduction	3
1.1.3 Connectives, cohesion and coherence	4
1.1.4 Contextual factors in subtitling	5
1.2 Hypothesis and Research Questions	8
1.3 Significance of the Study	9
1.4 Overview of the Study	10
1.5 Organisation of the Thesis	11
Chapter 2 Coherence and Subtitling	12
2.1 Construction of Coherence.....	12
2.1.1 Inference.....	13
2.1.2 Context	14
2.1.3 Background knowledge.....	14
2.1.4 Speech act theory	15
2.1.5 The cooperative principle.....	17
2.1.6 Relevance Theory	18
2.1.6.1 Key principles of Relevance Theory.....	19
2.1.6.2 Inference.....	20
2.1.6.3 Context	20
2.1.6.4 Explicit and implicit information.....	21
2.2 Connectives or Discourse Markers?.....	22
2.2.1 Connectives	23
2.2.2 Discourse markers	24
2.2.3 <i>And</i> -polysemy and multifunctionality.....	27
2.3 Cohesion in Text and Coherence in Mind.....	29
2.3.1 Connectedness in text and mind.....	29

2.3.2	The role of connectives in cohesion and coherence.....	30
2.3.3	Connectives and comprehension.....	31
2.3.3.1	Positive or negative impact of connectives?	32
2.3.3.2	The facilitation level of connectives	33
2.3.3.3	The constraint level of connectives.....	33
2.3.3.4	The continuity hypothesis	34
2.4	Features and Constraints	35
2.4.1	Technical constraints: time and space.....	35
2.4.2	Multiple semiotic channels	36
2.4.3	Crossover between spoken and written mode.....	37
2.5	Text Reduction in Subtitling.....	39
2.5.1	Quantitative reduction.....	41
2.5.2	Reduction and Relevance Theory	42
2.5.3	Reduction and language functions	42
2.5.4	Reduction of discourse markers and connectives	43
2.5.5	Explicitation and implicitation.....	44
2.5.6	Text typology and genre	45
2.6	Context in Subtitling	48
Chapter 3 Cohesion Analysis		50
3.1	Materials.....	50
3.2	Procedures	54
3.3	Results.....	55
3.3.1	Results for <i>and</i>	57
3.3.2	Results of the cohesion analysis with <i>and</i>	58
3.4	Discussion	61
3.4.1	<i>And</i> as a connective or a continuative.....	62
3.4.2	Genre and reduction of connectives.....	64
3.4.3	Connectives types and the facilitation level.....	67
3.4.4	Information loss and audience comprehension.....	69
3.4.5	Conclusion	71
Chapter 4 Audience Reception		74
4.1	Materials.....	74
4.2	Questionnaire Design.....	76

4.3 Participants.....	78
4.4 Procedures.....	78
4.5 Results: Questionnaire Part I.....	79
4.6 Results: Questionnaire Part II.....	80
4.6.1 Quantitative analysis of Likert-scale items.....	81
4.6.2 T-tests.....	83
4.6.3 One-way repeated measures ANOVA.....	85
4.6.4 MANOVA (or four-way ANOVA).....	87
4.6.5 Conclusion.....	89
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	94
5.1 Review of the Study.....	94
5.2 Coherence and Context.....	96
5.2.1 Communicative factors.....	97
5.2.1.1 Field, tenor and mode.....	97
5.2.1.2 Content, form and style.....	100
5.2.1.3 Subtitling as rewriting.....	101
5.2.2 Pragmatic factors.....	102
5.2.2.1 Economical translating.....	103
5.2.2.2 Audience-centred translating.....	105
5.2.3 Semiotic factors.....	106
5.2.3.1 Text, genre and discourse.....	106
5.2.3.2 Extralinguistic factors.....	108
5.2.4 Conclusion.....	110
Chapter 6 Conclusions.....	112
6.1 Implications for Theory.....	112
6.2 Implications/Recommendations for Practice and Training.....	113
6.3 Evaluation of Methods.....	116
6.4 Recommendations for Future Research.....	118
References.....	120
Appendices.....	129
Appendix A: Sample materials for the cohesion analysis.....	130
Appendix B: List of four types of connectives.....	136

Appendix C: Results of the cohesion analysis	137
Appendix D: English questionnaire	142
Appendix E: Chinese questionnaire	149
Appendix F: General information about the respondents	156
Appendix G: Samples materials for the audience reception study	163
Appendix H: Average scores of each clip for each item.....	175

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Classifications of connectives.....	25
Table 2.2: Classifications of discourse markers.....	25
Table 2.3: Spoken vs. written discourse.....	38
Table 2.4: Subtitling strategies.....	40
Table 2.5: Condensation strategy.....	41
Table 2.6: Text typology.....	46
Table 2.7: Classification of audio-medial texts.....	47
Table 3.1: Documentary: <i>Who Killed Julius Caesar</i>	51
Table 3.2: Travel programme: Globe Trekker: Vienna City Guide.....	51
Table 3.3: Word counts of research materials.....	52
Table 3.4: Documentary vs. Travel Programme.....	53
Table 3.5: Results of the cohesion analysis without <i>and</i>	55
Table 3.6: Observed counts: all connectives.....	56
Table 3.7: Observed counts: connective types.....	56
Table 3.8: Results of chi-square tests.....	57
Table 3.9: Occurrences of ST <i>and</i> with a TT counterpart.....	57
Table 3.10: The amount of ST <i>and</i> in each TT connective type.....	58
Table 3.11: Observed counts: <i>and</i>	58
Table 3.12: Results of the cohesion analysis with <i>and</i>	59
Table 3.13: Results with and without <i>and</i>	59
Table 3.14: Observed counts: all connectives with <i>and</i>	60
Table 3.15: Observed counts: additive connectives with <i>and</i>	60
Table 3.16: Result of chi-square tests.....	60
Table 3.17: Type of connectives (including <i>and</i>).....	68
Table 4.1: Amount of connectives in each clip.....	76
Table 4.2: Likert scale for importance of criteria.....	76
Table 4.3: Likert scale for the reception study.....	77
Table 4.4: Groups A & B.....	79
Table 4.5: Max and min clips.....	79
Table 4.6: Average score of each item.....	80
Table 4.7: Average scores of 8 clips for each item.....	82
Table 4.8: Lowest-highest score difference by groups.....	83
Table 4.9: Independent samples statistics.....	83

Table 4.10: Paired samples statistics.....	84
Table 4.11: Max vs. Min, by item.....	85
Table 4.12: Descriptive statistics of four variables.....	86
Table 4.13: Pairwise comparisons among four groups.....	86
Table 4.14: Descriptive statistics of 12 items.....	87
Table 5.1: Documentary: Building the Biggest: The West Coast Line.....	107
Table 5.2: Travel programme: <i>Globe Trekker: Venice City Guide</i>	107
Table 6.1: Linguistic skills of subtitling.....	114
Table 6.2: Technical skills of subtitling.....	115
Table 6.3: Reclassification of subtitling skills.....	116

Chapter 1. Introduction

This thesis is a report of an empirical study of reduction in subtitling with particular reference to connectives in English and Chinese. The study is based primarily on the quantitative analysis of reduction of connectives and audience reception of subtitles to examine how coherence and comprehension are achieved in subtitling. This first chapter of the thesis presents the general background of the study, specifies the problem of the study, describes its anticipated significance, and provides an overview of the methodology. This chapter concludes by outlining the organisation of the thesis.

1.1 Background

Over the past decade, the study of audiovisual translation has received considerable attention. In particular, a growing number of research studies are now available to shed some light on subtitling. The setting for this research is Taiwan, where subtitling is the most common type of audiovisual translation and most of the subtitle translations work from English scripts to Chinese subtitles. In addition, all subtitles shown in TV programmes in Taiwan are open subtitles, rather than closed subtitles. That is, the viewers cannot turn off the subtitles even if they do not need them. The omnipresence of subtitles on the screen makes Taiwan a land of subtitles, and its people are very much used to watching TV and reading subtitles at the same time.

Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 8) define subtitling as “a translation practice that consists of presenting a written text, generally on the lower part of the screen, that endeavours to recount the original dialogue of the speakers, as well as the discursive elements that appear in the image (letters, inserts, graffiti, inscriptions, and the like), and the information that is contained on the soundtrack (songs, voices off)”. Thus, subtitling does not only involve translating film dialogue and narrative. The image and soundtrack must also be taken into consideration in the translating process.

Moreover, there are two types of subtitling: intralingual and interlingual, and in Taiwan both are prevalent. Intralingual subtitling refers to subtitles in the same language as the programmes and is usually made for the deaf and the hard-of-hearing, but in Taiwan it is mainly for the ease of comprehension. By contrast, interlingual subtitling involves the change of languages. Most Chinese subtitles of foreign programmes, such as dramas and movies, are translated from English in Taiwan, and it is the interlingual subtitling

that is the focus of the present study.

Subtitling is the main method to make most foreign films (mostly English films) understandable to people in Taiwan, while dubbing is mainly used in Korean TV dramas for the older audience who cannot or do not want to read subtitles. The reasons for the preference of subtitling over dubbing are probably that subtitling is much cheaper, faster and authentic than dubbing. In terms of authenticity, subtitling preserves the original sound in its entirety, and the viewers are able to pick up the original voice of a character, which may provide insights into his/her personality, mood or intention (Kilborn 1993:646, cited in Guardini 1998: 97). Moreover, subtitling is often preferred by more educated audiences, especially if they have some knowledge of the source culture and language (O'Connell 2007: 128), and this is especially true in Taiwan where English is considered the most important foreign language.

1.1.1 The rise of audiovisual translation

According to Gambier (2003), audiovisual translation had not been taken seriously until 1995. In 2002 Chaume Varela (p4) argued that the reasons for this neglect were: Communication, Media and Translation Studies are still relatively new disciplines; the insignificance that the subtitler's task had in academic settings because audiovisual translation was not considered as literary translation; audiovisual translation had not been paid much attention within its own professional setting, in which the speed of the process, the tight timescales and financial pressures, and the number of people who had direct access to the translation had made audiovisual translation a mass production process, instead of an artistic and professional activity.

However, according to Gambier (2003), this situation has changed for a number of reasons. These reasons include annual conferences on audiovisual communication, a rising number of publications, the booming new technology, language policy, and language awareness. Another important reason is that translation practice changes rapidly. In the digital age, the audiovisual equipment is faster, flexible, and less cumbersome. In addition, subtitling deserves to be researched because it is a kind of special translation. All the potential translation problems caused by cultural differences and linguistic problems which translators may come across can all happen to subtitlers.

Moreover, Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007) suggest that audiovisual translation has

gained visibility due to the proliferation and distribution of audiovisual materials in our society. They claim that we spend many hours everyday watching screens on television sets, cinemas, computers and mobile phones to carry out our work, to develop and enhance our professional and academic careers, to enjoy ourselves, and to obtain information. Consequently, the image is ubiquitous in our time and age, and the need for translating audiovisual materials has been increasing. However, Díaz Cintas (2004: 50) argues that “A clear paradox exists which emphasises the surprising imbalance between the little research on audiovisual translation and its enormous impact on society”. In particular, there has still been little research on how reduction in subtitling affects cohesion and coherence of subtitles. As a result, the present study aims to investigate how the addition and omission of connectives contribute (or not) to the comprehension of subtitles.

1.1.2 *Subtitling and reduction*

Subtitling typically involves reduction. According to Assis Rosa (2001: 218), reductions in subtitling are caused by several reasons. First, reductions may result from the change of medium, channel, and code, such as the change from spoken register to written register. As a result, spoken features of the source text are often omitted. Second, reductions may be due to the selection criteria characteristic of subtitling, such as the need for text compression due to time and space constraints. Subtitles are limited to a maximum of two lines. Thus, the target text needs to be reduced depends on the time available, the reading speed of the audience, and the speed of the source text. Third, reductions may be associated with translators working only with scripts and without watching the film. Consequently, when the source soundtrack contains extra spoken-language features (e.g. pauses and hesitations) not present in the script, they may be lost in the subtitles. For example, a speaker may use a pause to create suspense. However, if the translator is not aware of the pause, he or she may destroy the suspense. Fourth, reductions may be a consequence of the secondary or marginal function of the subtitles, which should not draw the attention of the audience away from the image. The audience should be given sufficient time to read, watch, and listen at the same time. Fifth, reductions may be the result of “socially and politically significant choices influenced by value systems”. For example, swear words may be toned down or even deleted in subtitles either based on the decision of the subtitler or the policy of the TV stations and cinema companies.

Moreover, reduction in subtitling may lead to information loss and poorer quality of subtitles, which is a risk that subtitlers try to avoid by cutting out non-important items. Consequently, it seems that words and phrases that carry little or no meaning are often omitted in subtitling, for example, repetitions, modals (e.g. *may* and *would*), tag questions (e.g. *...aren't you?* and *...did you?*), and filler words (e.g. *well* and *you know*) (Assis Rosa 2001, Chaume 2004). However, the question of whether connectives are important items or not in subtitling still remains unanswered, and it will be discussed in the next section.

In recent years, several studies in this respect have focused on quantitative reduction in subtitling. For example, Georgakopoulou (2003) systematically analysed the percentages of reduction in different film genres and found that the degree of reduction was determined by genre, context, and speed of delivery. Nonetheless, quantitative reduction may not necessarily lead to qualitative reduction. Indeed, Gottlieb (1998: 247) argues that “a full transcription/translation of the spoken discourse in films and television is seldom desirable”, because there are some semiotic redundancies in films and television. In his view, even deliberate speech, including script-based narration, may contain so much redundancy that a slight condensation will enhance rather than impair the effectiveness of the intended message. While this claim is plausibly argued, little empirical evidence has been found to support it.

More particularly, to the best of my knowledge, no empirical studies have focused on whether and how reduction in subtitling, particularly the reduction of connectives, may affect cohesion and coherence of subtitles – a key topic in this thesis. It may be argued that connectives are an important aspect of textual quality, but their role in text comprehension is not clear, which will be discussed next.

1.1.3 *Connectives, cohesion and coherence*

Connectives are closely related to the formation of cohesion and coherence. Pander Maat and Sanders (2006) define connectives as one-word items or fixed word combination that express the relation between clauses, sentences, or utterances, and “a connective indicates how its host utterance is relevant to the context” (ibid: 33). According to the classification of Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are four types of connectives: additive (adding information, e.g. *and* and *furthermore*), adversative (comparing and contrasting events and things, e.g. *but* and *in contrast*), causal

(explaining why and how events happen, e.g. *because* and *therefore*), and temporal (ordering events in time, e.g. *next* and *finally*).

According to Baker (1992: 218), "...cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text". The present study adopts the view that cohesion is a textual element, and coherence is a mental phenomenon that exists in the mind of the reader. Although a fairly large body of literature exists on the relationship between cohesion and coherence (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, Brown and Yule 1983, Enkvist 1990, Gumperz et al. 1984, Sanders and Pander Maat 2006), little research has been done to investigate whether and how the reduction of connectives may affect cohesion and coherence of subtitles, which in turn may hamper audience comprehension.

In addition, Spooren and Sanders (2006: 4) suggest that connectives play an important role in guiding the hearer or reader in constructing a coherent representation of the discourse by signalling the semantic relation between two discourse segments. However, by revisiting the related literature of studies on reading comprehension, it appears that so far there is no consensus on the actual effect of the explicit presence of connectives on text comprehension. Although many reading experiments based on English have confirmed that connectives facilitate reading comprehension, a number of studies have found that connectives have a negative impact on comprehension because they make the sentences longer and increase working memory load (Millis et al. 1993). The reason for the contradictory findings may have to do with the fact that they used different text types (narratives and expositorys) and types of connectives (additives, causals, temporals, and adversatives). As a result, the present study investigated all the four types of connective in the informative texts so as to shed some light on these apparently contradictory research findings.

1.1.4 Contextual factors in subtitling

Also, there have been few studies linking coherence and cohesion to context in subtitling. Reiss (2000: 69) suggests that contextual factors may allow an author to reduce the linguistic form of the message to be conveyed to a minimum, because the hearer or reader will be able to fill in the result of the situation in his/her own language. Hence, this study tries to draw on the notion of context in translating proposed by Hatim

and Mason (1990) to explore whether, and if so, how the audience may fill in a missing link when subtitles are less cohesive. They suggest that context in translating consists of three dimensions: communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction.

First, communicative transaction involves register analysis, which consists of three main types of register variation: field, tenor, and mode. According to Halliday (1978: 31-2), register refers to “the fact that the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation....What the theory of register does is to attempt to uncover the general principles which govern this variation, so that we can begin to understand *what* situational factors determines *what* linguistic features” (original emphasis). In Halliday’s terms, the situation is the environment in which the text comes to life. Moreover, field refers to subject matter, e.g. political discourse. Tenor means the relationship between the addresser and the addressee, e.g. formal and informal. Mode is the medium of the language activity, e.g. speech and writing. In short, register is the study of the relation between language and its context, and it is determined by what is taking place (field), who is taking part (tenor), and what part the language is playing (mode) (ibid: 31).

Second, pragmatic action mainly involves three pragmatic approaches: speech acts, the cooperative principle, and Gricean maxims. In a broader sense, cognitive-pragmatic theories such as Relevance Theory are also involved (cognitive pragmatics is defined as the study of language use within the framework of cognitive science). Speech act theory, as proposed by Austin in 1962, claims that all utterances have some communicative force which moves communication forward (Hatim and Mason 1990: 59). Cook (1994: 40) claims that this theory may explain how the receiver can reason from the literal meaning of what is said to the pragmatic (implied) meaning and induce what the sender is intending to do with his or her words. Grice proposes the cooperative principle and a set of maxims to account for how knowledge is conveyed when people imply, suggest or mean something distinct from what they literally say (Hatim 1998: 77). The cooperative principle is defined as “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice 1975: 45). The Gricean maxims consists of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, which will be discussed together with the cooperative principle in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.1.5).

Third, according to Hatim and Mason (1990), semiotic interaction involves the interplay of text, discourse and genre as signs, and semiotics in this sense refers to the study of language as signs. A text is a set of mutually relevant communicative functions structured to achieve an overall rhetorical purpose such as to narrate and to counter-argue (ibid: 243). Discourse is defined as “modes of speaking and writing which involves participants in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of socio-cultural activity” (e.g. racist discourse and official discourse), and genre refers to “conventional forms of texts associated with particular types of social occasion” (e.g. poetry and science fiction) (ibid: 240-1). To illustrate the relationship among texts, discourse and genre, let’s take an article abstract for example. At the textual level, its coherence is expected to be maintained. In terms of discourse, it tends to be neutral, and it is a genre which has its own conventions (ibid: 73-4).

Furthermore, text typology also plays a role in the semiotic context. Reiss (1971) proposes three basic text types: informative (e.g. news reports), expressive (e.g. poetry), and operative (e.g. advertisements). In the present study, two types of TV programmes were analysed: documentaries and travel programmes, and they are both informative texts. Also, it is important to distinguish between text type and genre mentioned above for the purpose of this study. In this study, documentaries and travel programmes are considered two different TV genres with the same function of providing information to the audience, and their distinction will be further discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.5.6).

In addition to the intertextual aspect of the context, it must be pointed out that the semiotic interaction in subtitling also involves picture and sound as signs, which make subtitling a special type of translating. In short, it may be said that communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction form a complete context of subtitling.

To sum up, while the study of subtitling has received increasing attention, there has been little empirical research on how reduction in subtitling affects cohesion and coherence of subtitles. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine whether and how reduction in subtitling may facilitate or hinder comprehension of subtitles by taking into account not only the textual reduction of subtitling, but also the perception of the audience.

1.2 Hypothesis and Research Questions

More specifically, this study aims to examine whether and how the omission of connectives affects cohesion and coherence of subtitles of documentaries and travel programmes. This study tests the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may not adversely affect comprehension or subtitle quality, because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction without affecting coherence. In order to examine the hypothesis, a two-phase study was designed to answer two sets of specific research questions. In the first phase, a quantitative analysis of textual cohesion in the subtitles of scripted documentaries and unscripted travel programmes was conducted, and the similarities and differences between the two types of programmes will be further discussed in Chapter 2. The cohesion analysis was designed to answer the following research questions:

- How are connectives translated in documentaries and travel programmes? How far are they added, omitted, or retained in target texts? Whether are they made explicit (i.e. translated) or implicit (i.e. omitted) in target texts? Whether and how is the amount of connectives in STs and TTs and each type of connectives genre-related?
- To what extent is the addition/omission/retention systematic or random? If it is systematic, what type of connectives tends to be added or omitted more often than other types of connectives, and why?

In the second phase, an audience reception study was conducted to find out how the participants responded to the addition and omission of connectives in subtitles. The connectives in the clips watched by the participants were either increased or decreased to a maximum or minimum amount to enhance or reduce the cohesion level of Chinese subtitles. The reception study was designed to answer following questions:

- Does the addition/omission of connectives in the subtitles of documentaries and travel programmes affect coherence and audience comprehension? If yes, in which way, and to what extent?
- Does the audience find subtitles explicitly marked with connectives more comprehensible than those without connectives? If yes/no, why?

Having stated the hypotheses and research questions, this paper will next discuss why the study is important from several points of view.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be explained from the perspectives of theory, teaching/assessment, and subtitling practice. Firstly, while the role of connectives in the formation of cohesion in text is recognized, their role in guiding and facilitating comprehension has remained controversial: some researchers argue that the absence of connectives may capture and maintain readers' attention and help them to store and retrieve information (Vivanco 2005), whereas some find that they possess subtle shades of meaning that have precise functions for coherence, thereby implying or stating that they are not superfluous or even necessary (Millis and Just 1994, Sanders and Noordman 2000). In this study, connectives are defined as logical connectors that are words or short phrases that link clauses or sentences and their function is to explicitly specify a particular semantic relationship between two clauses or sentences. Therefore, this study may contribute to the study of connectives by clarifying their role and function in subtitling.

Moreover, as Pander Maat and Sanders (2006: 39) suggest, from a methodological point of view, the integration of cognitive-pragmatic theories such as Relevance Theory with empirical studies is a better approach to the study of connectives than theoretical studies that relies entirely on intuitions regarding the appropriateness of connectives in constructed examples, or empirical studies that focus only on experimentally elicited reactions to texts or experimentally elicited language use. However, few studies on the role of connectives in comprehension have combined empirical research and cognitive-pragmatic theories to illustrate how comprehension is facilitated (or not) by the presence of connectives. Therefore, this study tried to find out the role of connectives by conducting an audience reception study and explaining its results from the perspective of pragmatics (including cognitive pragmatics).

More generally, from a theoretical point of view, while considerable attention has been paid in the past to research issues related to subtitling, theoretical discussion of issues related to reduction in subtitling and its effect on comprehension has been scant and scattered. Thus, this study draws on the notion of context in translating proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990) as discussed in Section 1.1.4. It is hoped that this theoretical framework may lead to a more integrated and comprehensive view of context in subtitling and broaden the scope of subtitling research.

Secondly, the results of this study may be of value to teaching and assessment of subtitling, because the importance of contextual features of subtitling is often ignored. Trainee subtitlers are usually taught the need for reduction in subtitling, but what is more important is that they need to learn what makes good-quality reduction. As a result, this study could be useful to the trainees and trainers by providing a better understanding of contextual factors in subtitling such as image and sound, genre and register, and background knowledge and viewing purpose of the audience.

Finally, this study may be beneficial to professional subtitlers, because the conventions of genres, discourses and texts may provide guidelines on what and how to translate. According to Fawcett (1997: 83), all translators should be able to perform register analysis (i.e. analysis of field, tenor and mode discussed in Section 1.1.4) for two reasons: (i) they will be able to have an understanding of the text they are translating which goes beyond the simple level of denotation and allows them to choose the appropriate register in the target language, and (ii) when they are required to deal with new subject matters, they can produce their own analysis of the registers for that subject. More specifically, in order to transfer the meaning of the source language appropriately, subtitlers should be able to analyse and determine relationships between characters and all the other relevant elements in film, the level of formality (formal or informal), and mode of the discourse (spoken or written) – i.e. to perform register analysis in the process of subtitling.

In summary, it is hoped that this study may lead to a better understanding of the nature of subtitling and serve as the basis for the study of contextual factors in subtitling.

1.4 Overview of the Study

As mentioned in Section 1.1.3, cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exists within the text, and coherence is something that depends on the mental activity of the reader. From a methodological point of view, Blum-Kulka (1986: 23) suggests that “Cohesion is an overt textual relationship, objectively detectable. The study of cohesion lends itself to quantitative analysis...Coherence, on the other hand, defies quantitative methods of analysis, unless approached from the reader’s point of view.” Therefore, with the aim of exploring both ‘cohesion in text’ and ‘coherence in the reader’s mind’, this study was designed to use these two concepts to investigate both textual reduction and audience reception with special reference to connectives.

The first part of this study involved quantitative text analysis of source texts and target texts of two TV genres: scripted documentaries and unscripted travel programmes. Moreover, both STs (English) and TTs (Chinese) of five documentaries and five travel programmes were transcribed and analysed to reveal the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles. The second part of this study involved a questionnaire survey using four English clips (two scripted documentaries and two spontaneous travel programmes from Discovery Channel) to test the response of participants on the reduction of connectives in Chinese subtitles.

1.5 Organisation of the Thesis

The next chapter of this thesis is a review of the literature, addressing various issues with respect to the role of connectives in the comprehension of subtitles. Chapter 3 describes how the cohesion analysis was conducted by comparing the addition/omission of connectives in the source and target texts and provides discussion of the results. Chapter 4 deals with the audience reception study that used a questionnaire to investigate how the respondents perceived the quality of the subtitles. Chapter 5 offers general discussion of the results of the present study. Chapter 6 provides conclusions, implications, and limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2. Coherence and Subtitling

This chapter provides a theoretical overview on several approaches to the study of coherence, the role of connectives in cohesion and coherence, and an introduction to the features and constraints of subtitling as well as several issues concerning context in subtitling.

The notion of coherence has been studied textually and cognitively. From the perspective of text linguistics, coherence exists in the text. According to Sanford (2006: 585), "...coherence is an intrinsic defining property of a text", where each part of a text is connected to one other part by some sort of relation to form a coherent discourse, e.g. cause-consequence. Hence, coherence in text is made manifest by coherence relations and is referred to as textual coherence. Nonetheless, it has been a dominant view that, from the cognitive perspective, coherence exists in mind: "Coherence is something that depends on the mental activity of the reader or listener, on their capacity to understand the message that the producer of the text is trying to convey" (ibid). In other words, coherent discourse derives from the mental representation of the text rather than the text itself (Sanders and Pander Maat 2006: 592). The present study adopts the cognitive view that coherence exists in the mind, and that it is coherence in mind that leads to successful comprehension.

The present study is largely informed by three cognitive-pragmatic approaches to coherence: speech act theory, the cooperative principle, and Relevance Theory. Cognitive pragmatics is the study of language use within the framework of cognitive science. According to Setton (1999: 4), pragmatics deals with "the role of context and inference, the relationship between the explicit and implicit in linguistic communication, and those dimensions of meanings which are related to extralinguistic factors such as time, place and situation, and the knowledge available to the participants". Therefore, in the present study, the cognitive-pragmatic approaches will be discussed with emphasis on how inferences are made when information is left implicit, but first the role of inference, context, and background knowledge in the construction of coherence will be examined to provide a basis for the discussion of these approaches.

2.1 Construction of Coherence

Dancette (1997: 78) suggests that "To understand a text is to build a meaningful and

coherent representation of its conceptual content, or text world. It is to actualize links that may or must be established between linguistic elements in the textual structure, and non-linguistic elements pertaining to intertextual and extratextual information”. That is, comprehension comes from the building of a coherent representation that does not only operate at the semantic level, but also at the conceptual level where all informational input (the text, situational context, world knowledge) is integrated (ibid). Thus, it may be argued that the process of comprehension is, in essence, a process of coherence building. According to Velde (1989), the construction of coherence involves factors like conversational maxims, pragmatic information, sociocultural information, schema-based knowledge, grammar rules, but the most important one is inference.

2.1.1 Inference

Velde (1989: 185) claims that “Inferences are indispensable to the construction of coherence”. He argues that making inferences is a problem solving process. First, the inferential processes identify information within verbal texts; second, they extract information from verbal texts; third, they connect information within, between and beyond verbal texts; and finally, they add information to verbal texts (ibid: 175). According to Enkvist (1990: 17), this kind of adding of information or inference plays a crucial role in communication. He illustrates this point with the following example:

Life with Stephen, who as you know is nine, is just great.
For Christmas he got a chainsaw from his godmother.
I am wondering how much the new floor will cost me.

The readers should be able to infer the connection between the 9-year-old’s chainsaw and the need for a new floor, because they know that the chainsaw may damage the floor when it is used by a little boy. In addition, it is easy for them to infer that *just great* should be given an ironic reading. Thus, Enkvist suggests that the readers will have no difficulty filling in the missing links by making inferences (ibid). With respect to the relationship between cohesion in text and inferences, Brown and Yule (1983:269-70) suggest that a highly cohesive text which has few missing links will require a lot of space to convey very little information, but will not demand a lot of interpretive work, i.e. inferencing, on the part the readers. However, it is typically the case that the texts will show a minimal amount of formal cohesion, assume massive amounts of background knowledge, and require the readers to make necessary inferences in order to understand what is being conveyed (ibid). However, it is impossible to make inferences without taking context into account.

2.1.2 Context

Baker (2006: 321) suggests that the notion of context has been extensively discussed but rarely critiqued and elaborated in the study of translation and interpreting. Moreover, among various approaches to context, one approach particularly relevant to the present study defines context in terms of a series of pre-existing entities and relations in the real world (ibid: 323). In this approach, context involves situational factors, and thus is referred to as “context of situation”, a term coined by Malinowski in 1923. In order to define the situational context of speech, Hymes distinguished sixteen components which he grouped into eight divisions using the word “S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G” as an acronym, with each letter of the word standing for a cluster of dimensions of speech events: Situation, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genre (1967, reprinted in Hymes 1974). The components of the Hymes model are boldfaced in the list below (adapted from Renkema 1993: 44):

Situation	Setting refers to the time and place of a speech act and, in general, to the physical circumstances surrounding it.
Participants	All speech events include the speaker and hearer .
Ends	The goals and outcomes of the speech.
Act Sequence	The form and content of the message.
Key	The key refers to the overall tone or manner of the speech, e.g. serious or mocking.
Instrumentalities	Channels refer to the choice of oral, written, or other medium of transmission of speech; forms of speech refer to dialect, standard language, etc.
Norms	Norms implicate the belief system of a community.
Genre	The genre refers to fairy tale, poem, lecture, advertisement, editorial, etc.

Nonetheless, Hymes’s model does not take into consideration background knowledge that is important to the interpretation of discourse (ibid). Nevertheless, it may be argued that background knowledge also contributes to coherence by supplying information not explicitly stated by the speaker.

2.1.3 Background knowledge

Rost (2001: 60) states that the most fundamental aspect of comprehension is the integration of the information conveyed by the text with information already known by the listener. The notion of background knowledge is closely related to schema theory introduced by Bartlett in 1932, which according to McCarthy (1991: 168), is about the

role of background knowledge in the reader's ability to make sense of the text. Renkema (1993: 163) claims that a schema is a set of organised knowledge about a specific element in the world; "knowledge" refers to the stereotypical knowledge that is more or less the same for all language users in a particular culture. For example, every language user associates different things with the word "house", but the stereotypical knowledge is the same for everyone: a house has rooms, a kitchen, a front door, a roof, etc. (ibid). In addition to objects, various kinds of events such as going to a movie can be represented by the concept of schemas. For instance, going to a movie involves going to the theatre, buying the ticket, buying refreshments, seeing the movie, and returning from the theatre (Anderson 2000: 159).

According to Carrel and Eisterhold (1988: 76), one of the fundamental tenets of schema theory is that "text, any text, either spoken or written, does not by itself carry meaning...a text only provides directions for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their own, previously acquired knowledge". Furthermore, the process of interpretation is guided by the principle that every input is mapped against existing schemas, which results in two modes of information processing: bottom-up and top-down processing (ibid). The former is driven by the incoming data, while the latter is evoked by general predictions based on higher-level general schemas (ibid). It is important to note that the two processes should be occurring simultaneously. As Cohen (1993: 27) points out, "Schemas operate in a top-down direction to help us interpret the bottom-up flow of information from the world".

Furthermore, speech act theory may provide an account of how formally unconnected utterances in conversation form a coherent sequence (Brown and Yule 1983: 232-3).

2.1.4 *Speech act theory*

Speech act theory aims to explain how the receiver can reason from the literal meaning of what is said to the pragmatic (implied) meaning and induce what the sender is intending to do with his or her words (Cook 1994: 40). Austin introduces speech act theory in 1962 and distinguishes three different kinds of actions which are performed when a language user produces an utterance (Hatim and Mason 1990: 59-60):

- a. locutionary act: the action performed by uttering a well-formed, meaningful sentence.
- b. illocutionary act: the communicative force which accompanies the utterance, e.g.

promising, warning, conceding, denying, etc.

- c. perlocutionary act: the effect of the utterance on the hearer/reader; i.e. the extent to which the receiver's state of mind/knowledge/attitude is altered by the utterance in question.

More specifically, the locutionary act is the act of saying something. The illocutionary force is what the speakers are doing with their words, e.g. promising and inviting. The perlocutionary effect is the result of the words; it is the effect on the hearer. Searle proposes five basic kinds of action that one can perform in speaking (1976, in Levinson 1983: 240): representatives (e.g. asserting and concluding), directives (e.g. requesting and questioning), commissives (e.g. promising and offering), expressive (e.g. thanking and apologising), and declarations (e.g. declaring war and firing from employment).

Lautamatti (1990) suggests that these communicative acts may help create coherent discourse when there is no overt cohesion in text. According to Brown and Yule (1983: 228), our understanding of some conversational discourse is not based on an interpretation of the sentences, but on our assumption that a reason is being expressed for an action performed in speaking. As a result, some formally unconnected utterances may be interpreted as forming a coherent sequence, which is illustrated by the following example (Widdowson 1978: 29, cited in Brown and Yule 1983: 228):

A: That's the telephone.

B: I'm in the bath.

A: O.K.

Widdowson suggests that only by recognising the action performed by each of these utterances within the conventional sequencing of such actions can we accept this conversation as coherent discourse (Brown and Yule *ibid*). The conventional sequencing may be presented as follows (*ibid*):

A requests B to perform action

B states reason why he cannot comply with request

A undertakes to perform action

Although speech act theory has been used to explain literal meaning and implied meaning in both spoken and written discourse, it originates from the analysis of spoken discourse and mainly deals with single utterances of speakers and hearers. Thus, it may be argued that speech act theory is more applicable to the analysis of spoken discourse

(e.g. conversation) than written discourse (e.g. an extended written text).

In addition to speech acts, the construction of coherence involves conversational maxims proposed by Grice (1975).

2.1.5 *The cooperative principle*

Grice (1975) proposes the so-called cooperative principle and a set of maxims to account for how knowledge is conveyed when people imply, suggest or mean something distinct from what they literally say (Hatim 1998: 77). The cooperative principle is defined as “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice 1975: 45), and the principle consists of four maxims:

- a. Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required.
- b. Quality: Do not say what you believe to be false.
- c. Relation: Say only those things that are relevant to the situation.
- d. Manner: Avoid obscurity of expression.

According to the cooperative principle and the maxims, if the speaker’s remark seems irrelevant, the hearer will seek to construct a sequence of inferences which make it relevant or at least cooperative (Green 1989: 91). Grice gives the additional information derived from inferences the name “implicature” and distinguishes conventional implicature from conversational implicature. The former is derived from the meanings of particular expressions, whereas the latter depends on features of the conversational context and is derived from pragmatic principles like the conversational maxims and the cooperative principle. Consider the following example given by Grice (1975):

He is an Englishman; he is therefore brave.

Through the fixed meaning of the word “therefore”, one can derive the conclusion that Englishmen are brave. This is what Grice calls conventional implicature. Conversational implicature is illustrated by the following example (Renkema 1993: 159):

A: Did you already buy fruit?

B: The oranges are already in the refrigerator.

On the basis of Grice’s maxim of quantity, B would only need to answer “Yes”. A can assume that B is complying with the cooperative principle and therefore can also

assume that B has a reason for providing additional information, which may be one of the following (ibid):

- I'll decide what kind of fruit is bought.
- You know I buy oranges every week.
- I have done even more than you requested; I have already put the fruit in the refrigerator.

Green (1989: 103) claims that the cooperative principle provides the basis for a natural account of coherence. Nonetheless, one of the limitations of this approach is that different cultures, countries and communities have their own ways of observing and expressing maxims for particular situations (Cutting 2002: 41). For instance, in Britain it is not acceptable to say, "We'll call you in about two weeks" and then not call, but in some countries this is a normal way of expressing "We're not interested."

Moreover, Sperber and Wilson (1986) propose a relevance-theoretic model to human communication, claiming that all Gricean maxims can be reduced to the maxim of relation, since relevance is a natural feature of successful communication. This is outlined in the following section.

2.1.6 Relevance Theory

Tirkkonen-Condit (1992: 238) succinctly points out the essence of Relevance Theory by suggesting that it explains success in human communication in terms of two assumptions:

- a. human beings are able to infer what is meant by combining the information they derive from an ostensive stimulus such as an utterance, and the information they derive from their own cognitive context.
- b. human beings observe the relevance principle.

Relevance means the aim to achieve maximum benefit at minimum processing cost, which explains the economy of communication: "people say only what they judge relevant for the hearer at each point of communication" (ibid).

In the following sections, several important principles of Relevance Theory will be explained to illustrate how Relevance Theory works.

2.1.6.1 *Key principles of Relevance Theory*

As Blakemore (2001: 105) suggests, relevance is defined in terms of contextual effect and processing effort. Contextual effects include such things as adding new information, strengthening or eliminating an existing assumption; processing effort is the cost of accessing and using contextual assumptions in the derivation of contextual effects (ibid). When discussing contextual effects essential to the comprehension process, Sperber and Wilson (1995: 118) claim that:

“As a discourse proceeds, the hearer retrieves or constructs and then processes a number of assumptions. These form a gradually changing background against which new information is processed. Interpreting an utterance involves more than merely identifying the assumption explicitly expressed: it crucially involves working out the consequences of adding this assumption to a set of assumptions that have themselves already been processed. In other words, it involves seeing the contextual effects of this assumption in a context determined, at least in part, by earlier acts of comprehension.”

The degree of relevance is determined by contextual effects and processing effort. The greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance; the smaller the effort needed to achieve those effects, the greater the relevance. Thus, according to Levinson (1989: 459), “Relevance” (R) equals output over input:

$$R = \frac{E \text{ (number of contextual effects)}}{C \text{ (cost of effort involved in obtaining E)}}$$

Sperber and Wilson (1995: 158) define the principle of relevance as “every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance”. That is, when a person sets out to communicate something, he/she automatically communicates the presumption that what he/she is going to say is optimally relevant to the audience. An utterance is optimally relevant when it enables the audience to find the intended meaning without unnecessary processing effort and when that intended meaning provides adequate contextual effects (Gutt 1998: 43). The concept of optimal relevance is particularly important to the present study, because in Relevance Theory the comprehension procedure is defined in terms of the search for optimal relevance. That is, the hearer begins the interpretation process from information most readily available to him/her at the time (ibid). Then the hearer will proceed with the interpretation process until an interpretation is derived without unnecessary effort and yields adequate contextual effects (ibid: 44).

Furthermore, the notion of optimal relevance can be applied to translation. Gutt, who first applied Relevance Theory to translation in 1991, claims that labels referring to different kinds of communication such as novels and commentaries can guide the readers in their search for optimal relevance (1998: 46). For example, when given something called “a novel” to read, one would look for the plot, the way in which characters are portrayed, values, attitudes, etc., instead of historical accuracy, objectivity of presentation, quality and quantity of source materials used, etc., which would be found in a historical reference work (ibid: 46-7). Thus, such text-type labels can be helpful in guiding the readers towards the intended interpretation in a translation if they know the text type of the translation and are familiar with it. However, it should be noted that text types and genres are often mixed up, which will be clarified in Section 2.5.6.

2.1.6.2 Inference

Inference plays a significant role in Relevance Theory. Sperber and Wilson (1986) claim that we can communicate because we are capable of drawing inferences from one another’s behaviour. They define inference as “the process by which an assumption is accepted as true or probably true on the strength of the truth or probable truth of other assumptions. It is thus a form of fixation of belief” (1995: 68).

Gutt (1998: 41) illustrates the notion with the following example:

- A: Will Sarah be long?
- B: She is with Frank now.

Certain inferences can be made from the exchange based on some assumptions. If Frank is known to be very quick with people and deals with a matter in a few minutes, then A would gather from B’s answer that Sarah will not be long. However, if Frank is known to be someone who keeps people for a long time in his office, A would understand that Sarah would be long. Therefore, the success of communication depends on whether the hearer uses the right contextual information, i.e. whether Frank likes to keep people for a long time (ibid). However, the notion of context in Relevance Theory is different from the situational context discussed in Section 2.1.2.

2.1.6.3 Context

Context plays a significant role in Relevance Theory. According to Baker (2006: 323), a cognitive view of context tends to distinguish between what is in the world and what is in the mind of the language user or translator, stressing that context is the language

user's assumptions about what is in the world, rather than what is actually in the world. Thus, the concept of context in cognitive-based Relevance Theory is defined as follows (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 15-6):

A context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world. It is these assumptions, of course, rather than the actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance. A context in this sense is not limited to information about the immediate physical environment or the immediately preceding utterances: expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker, may all play a role in interpretation.

According to Hatim (2001: 37), an important characteristic of context in Relevance Theory is that various contextual assumptions exhibit variable degrees of accessibility, i.e. the contextual assumptions are not equally accessible by all individuals all the time. For example, if A in the above exchange (see Section 2.1.6.2) does not know what Frank is like, B's intended meaning would be highly inaccessible to A, whereas those who know Frank will immediately get the point.

2.1.6.4 *Explicit and implicit information*

In addition to inference and context, Relevance Theory also provides an account for explicit and implicit information. In Relevance Theory, explicit information (or explicature) is defined as "An assumption communicated by an utterance *U* is explicit if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by *U*" (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 182, original italics). That is, explicit information consists of the assumptions that can be logically deduced from the utterance. Implicit information (or implicature) is defined as an assumption implicitly communicated by an utterance (ibid). However, Shiro (1994: 171) argues that there is no clear-cut division between the implicit and the explicit, only degrees of explicitness or implicitness. Hence, more explicit information is closer to the textual information, while less explicit information relies more on the reader's contextual knowledge (ibid).

Gutt (1992: 33-4) claims that Relevance Theory offers an explanation of how implicit information is recovered: it is the search for optimal relevance that leads to the recognition of implicit information. Furthermore, Relevance Theory explains why there is such a thing as implicit information: to convey information implicitly rather than explicitly is a very economical way of communication. Thus, the use of implicit information is well motivated within a cost-sensitive model of human communication.

Relevance Theory provides a theoretical account of human communication, but it has its limitations too. As Mey (2001: 85) points out, Relevance Theory is a minimalist theory of communication, which claims that relevance is all we need to achieve successful communication. However, it is argued that the notion of relevance is so encompassing that it loses its explanatory force (ibid). Moreover, Relevance Theory, as a communication theory, says little about real communicative interaction as it happens in our society (ibid). Another limitation is that Relevance Theory does not take into consideration cultural and social dimensions, such as age, gender, status and nationality (Cutting 2002:44).

The speech act theory, the cooperative principle, and Relevance Theory all make great contribution to the study of coherence, but they have their own advantages and disadvantages in describing and explaining what coherence is. Thus, the present study aims to examine to what extent these approaches can be used to explain the audience's comprehension process in subtitling, especially when connectives are reduced in subtitles.

In the following sections, two concepts will be examined. One refers to various definitions and classifications of connectives proposed by scholars and their role in contributing (or not) to cohesion and coherence. The other is the intricate relationship between cohesion and coherence. The present study distinguishes connectives from discourse markers and mainly focuses on the former.

2.2 Connectives or Discourse Markers?

It is generally believed that discourse markers or connectives indicate connections in discourse. However, Schourup (1999: 228) suggests that there has been no consensus on the issues of how to term and classify the linguistic expressions which he refers to as "discourse markers", which are also known by a variety of other names, e.g. pragmatic particles, discourse particles, pragmatic markers, pragmatic operators, pragmatic connectives, inference particles, cue words, and discourse connectives. Moreover, Jucker and Ziv (1998: 1) claim that the functions of discourse markers include "discourse connectors, turn-takers, confirmation-seekers, intimacy signals, topic-switchers, hesitation markers, boundary markers, fillers, prompters, repair markers, attitude markers, and hedging devices", which further contribute to the terminological confusion. Some researchers use different terms for the same list of connectives or

discourse markers, whereas some use the same term for a different list. In some cases, connectives and discourse markers are used interchangeably, while in other cases, they are not. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the terms “connectives” and “discourse markers” are distinguished according to their meanings and functions on a functional linguistic basis. In the following sections, connectives and discourse markers will be defined and compared.

2.2.1 Connectives

Connectives are defined as logical connectors that are words or short phrases that link clauses or sentences in the present study. Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that an important function of connectives is that they explicitly specify a particular semantic relationship between two clauses or sentences.

According to van Dijk (1977: 52), connectives are a set of expressions from various syntactic categories that express relations between propositions or facts, and there are five groups of connectives. The first group consists of conjunctions, both coordinating and subordinating, e.g. *and* and *because*, whose function is to make composite sentences from simple sentences. The second group is formed by sentential adverbs, such as *yet* and *consequently*, which also make sentences out of sentences. It seems that the sentential adverbs suggested by van Dijk are conjunctive adverbs (“conjuncts”) such as *besides* and *however*, which connect the host utterance to the preceding discourse, rather than disjuncts such as *unfortunately* and *suddenly*, which comment on either the content (“attitudinal disjuncts”) or the character (“style disjuncts”) of their host utterance. The third group is made of prepositions with a “connective” character, like *due to* and *in spite of*. The fourth group of connectives is that of interjections and particles like *you know* and *isn't it*. The last group of connectives may be expressed by predicates of various categories, e.g. nouns, verbs, adjectives, and by phrases and clauses: *conclusion*, *alternative*, *to concede*, *it follows that*, etc. (ibid). Like conjunctions and sentential adverbs, these phrases and clauses also serve a connective function in sentences. However, this classification seems to overlap with that of so-called “discourse markers”, because some conjunctions, sentential adverbs, interjections and particles are also regarded as “discourse markers” by some theorists. Nonetheless, for the purpose of the present study, the fuzzy line between connectives and discourse markers needs to be clarified. If connectives are words or phrases that link clauses or sentences, then what are discourse markers?

2.2.2 Discourse markers

According to Schiffrin (1987: 31), discourse markers are “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”. The list of discourse markers proposed by Schiffrin is as follows:

oh, well, but, and, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, y’know, see, look, listen, here, there, why, gosh, boy, this is the point, what I mean is, anyway, whatever

Nevertheless, the scope of discourse markers defined by Schiffrin seems to “constitute a rather heterogeneous group, comprising coordinating and subordinating conjunctions such as *and* and *because*, parenthetical clauses such as *you know* and *I mean*”, temporal and conjunctive adverbs such as *now* and *so*, and (not so easily categorized) particles like *oh* and *well*” (Hansen 1998: 24).

In view of this wide variety of discourse markers, Fraser (2006) narrows down the scope of discourse markers by classifying them as one of pragmatic markers. He defines pragmatic markers as “part of a discourse segment but are not part of the propositional content of the message conveyed, and they do not contribute to the meaning of the proposition per se” (ibid: 189). Furthermore, they are classified not syntactically but in term of their semantic/pragmatic functions (ibid). The four types of pragmatic markers proposed by Fraser (2006) are illustrated below (with the pragmatic maker in boldface type):

- Basic pragmatic markers signal the type of message (the illocutionary type) the speaker intends to convey in the utterance:

***I promise** that I will be on time.*

- Commentary pragmatic markers provide a comment on the basic message:

We got lost almost immediately.

***Fortunately**, a police officer happened to pass by.*

- Parallel pragmatic markers signal a message separate from the basic message:

***Well**, we would do it either of two ways.*

- Discourse markers signal a relation between the discourse segment which Hosts them and the prior discourse segment:

*John can't go. **And** Mary can't go either.*

Fraser (ibid: 191) defines discourse markers as: “For a sequence of discourse segments S1-S2, each of which encodes a complete message, a lexical expression LE functions as

a discourse marker if, when it occurs in S2-initial position (S1-LE+S2), LE signals that a semantic relationship holds between S2 and S1 which is one of: a. elaboration; b. contrast; c. inference; or d. temporality”. He proposes four types of discourse markers: contrastive, elaborative, inferential, and temporal markers (ibid: 196-7), which are generally consistent with the four types of conjunctions proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976): additive, adversative, causal and temporal. The term “conjunctions” used by Halliday and Hasan generally encompass the meaning of connectives as words or expressions that combine two clauses to make their relation explicit. The two classifications are illustrated in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Classifications of Connectives

Type of conjunctions (Halliday and Hasan 1976)	Type of discourse markers (Fraser 2006)	Examples
Additive	Elaborative	and, above all, or, for example, furthermore
Adversative	Contrastive	yet, though, but, however, instead, in contrast
Causal	Inferential	because, so, since, therefore, consequently
Temporal	Temporal	next, meanwhile, at first, originally, finally

However, while small words that are often regarded as discourse markers, e.g. *oh*, *well*, *I mean*, *you know* and *now*, are excluded from the list of discourse markers and classified as “parallel pragmatic markers” by Fraser (2006), Halliday and Hasan (1976) call them “continuatives” and group them into another type of conjunction (see Table 2.2 for the classifications of discourse markers and examples). They suggest that although continuatives do not express any one of the additive, adversative, causal or temporal relations, they play a cohesive role in the text (1976: 267).

Table 2.2: Classifications of discourse markers

Halliday and Hasan 1976	Fraser 2006	Examples
Continuative	Parallel pragmatic markers-- conversational management markers	well, oh, now, anyway, yeah, right, I mean, you know, look, listen

The overview of various definitions and classifications seems to suggest that there is little difference between connectives and discourse markers. Nonetheless, some scholars

tend to differentiate between the two. Pander Maat and Sanders (2006: 33) argue that discourse markers and connectives are different in several respects. Connectives may be either truth-functional or non-truth functional and may be tightly connected to the sentence syntactically, while discourse markers are commonly regarded as not affecting the truth conditions of their host utterances and only loosely connected to their host sentences syntactically. In broad terms, a truth function is a function that determines the truth or falsity of a statement. Each logical connective investigated by this study represents a truth function. By contrast, non-truth-functional connectors such as discourse markers as defined by the present study cannot determine the truth or falsity of a statement. Common examples of connectives are *because* and *but*, and examples of discourse markers are *well* and *you know*. Furthermore, the degree of syntactic integration seems to be the defining feature for deciding what connectives or discourse markers are (ibid).

Fischer (2006) proposes the idea of “integratedness” to account for the variability of the spectrum of approaches to the study of discourse particles/markers. She suggests that one end of the spectrum focuses on items that constitute parts of utterances such as connectives (e.g. *so* and *because*) as defined in the study; the other end focuses on completely unintegrated items that may constitute independent utterances such as feedback signals or interjections (e.g. *well* and *oh*), i.e. discourse markers as defined in the study (ibid: 8). Moreover, approaches that focus on integrated items usually study their connecting function, while approaches that focus on unintegrated items mainly address the roles discourse markers may play in the management of conversation, such as sequential structure of dialogue, turn-taking, speech management, and interpersonal management (ibid: 9), and hence it may be assumed that discourse markers mostly occur in conversation. As McCarthy (1991: 49) suggests, in a lot of spoken data, some conjunctions (e.g. *and*, *but*, *so*, and *then*) are not only used to link individual utterances within turns, but often at the beginning of turns so as to link one speaker’s turn with another speaker’s, link back to an earlier turn of the current speaker, or mark a shift in topic. In this sense, the conjunctions should be regarded as “discourse markers”, because they organise and manage quite extended stretches of discourse (ibid).

Furthermore, it may be argued that the integratedness of connectives and discourse makers reflects their respective scope, i.e. the type and the size of the discourse segment hosting them. That is, the discourse segment hosting a connective is defined in

grammatical terms, e.g. a clause, a sentence, a noun phrase, etc., and connectives forms parts of sentences. By contrast, discourse markers are linguistic items of variable scope, which means that the discourse segment hosting a discourse marker is defined in terms of discourse units of almost any size or form, e.g. a turn, an utterance, a series of sentences, etc. (Hansen 1998: 73). Moreover, discourse markers may constitute utterances themselves, e.g. “Oh!”, “Well...”, “Okay.”, etc. Hence, it may be argued that a connective is syntactically more integrated into the discourse segment that hosts it than a discourse marker.

Following this distinction, the present study focuses on connectives such as conjunctions (e.g. *and* and *because*), conjunctive adverbs (e.g. *consequently* and *nevertheless*), and prepositional phrases (e.g. *due to* and *in the end*), and they are classified into four types: additive, adversative, causal and temporal, as suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Furthermore, some connectives are multifunctional and polysemic, e.g. *and*, *so*, *since*, and *then*. Among them, the connective *and* that has the most general meaning is the focus of the study.

2.2.3 *And—polysemy and multifunctionality*

Connectives do not stand in a simple one-to-one relationship with a particular cohesive relation. For example, *and* can occur between sentences which exhibit any one of the four relations mentioned in Section 2.2.2, although it is usually considered as an additive connective which merely elaborates or extends what has been said. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 930-2), there are eight types of relations connoted by *and*, which are illustrated below (an adverbial is inserted to make the relationship explicit):

- a. The second clause is a **consequence** or **result** of the first:

He heard an explosion *and* he (*therefore*) phoned the police.

- b. The second clause is a chronologically **sequent** to the first:

I washed the dishes *and* (*then*) I dried them.

- c. The second clause introduces a **contrast**:

Robert is secretive *and* (*in contrast*) David is candid.

- d. The second clause is felt to be surprising in view of the first, so that the first clause has a **concessive** force:

She tried hard *and* (*yet*) she failed.

- e. The first clause is a **condition** of the second:

Give me some money *and* (*then*) I'll help you escape.

The implication of the sentence can be paraphrased as:

If you give me some money (then) I'll help you escape.

f. The second clause makes a point **similar** to the first:

A trade agreement should be no problem, *and (similarly)* a cultural exchange could be easily arranged.

g. The second clause is a “pure” **addition** to the first, the only requirement being that two statements are congruent in meaning:

He has long hair *and (also)* he often wears jeans.

h. Similar to (g) is a sentence in which the second clause adds an appended **comment** on or **explanation** of the first:

They dislike John—*and* that's not surprising in view of his behaviour.

Examples (f)-(h) illustrate *and* as an additive connective that merely adds something to the first clause. However, as examples (a)-(e) show, *and* may connote different types of relations other than addition. According to the explicitation hypothesis proposed by Blum-Kulka (1986), the source text in translation tends to be more explicit than the target text, and this explicitation can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesiveness in the target text. Therefore, it may be assumed that the relations *and* connotes will be “explicitly” translated in the target text. That is, the meaning of *and* may be made clearer in translation. As illustrated in examples (a)-(e), *and* may be explicitly translated as *therefore*, *then*, *in contrast*, *yet*, or *if...then*. Furthermore, it may be argued that because *and* connotes a large number of meanings, its actual meaning in a sentence has to be inferred as opposed to being read off directly from the text.

On the other hand, *and* does not simply function as a connective. In spoken discourse, it also serves as a filler word to hold the floor for the speaker to indicate that he/she is about to say something more (Kroll 1977: 95, cited in Beaman 1984: 47). Moreover, Peng (2006: 102) suggests that when *and* is combined with a conjunctive word or phrase in examples like “and so...” and “and in addition...”, it is regarded as an “empty” marker, because it is “so” and “in addition” that marks the relation, not “and”. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that when *and* functions as a filler word or a continuative, it is usually not translated in the target text. In the present study, the function of *and* and how it is translated in subtitling were investigated, and it will be discussed in Chapter 3. Moreover, connectives are generally believed to be linking devices that indicate cohesion and coherence.

2.3 Cohesion in Text and Coherence in Mind

According to Hoey (1991:12), "...cohesion is a property of the text and [...] coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text. In other words, cohesion is objective, capable in principle of automatic recognition, while coherence is subjective and judgments concerning it may vary from reader to reader". The relationship between cohesion and coherence can be further illustrated by the following example:

A dog came into my room.
So I plugged it in and switched it on.

The example is cohesive by the presence of the connective "so", but it is not coherent. How can you plug a dog in and switch it on? It may be argued that coherence is a process of making sense, which in turn leads to comprehension, but this example does not make any sense, at least not without additional background assumptions. Thus, it may be argued that formal connection is not a necessary condition for a text to be coherent, and it is coherence in mind that leads to comprehension. The present study adopts the view that cohesion is a textual phenomenon, and coherence is a mental phenomenon that exists in the mind of the reader.

2.3.1 *Connectedness in text and mind*

While many researchers put emphasis on either cohesion or coherence, some seem to work towards the integration of the two notions. Enkvist (1989: 375) proposes the term "connexity" to cover the sum total of cohesion and coherence. Cohesion refers to linguistic devices that link clauses and sentences, e.g. ellipsis and conjunction, while coherence refers to those linking mechanisms that manifest themselves through semantic relations and inference rather than overt linguistic elements such as pronouns, articles, and deictics (ibid: 374). He suggests that "connexity" is synonymous with "interpretability", and a text is interpretable and understandable only when there is a certain amount of structuring in a text (ibid: 375). That is, both textual cohesion and inferential coherence are needed in the interpretation and comprehension of a text. The relation between cohesion and coherence is complementary. If coherence is low, cohesion will need to increase to keep the text interpretable, and vice versa.

Furthermore, Enkvist (1989) claims that the notion of interpretability brings the issue of the role of the reader. That is, certain texts can be perfectly meaningful to some readers but difficult to others. A professional text on medicine can be readily interpretable by a person with the proper background, but difficult to a lay person. Hence, it may be

argued that the reader's background knowledge contributes to inferential coherence, which in turn enhances the interpretability of the text. McNamara et al. (1996) investigated the interactions among text cohesiveness, readers' background knowledge, and levels of understanding. They found that readers who know little about the domain of the text benefit from a cohesive text (with connectives present), while high-knowledge readers benefit from a minimally cohesive text (with connectives absent), and argued that the less cohesive text forces the knowledgeable readers to engage in compensatory processing to infer unstated relations in the text (ibid). Therefore, it is possible for readers to understand a less cohesive text by drawing inferences, and the degree of interpretability is partially determined by their background knowledge.

2.3.2 The role of connectives in cohesion and coherence

The role of connectives in the interpretability of a text seems to be less obvious than their role in the cohesion of a text. According to Spooren and Sanders (2006: 4), "Connectives play an important role in that they guide the hearer or reader in constructing a coherent representation of the discourse by signalling what relation holds between two discourse segments". Nevertheless, there has been no consensus on the role of connectives in "signaling what relation holds between two discourse segments" (cohesion) and "constructing a coherent representation of the discourse" (coherence). The role of connectives in cohesion is obvious. Connectives contribute to textual cohesion by marking semantic relations explicitly, and a text without connectives is not considered cohesive. Furthermore, it is suggested that some connectives contain more semantic information than others:

"Semantically, linkage may be placed on a scale of cohesiveness: the most cohesive signals are connectives like *therefore*, which makes a fairly explicit relation between two clauses: that of reason. *And*, on the other hand, is the vaguest of connectives—it might be called a 'general purpose link,' in that it merely says that two ideas have a positive connection, and leaves the reader to work out what it is" (Leech & Short 1981:250, cited in Øverås 1998: 7).

That is, connectives with more semantic information like *therefore* make the relation between two clauses more explicit than connectives with less semantic and vague information like *and*. Consequently, in subtitling, it may be assumed that connectives with less semantic information are more likely to be reduced than connectives with more information when subtitles need to be more concise than their originals due to time and space constraints.

However, the role of connectives seems to be less obvious in coherence, because connectives are related to the surface structure of texts, while coherence is a mental phenomenon which cannot be identified in the same way as cohesion (Thompson 2004: 179). In this respect, many researchers have conducted reading experiments to investigate the relationship between connectives and coherence/comprehension.

To the best of my knowledge, no researchers have conducted reading experiments on Chinese connectives except Wu and Liu (1986) and Chan (2005). Their studies showed that connectives facilitate reading comprehension. Furthermore, Chan (2005) found that the absence of adversative and causal connectives (e.g. 但是[*dan-shi*] (*but*) and 因此[*yin-ci*] (*therefore*) makes a sentence the least readable or the most difficult to understand. Both studies focused on the reading of individual sentences, rather than a text. However, it may be argued that the role of connectives in reading comprehension should be examined in a text since we usually read a text, not a sentence. In addition, both studies examined only a small number of connectives such as 而且[*er-que*] (*and*), 但是[*dan-shi*] (*but*), 或者[*huo-zhe*] (*or*), 所以[*suo-yi*] (*so*), 因為[*yin-wei*] (*because*), 以後[*yi-hou*] (*then*). Hence, a more comprehensive study of Chinese connectives is needed to understand their role in text comprehension. Moreover, a Chinese connective and its English dictionary equivalent may not perform exactly the same function, because of differences in lexical coverage and preferred rhetorical structure (parataxis vs. hypotaxis) between the two languages. Chinese is a language characterised by highly paratactic constructions, i.e. the tendency to use fewer connectives, while English is characterised by hypotactic structure and tends to use more connectives (Chen 1997: 112-113). In contrast to Chinese connectives, the role of English connectives in the reading process has been extensively studied. In the following sections, all reading experiments discussed are based on English.

2.3.3 Connectives and comprehension

Some studies on English connectives have shown that different types of connectives affect reading comprehension differently (Goldman and Murray 1992, Murray 1995, Murray 1997). Several studies have found that connectives have a negative impact on reading comprehension, because they make the sentences longer and increase working memory load (Millis et al. 1993). However, many reading experiments have confirmed that connectives facilitate reading comprehension (Millis and Just 1994, Sanders and

Noordman 2000). That is, the presence of connectives in text may decrease reading time and improve content recall. Degand et al. (1999) found that connectives do facilitate reading comprehension, and that the reason why their findings are diverging from those of Millis et al.'s (1993) experiments is that their experiments were different in terms of text length and types of connectives used. The two studies will be examined next to shed light on the problems of these reading experiments.

2.3.3.1 Positive or negative impact of connectives?

Millis et al. (1993) investigated the influence of connectives on memory for expository text and focused on three types of connectives: temporal (*before/and then*), causal (*which caused/which enabled*), and intentional markers (*in order that/so that*). The subjects read four expository paragraphs which described a process or mechanism, and all paragraphs contained seven statements. Contrary to the claim that connectives help make a cohesive text and aid in the formation of coherent text representation (Halliday and Hasan 1976), they found that the presence of connectives does not facilitate memory for text, one measure of text comprehension, in their reading experiments. Instead, texts without connectives result in slightly greater recall than texts containing connectives. According to Millis et al. (1993: 335), this is because the connectives constrain readers from generating additional elaborations beyond the explicit connectives. That is, the readers need not further process text information when connectives are present. In contrast, when connectives are absent, readers have to generate elaborations by themselves, and the additional process may in turn help them to recall better.

On the other hand, Degand et al. (1999) found that connectives significantly improve comprehension. They investigated the impact of causal markers (*so/because*) of coherence on the comprehension of expository discourse. The experimental material consisted of ten expository texts of approximately 200 words. All texts were based on original encyclopedic or popular scientific articles. Contrary to Millis et al.'s (1993) findings, they found that texts with connectives lead to a better comprehension performance than texts without connectives. The contradictory findings of the two studies show that text types, text length, definitions and types of connectives may lead to different results. Consequently, the effect of connectives on reading comprehension may vary from one text to another, and it still needs further investigation. Furthermore, many studies found that different types of connectives affect reading comprehension

differently, and three of them that are particularly relevant to the study will be discussed in the following sections.

2.3.3.2 The facilitation level of connectives

Goldman and Murray (1992) conducted cloze tests and asked college students to fill in missing logical connectors in expository passages with the four connective types. It was found that temporal connectors and adversatives were more difficult to select correctly by the subjects than additives and causals (ibid). They argue that this is because temporals are used to signal a more diverse set of logical relations (e.g. temporal sequence, enumeration, summary, and conclusion) and often refer to a larger discourse context (ibid: 506). As to adversatives, it is argued that an adversative relation may require a more complex backward search and computation of the meaning of surrounding content than a causal or additive relation (ibid: 517).

Furthermore, they found that temporals were more difficult to select correctly than adversatives, because the former often signal the general organisation of discourse, which is believed to be more important to comprehension than the local sentence-to-sentence context provided by other types of connectives. As to additives and causals, it was found that additives did not differ significantly from causals, although additives were considered the least constraining connectives that merely elaborate previous content and had been assumed to be the easiest to select (ibid). Hence, according to Goldman and Murray, temporals and adversatives are more important to text processing than causals and additives. The facilitation level of the four connective types may be formulated as follows (the sign “<” means “less than”):

additive/causal < adversative < temporal

2.3.3.3 The constraint level of connectives

Murray (1995) proposes a processing model which assumes that different types of connectives have different constraint levels on text processing. He claims that adversatives are highly constrained in that they specify that the subsequent text is to contrast or limit the scope of the content of the preceding text (ibid: 120). Causals are moderately constrained because the subsequent text may be related in several ways to the preceding text, e.g. cause and effect, while additives are highly unconstrained because they signify that the subsequent text merely elaborates or extends what has been said (ibid). Thus, connectives with a high constraint level like adversatives will

most likely reduce reading time (ibid: 121). Connectives with a moderate constraint level like causals will lead to a moderate facilitation level, while connectives with a highly unconstrained level like additives will lead to very little facilitation due to their low level of semantic constraints (ibid). In other words, the higher the constraint level, the higher the facilitation level (ibid: 121):

additive < causal < adversative

Murray (1995) conducted reading experiments to test the assumptions of the model. Subjects were asked to read two-sentence narratives that depicted one of three relations: additive, causal and adversative, either with connectives present or absent (ibid: 109). It was found that only adversatives facilitate text processing by reducing reading time (ibid: 119). Causals were found to be an important indicator in narratives, signalling the reader to pay greater attention to the target sentence, while the presence of an additive did not increase or decrease reading time compared to a condition where the connective was absent (ibid). Thus, the findings were generally consistent with the model's assumptions.

2.3.3.4 *The continuity hypothesis*

Similarly, Murray (1997) investigated how different types of connectives facilitate reading comprehension differently and proposed the continuity hypothesis. He argues that readers tend to interpret sentences in a narrative in a continuous manner, while discontinuity is an exception rather than a rule in readers' interpreting process. Examples of discontinuity include an abrupt topic change, a surprising turn of events, and a violation of an expectation created in the previous text (ibid: 228). Thus, signals of discontinuity such as adversatives play a more facilitating role in text processing than signals of continuity like additives and causals (ibid: 235).

Furthermore, Murray (ibid: 230) suggests that when connectives are absent between sentence pairs, readers tend to interpret the sentences first with causals followed by additives. Thus, the facilitation level of additives, causals, and adversatives may be ordered as follows:

additive < causal < adversative

Thus, when the findings of the facilitation level, the constraint level, and the continuity hypothesis of connectives are combined (Goldman and Murray 1992, Murray 1995, and

Murray 1997), the facilitation level of the four types of connectives may be formulated as follows:

additive < causal < adversative < temporal

One of the present study's aims is to investigate whether reduction of connectives in subtitling is systematic or random. Therefore, the above facilitation level of connectives is used to examine whether the reduction of connectives during subtitling shows similar tendency. That is, it is hypothesised that highly unconstrained connectives like additives will more likely be omitted since subtitles need to be clear and concise, while adversatives and temporals will more likely be translated due to their importance in text processing. Nonetheless, it is important to note that *and* is not considered as a "pure" additive due to its polysemy and multifunctionality, and hence it is not classified as any type of connectives in the study.

In the following sections, several issues concerning subtitling such as features and constraints, text reduction, and text typology will be reviewed to further explore the effects of reduction, especially the reduction of connectives, on audience comprehension in subtitling.

2.4 Features and Constraints of Subtitling

According to Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 9), subtitling is characterised by the interaction of sound, image and subtitles, the viewer's ability to read both the image and the written text at a particular speed, the actual size of the screen, the synchrony of subtitles, image and dialogue, a semantically adequate account of the SL dialogue, and sufficient display time of subtitles on screen. These features may constrain the translator in the subtitling process. As de Linde (1995:11-2) suggests, the translator may be textually constrained by the presence of the additional visual component (image) and the switch from oral to written discourse.

2.4.1 *Technical constraints: time and space*

The translator is constrained by time and space. Guardini (1998: 98) states that the presentation time of subtitles is dictated by four factors:

- a. the duration of the utterance in the original version;
- b. the reading speed of the viewers (the subtitles need to be readable even to slow readers);

- c. the visual information given on the screen, which needs to be perceived clearly by the viewers, and
- d. the editing style adopted in the film.

The presentation time of subtitles is largely dictated by the reading speed of the viewers. According to Hervey and Higgins (1992: 159), in order for the subtitles to be readable, one line of subtitle requires at least two seconds' viewing time, and two lines of subtitle require at least four seconds. As for the space, the size of a television screen (in combination with the minimum letter-size legible to the average viewer) limits the number of English characters to about 35 per line with a maximum of two lines (Gottlieb 1992: 164). In the case of Chinese subtitles, the rule of thumb is 12 to 16 characters for one-line subtitles, and no more than 24 characters for two-line subtitles. As a result of time and space constraints, subtitles are inevitably subject to reduction. On the other hand, as Gottlieb (1994: 265) suggests, "the translator is constrained by, and in some situations supported by, other communicative channels present", e.g. image and sound.

2.4.2 Multiple semiotic channels

The subtitler is constrained and helped by the synchronous presence of sound, image and subtitles, because subtitling differs from other types of translation in several aspects semiotically. Semiotics is the study of signs and symbols as elements of communicative behaviour such as language, gestures, or clothing. From the perspectives of semiotics, Gottlieb (1992, 2004) defines subtitling as:

- a. **prepared** communication
- b. using **written** language
- c. acting as an **additive**
- d. and **synchronous** semiotic channel,
- e. as part of a **transient**
- f. and **polysemiotic** text.

First, subtitles are prepared and cued in advance. Second, subtitles are presented in a written form and added to the original with the source language being maintained. As a result, the viewers may listen to the source language and read the subtitles at the same time. Third, the terms "synchronous" and "transient" refers to the fact that subtitles are in sync with the original and cannot be re-read by the viewers.

Finally, Gottlieb's definition takes into account the fact that subtitling involves more than one semiotic system, and the total message of polysemiotic texts like subtitled films is conveyed through at least two parallel channels, such as visual and auditory channels. According to Gottlieb (1994: 265), the subtitler has to consider four simultaneous channels when translating films and TV programmes:

- a. the verbal auditory channel: dialogue, background voices, and sometimes lyrics;
- b. the non-verbal auditory channel: music, natural sound, and sound effects;
- c. the verbal visual channel: captions, superimposed titles, and written signs on the screen;
- d. the non-verbal visual channel: gestures, facial expressions, and picture composition and flow.

The four channels work together to form a complete semiotic context for subtitling, but they present a challenge to the subtitler: How to accommodate these channels in limited time and space? It is impossible for the subtitler to subtitle everything in films and television, and inevitably some elements need to be eliminated, which in turn may lead to loss of meaning. However, the audience is not only reading subtitles in the viewing process. They are, at the same time, taking information from other audiovisual channels such as image and sound, which enable them to supplement the content of the subtitles. Consequently, the subtitler is both constrained and supported by the presence of these audiovisual channels. Hence, it may be hypothesised that reduction in subtitling may not necessarily lead to information loss when the polysemiotic nature of subtitling is taken into consideration.

2.4.3 Crossover between spoken and written mode

Another important feature and/or constraint of subtitling that is particularly relevant to the present study is the transfer of both modes and languages. Subtitling that involves translation between two languages crosses over from speech in SL to writing in TL, thus changing both mode and language. According to Brown and Yule (1983: 15), spoken language contains many incomplete sentences and little subordination, and hence is much less structured than written language. Moreover, in written language, relationships between clauses are often marked by *that* complementisers, *when/while* temporal markers, logical connectives like *besides*, *moreover*, *however*, etc., while in spoken

language, relationships between clauses are often not marked by connectives (ibid: 16). In other words, the speaker is typically less explicit than the writer, e.g. *I'm so tired, (because)I had to walk all the way home* (*because* is often omitted), while the writer uses more rhetorical organisers like *firstly* and *in conclusion* (ibid). In addition, the speaker uses a large number of fillers like *well, I think, you know*, etc. that are not used in writing (ibid: 17). Typical features of spoken and written discourse are illustrated in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Spoken vs. written discourse

Spoken Discourse	Written Discourse
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Paralinguistic effects: intonation, accent, gesture ➤ Immediate, transitory ➤ Spontaneous, unplanned ➤ Interactive, face-to-face ➤ Less structured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fragments -Simple, active, declarative -More fillers: <i>well, you know, by the way</i> -Non-fluency: false starts, backtracking, repetitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Graphic effects only ➤ Permanent ➤ Edited, planned ➤ Non-interactive ➤ More structured: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Full sentences -Complex sentences -More structural markers: <i>firstly, more importantly, in conclusion</i> -Fluency

The distinction between speech and writing can be further illustrated by the closeness-distance continuum, in that spoken language involves communicative closeness and written language, communicative distance (Koch and Österreicher 1990, cited in Hansen 1998: 92). According to Hansen (ibid: 95), extreme communicative closeness involves face-to-face interaction between two interlocutors and is mainly characterised by complete privacy, a large degree of intimacy, emotional involvement, cooperation, dependency on the situational context, turn-taking, and free topics. On the other hand, extreme communicative distance involves a large anonymous audience, separated in time and space from the communicator, and no opportunity to cooperate directly in the production of the discourse.

Hervey and Higgins (1992: 159) suggest that a subtitle is “an excellent example of crossover between an oral ST and a written TT”, and such crossover is of vital importance for minimizing translation loss. The reason is that the translator usually

wants to produce a TT that keeps some of the characteristics of the oral style of the ST, e.g. social register, tonal register, dialect, and sociolect, so that the ST speaker will not “talk like a book” due to an over-polished TT. Thus, compromise has to be made between making the subtitles easily readable as a written text and injecting into them features of an oral discourse (ibid). Nevertheless, due to the transfer from spoken to written mode in subtitling, some characteristics of spontaneous speech such as paralinguistic features are inevitably filtered out, e.g. intonation, stress, pitch, accent, attitude, and voice quality (tense, relaxed, whispered, husky, etc.). Moreover, it seems that since speech tends to be more fragmented and writing is more integrated, less structured features in spoken language like false starts, overlaps, hesitations, incomplete sentences, repetitions, and self-corrections are often reorganised to form complete sentences in the subtitling process of transferring speech to writing. Therefore, it may be argued that the subtitles would be inevitably “read more like a book” due to the change of mode from speech to writing. As Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 145) suggest, “the written version of speech in subtitles is nearly always a reduced form of the oral ST”.

2.5 Text Reduction in Subtitling

Bravo (2004: 217) suggests that text reduction in subtitling entails omitting anything that the subtitler considers not necessary for understanding a film or clear to viewers because of what they are seeing on the screen, which includes tautologies, repetitions, hesitations, characters’ names, and references to screen gestures and visual expression. Inevitable reduction in subtitling leads to several subtitling strategies¹ that may not be found in other types of translation. Gottlieb (1992) proposes ten subtitling strategies: expansion, paraphrase, transfer, imitation, transcription, dislocation, condensation, decimation, deletion, and resignation, but not all of these involve reduction, such as expansion and paraphrase (see Table 2.4).

¹ There are terminology conflicts in this field. Different scholars use different terms for the same concept. For example, what Gottlieb calls “strategies”, Fawcett would call “techniques” and Van Leuven-Zwart would call “shifts”.

Table 2.4: Subtitling strategies

Type of strategy	Character of translation	Amount of translating	Examples	Media specific
1. Expansion	expanded expression	adequate	culture-specific references etc.	no
2. Paraphrase	altered expression	adequate	non-visualised language-specific phenomena	no
3. Transfer	Full expression	adequate	neutral discourse--slow tempo	no
4. Imitation	identical expression	equivalent	proper nouns, international greetings etc.	no
5. Transcription	anomalous expression	adequate	non-standard speech etc.	yes
6. Dislocation	differing expression	adjusted	musical or visualised language-specific phenomena	yes
7. Condensation	condensed expression	concise	normal speech	yes
8. Decimation	abridged expression	reduced content	fast speech of some importance	yes
9. Deletion	omitted expression	no verbal content	fast speech of less importance	yes
10. Resignation	differing expression	distorted content	untranslatable elements	no

According to Gottlieb (*ibid*), Types 1-6 provide adequate and equivalent translation, whereas Types 7-9 are common subtitling strategies that involve partial or total reduction of words. Type 10 is often found in situations where the translator cannot render tricky idioms and other culture/language-specific elements. Aiming to study reduction in subtitling, the present study focuses on condensation, decimation (partial reduction), and deletion (total reduction), because they are often associated with reduced subtitles and hence possible information loss in subtitling.

Condensation is considered the major strategy of subtitling, because subtitling involves transfer from spoken language to written language, and within a given time a much larger volume of text can be absorbed aurally than visually (Kruger 2001, 177). Perego (2003: 75) claims that although reduction strategies often leads to the loss of message portions, words, (socio)linguistic nuances, etc., it may “trigger the information gain, and not loss”, because what is left out in subtitles is generally unimportant, whereas whatever is added due to reduction is always vital. Table 2.5 illustrates an example of condensation strategy (*ibid*: 83).

Table 2.5: Condensation strategy

Original dialogue in Hungarian	Subtitles in Italian
Luca: [...] Na, Irénke jöjjön segítsen nekem. Lenn hagytam egy kosarat, nem tudtam egyedül felhozni.	L: Mi aiuti, per favore L: Ho lasciato giù un cesto molto pesante
English translation	English translation
Luca: [...]Well, Irénke, come help me. I've left a basket downstairs. I couldn't fetch it up alone.	L: Help me, please L: I left a very heavy basket downstairs.

In this example, the utterance “I couldn’t fetch it up alone” is compressed into an adjective phrase “very heavy” and added to the utterance “I’ve left a basket downstairs”. It may be argued that the English translation *I left a very heavy basket downstairs* conveys the same meaning of the original with fewer words, i.e. “I need someone to help me with the basket”. According to Perego (2003), the condensation of information by deleting unnecessary information leads to more readable subtitles, which in turn may facilitate comprehension. Moreover, although decimation and deletion lead to drastic cuts in the number of words, the translated version as a whole often manage to convey the message. For example, forms of address (e.g. “*Emily*, are you OK?” and “It’s alright, *Mr. Johnson.*”) can be deleted without causing information loss when they are used to get attention or maintain/reinforce social relationships.

Furthermore, researchers have studied text reduction in subtitling from several perspectives, such as quantitative reduction, Relevance Theory, and language functions, which will be discussed in the following sections.

2.5.1 Quantitative reduction

In recent years, much research has focused on quantitative reduction in subtitling. For example, Georgakopoulou (2003) systematically analysed the percentages of reduction in different film genres and found that the degree of reduction was determined by genre, context, speed of delivery, etc. However, Gambier (1994: 278) argues that reduction in the number of words does not necessarily mean that the quality of subtitling is reduced. Thus, not only the quantitative aspect of reductions but also the qualitative aspect of reductions in subtitling should be emphasized so as to gain deeper insight into the process of subtitling.

2.5.2 Reduction and Relevance Theory

Kovačič (1994) proposes that Relevance Theory may be used as a theoretical framework to explain the principles of the reductions in subtitling. It was found that the principles of Relevance Theory were useful to provide a systemic explanation for the reduction in subtitling:

“When the subtitler is short for [*sic*] space, he/she evaluates the relative relevance of individual segments of a given message. Relying on the viewers’ ability to apply adequate cognitive schemata or frames and to draw on either previous information in the story or their general knowledge of the world, the subtitler leaves out the part of the message he/she considers the least relevant for understanding the message in question, for perceiving the atmosphere of a situation or the relationship among the participants involved, and eventually for the general understanding and reception of the story” (Kovačič 1993, cited in de Linde 1995: 13).

Therefore, if the subtitler knows when and how to reduce subtitles by applying the principles of Relevance Theory to the subtitling process, the quality of his/her work should be higher than those who do not know these principles, and the same applies to those students who study subtitling translation (Kovačič 1994).

2.5.3 Reduction and language functions

Reduction in subtitling has also been studied from a functional linguistic view. Drawing on Halliday’s (1985) model of linguistic functions, Kovačič (1992, 1998, 2002) suggests that reduction in subtitling should be seen in terms of the three functions of a language: ideational (language used to convey information, ideas or experience, e.g. nouns and verbs), interpersonal (language used to establish relationship, e.g. phatic expression, terms of address, emotional exclamations, modality), and textual (language used to create well-formed texts, e.g. connectives). Kovačič’s (1992) study showed that ideational elements were preserved most, while interpersonal elements like phatic expression and exclamations were frequently omitted, because they were felt to be redundant when combined with image and sound and could not be readily expressed in written language (Kovačič 1998: 78). Textual elements were also often omitted because “coherence of dialogue is supported by continuity of visual material” (*ibid*). Kovačič’s (1998) experiment confirmed that ideational elements were omitted less frequently than interpersonal and textual elements (the difference between the latter two was not statistically significant).

According to Kovačič (2002: 104), however, these reductions may not hamper the

audience's comprehension, because subtitles are "only a component of a polysemiotic text, complementing and depending on the other constituent layers of the text, viz. picture and sound". This point can be exemplified by the situation when one reads the subtitles without watching the film. Under such circumstances, it would be difficult to figure out interpersonal and textual relations. However, when the subtitles and the film are put together, there would be no such problem (Kovačič 1991: 413, cited in Georgakopoulou 2003: 133).

2.5.4 Reduction of discourse markers and connectives

Chaume (2004) examined the Spanish translation of six English discourse markers (*now, oh, you know, (you) see, look, and I mean*) in the movie *Pulp Fiction* and found they were often omitted in translations. He argues that even if discourse markers are omitted, the audience still can "repair the possible misunderstandings" (ibid). He offers several reasons for this, and one of them draws on the cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975) and states that "a normal reader or spectator will assume that there are semantic relations between the sentences which display few, if any, explicit markers of cohesive relations" (ibid: 854). That is, "...we constantly make an effort to understand the relationships between ideas and units of talk, in spite of the fact that these ideas should be badly connected or simply not connected" (ibid). As a result, it may be assumed that Grice's cooperative principle contributes to the coherence in subtitling.

In addition to Chaume's study on discourse markers, there have been several studies on the reduction of connectives. While none of them are related to subtitling, one study on advertisements is particularly related to the present study. Vivanco (2005) did an empirical study on the absence of connectives to explore its effect on the maintenance of coherence in advertising texts. Six advertisements were examined in the study, and it was concluded that even with a relatively low number of connectives, these advertisements maintain their coherence with the aid of lexical (e.g. repetition) and semantic (e.g. synonyms and antonyms) resources. Furthermore, the absence of connectives in advertisements may capture and maintain readers' attention and help them to store and retrieve information. Nonetheless, the author did not mention one important factor that contributes to the coherence of advertising texts. That is, they are "multi-modal, and can use pictures, music and language, either singly or in combinations, as the medium permits" (Cook 2001: 219). Although advertisements and subtitles belong to different genres, they are similar in this respect. Thus, it may be

argued that, in addition to lexical and semantic resources, multimodality might well play an important role in contributing to coherence in these two genres.

2.5.5 Explicitation and implicitation

Moreover, text reduction in subtitling may be explained by the concept of explicitation and implicitation proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958). Explicitation is defined as “the process of introducing information into the target language which is present only implicitly in the source language, but which can be derived from the context or the situation”, while implicitation is defined as “the process of allowing the target language situation or context to define certain details which were explicit in the source language” (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, cited in Klaudy 1998: 80). Explicitation and implicitation are generally discussed together with addition and omission, and Englund Dimitrova (1993) uses the terms “addition-explicitation” and “omission-implicitation” (Klaudy *ibid*). Furthermore, Gottlieb’s subtitling strategies of expansion, paraphrase, transfer, imitation, transcription, and dislocation as discussed above involves addition-explicitation, Strategies are related explicitation, while reduction strategies such as condensation, decimation, and deletion involves omission-implicitation.

In addition to the general notion of explication and implicitation, Blum-Kulka (1986) explores discourse-level explicitation and proposes “the explicitation hypothesis” from the perspective of cohesion and coherence. She argues that when translating, the translator tends to make the target text more redundant or explicit than the source text, and this redundancy or explicitation can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesiveness in the target text (*ibid*: 19). Furthermore, according to the explicitation hypothesis, an increase in cohesive explicitness from the ST to the TT is inherent in the translation process regardless of differences between particular languages (*ibid*). However, she does not make it clear whether greater explicitness (higher cohesiveness) will always lead to easier comprehension.

Chen (2006) investigated explicitation through the use of connectives (i.e. conjunctions and sentential adverbs) in Chinese translations of popular science texts compared to non-translated Chinese popular science texts. It was found that around 75% of the occurrences of all TT connectives are carried over from the source texts, while the remaining 25% are expliciticised (i.e. added) in the translation process, which shows that explicitation of connectives is likely to be typical of Chinese translations of popular

science texts in general, despite the fact that Chinese is a language characterised by highly paratactic constructions, i.e. the tendency to use fewer connectives (ibid: 14). However, it should be noted that Chen's study did not investigate how ST connectives were translated into TT connectives. Chen suggests that the 25% explicitation may result from translators' preference for certain connectives, commissioner's requirements of explicit translation, and pedagogical emphasis on explicitation (ibid: 364-73). Furthermore, presumably the other 75% are simply transferred because of 'literal translation automaton', which refers to the tendency to translate word by word observed in novices as well as experts, and in process as well as product data (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005).

House (2004) claims that explicitation may make translations more informative and comprehensible. Nevertheless, it may be argued that the explicitation of connectives in translating does not necessarily lead to more readable or natural translations. As the study of Chen (2006) shows, explicitation may be typical of Chinese translations of popular science texts, but Chinese is a language characterised by paratactic constructions and less use of connectives (Chen 1997). Consequently, "while it is possible that the readers will find it easier to read such texts, it is also possible that they will be distracted by the unusual generic norms" (Heltai 2005: 69). Furthermore, the unnatural higher level of explicitness may contribute to "translationese", which refers to linguistic features that occur with a significantly higher or lower frequency in translations than in target-language originals (Puurtinen 2003: 389). Conversely, naturalness, the opposite of translationese, refers to the well-formedness of utterances in text as produced by native speakers in normal situations (Sinclair 1988: 11, cited in Warren 1993: 37). Therefore, translationese may be considered one of the major problems affecting the quality of translation. However, the notion of explicitation and implicitation seems to be more complicated when it applies to subtitling, because there are two opposed pressures on the subtitle translator: reduction because of time and space constraints in subtitling (see Section 2.4) versus explicitation as a translation universal as discussed above. Consequently, it may be assumed that implicitation may be more predominant than explicitation in subtitling.

2.5.6 Text typology and genre

Moreover, successful addition/omission of information depends largely on the subtitler's understanding of the type and nature of the original text. Reiss (1971) first

investigates the relationship between text types and translation and proposes three basic text types: informative (content-focused), expressive (form-focused), and operative (appeal-focused). Informative texts mainly provide information about a given topic, e.g. news reports; expressive texts mainly express the speaker's state of mind or feeling, e.g. poetry; and operative texts primarily seeks to bring out certain behaviour in the hearer, e.g. advertisements (Hatim and Munday 2004: 183). Reiss (2000: 46-7) claims that the translation of a informative text demands fidelity on content, an expressive text on form and aesthetic effect, and an operative text demands the achievement of an identical response when the audience and reasons for communicating are the same or similar. The function and examples of the three text types are illustrated in Table 2.6 (ibid: 26):

Table 2.6: Text typology

Text type	informative (content-focused)	expressive (form-focused)	operative (appeal-focused)
Examples	press releases, news reports, commercial correspondence, operating instructions	biographies, anecdotes, short stories, novellas, romances, poetry	advertisements, missionary text, propaganda, satire

In addition to the three text types based on the functions of language, Reiss (1971) proposes a fourth text type: audio-medial. Audio-medial texts are “*written to be spoken (or sung) and hence are not read by their audience but heard, often with the aid of extra-linguistic medium, which itself plays a part in the mediation of the complex literary blend*” (Reiss 2000: 27). Moreover, “They are distinctive in their dependence on non-linguistic (technical) media and on graphic, acoustic, and visual kinds of expression. It is only in combination with them that the whole complex literary form realizes its full potential” (ibid: 43). As a result, image and sound play an important role in audio-medial texts such as dramatic productions, TV programmes and films, whether in the original form or in a translation (ibid: 44).

Reiss (ibid) suggests that audio-medial texts could be classified under the informative type (radio addresses, documentary films), the expressive type (dramas), and the operative type (comedies and tragedies). However, she claims that translations of audio-medial texts are judged by whether they match the original in incorporating the contribution of non-linguistic media and other elements (ibid: 47), and this polysemiotic nature makes the fourth text type incompatible with other three text types.

Table 2.7: Classification of audio-medial texts

Audio-medial texts			
Text type	informative (content-focused)	expressive (form-focused)	operative (appeal-focused)
Examples	radio addresses, documentary films, news reports	dramas	comedies, tragedies, TV commercials

Based on the categorisation shown in Table 2.7, it may be argued that in addition to paying attention to non-linguistic and polysemiotic elements in audio-medial texts, the translator must be aware of the function and focus of audio-medial texts, because different translation strategies may be required for each text type.

The present study aims to investigate two types of informative audio-medial texts: documentaries and travel programmes from Discovery Channel. Reiss (2000: 48) suggests that the translation of informative texts must give priority to accuracy of the information they convey, and audio-medial texts to the conditioning factors of non-linguistic media. For example, a translation of a radio address should not only faithfully deliver its content, but also conform to the spoken syntax of the target language (ibid: 45). Therefore, it may be argued that when translating informative audio-medial texts like documentaries and travel programmes, the subtitler needs to both convey information accurately and accommodate non-linguistic and polysemiotic elements that are characteristic of audio-medial texts. Furthermore, informative texts put more emphasis on content than form when compared with expressive texts. Consequently, when it comes to the translation assessment of informative texts, what have been translated is more important than how they are translated.

Furthermore, text types are distinguished from genres for the purpose of the present study. Hatim and Mason (1990: 241) define genres as “conventional forms of texts associated with particular types of social occasion” (e.g. reference books, lectures, and advertisements). Reiss (1977) proposes to classify text genres according to linguistic characteristics or conventions (1989: 105). Nord (1997: 53) suggests that conventions are “implicit or tacit, non-binding regulations of behaviour, based on common knowledge and on the expectation of what others expect you to expect them (etc.) to do in a certain situation”. For example, instruction texts like operating manuals and recipes are characterised by imperative structures in English (*melt the butter on a medium heat*) (ibid).

In the present study, documentaries and travel programmes were considered to be two different TV genres mainly because the former is more written and formal than the latter. As discussed in Section 2.4.3, speech is characterised by incomplete sentences and little subordination and thus is less structured than writing, and the distinction between the two genres will be further discussed in the Materials section of the next chapter. Consequently, following the definitions of text types and genres proposed by Reiss (1971, 1977), the documentaries and travel programmes were considered to be two different genres that have the same function of providing information to the audience by the present study.

2.6 Context in Subtitling

Several important issues concerning subtitling have been reviewed and examined in this chapter to provide a backdrop for the present study, which could be largely summarised by the concept of context in translating proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990). They suggest that taking context into account is an essential part of translating if translators aim to perceive intended meaning conveyed by subtle variation of expression (ibid: 57). In addition, they define context in a broader sense and propose three dimensions of context: communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction.

First, the communicative transaction involves register analysis. Register is defined as the tendency to pattern language behaviour in relation to a particular type of activity, level of formality, etc. (ibid: 243). There are three main types of register variation: field, tenor, and mode (see Chapter 1, Section 1.1.4). Furthermore, as mentioned in Section 2.5.3, Halliday (1973) proposes three functions of a language: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. According to the systemic functional linguistics, the ideational function is related to the field aspects of a text, representing the “content” function of language; the interpersonal function to the tenor aspects of a text, representing the “participation” function of language; and the textual function to the mode aspects of a text, representing the “relevance” (i.e. language in its relevance to the environment) function of language, without which the other two do not become actualised (Halliday 1978: 123). In other words, the field of social action tends to be encoded linguistically in the form of ideational meanings, the role relationships (tenor) in the form of interpersonal meanings, and the mode in the form of textual meanings (ibid).

Second, pragmatic action involves speech acts, the cooperative principle, and Gricean

maxims, which may be used to explain how the audience may fill in a missing link, which in turn leads to successful comprehension. Nevertheless, little empirical research has been conducted to investigate audience reception on subtitles, especially when they are reduced. Chaume (2004), however, shows that discourse markers mostly used in the spoken discourse are often omitted in subtitling, and draws on the cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975) to argue his point that even if discourse markers are omitted in subtitling, the audience still can perceive intended meaning conveyed in a film (see Section 2.5.4).

The third dimension is semiotic interaction. As discussed in Section 2.4.2, semiotics of subtitling involves picture and sound, but Hatim and Mason (1990) define semiotics in translating as the interplay of text, discourse and genre as signs. Texts are a set of mutually relevant communicative functions structured to achieve an overall rhetorical purpose, e.g. to narrate, to counter-argue, etc. (ibid: 142). Discourses are modes of speaking and writing which involve the participants in adopting a particular stance on certain areas of socio-cultural activity, e.g. scientific discourse and legal discourse, and genres are defined in terms of a set of features appropriate to a given social occasion (ibid: 140-1).

To conclude, this study aims to test the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may not adversely affect comprehension or subtitle quality, because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction without affecting coherence. In order to examine the hypothesis, the present study conducted a two-phase study to answer two sets of research questions. The first-phase quantitative analysis of textual cohesion will be discussed in the next chapter. After the discussion of the cohesion analysis, the second-phase audience reception study designed to investigate how coherence in subtitling is achieved will be described and examined in Chapter 4.

Chapter 3. Cohesion Analysis

This chapter describes the method used in the cohesion analysis, followed by its results and discussion. In this analysis, quantitative text analysis was adopted to reveal the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles. The results will be reported and discussed from three perspectives: the total amount of connectives (including and excluding *and*), the amount of each type of connectives, and the amount of *and* in different TV genres. This analysis was designed to answer the following research questions:

- How are connectives translated in different TV genres (i.e. ‘documentaries’ and ‘travel programmes’)? To what extent are they added, omitted, or retained in target texts? Are they rendered explicitly or implicitly in target texts? Is the amount of connectives in STs and TTs and each type of connectives genre-related, and if yes, how?
- Is the addition/omission/retention systemic or random, and if yes, to what extent? If it is systematic, what type of connectives tends to be added or omitted more often than other types of connectives, and why?

3.1 Materials

In order to answer these questions, two types of TV programmes were analysed: scripted documentaries and an unscripted travel series called *Globe Trekker*² (a long-lived travel series that is popular in Taiwan and formerly known as *Lonely Planet*) from Discovery Channel (see Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for sample transcription). The reason why this study chose to examine the two programmes with relatively few differences between them—as opposed to two very different types of programmes (e.g. documentaries vs. sitcoms)—is that it focused on a set of manageable differences (e.g. scripted vs. non-scripted) as well as similarities (e.g. both documentaries and travel programmes can be classified as informative programmes).

² In an interview, Justine Shapiro, one of the hosts of *Globe Trekker*, says that the production of *Globe Trekker* is spontaneous and there is no script. This interview was accessed from <http://www.weta.org/pressroom/globetrekker3/?p=Q%26A+with+Justine+Shapiro> on 28 Apr. 2007.

Table 3.1: Documentary: *Who Killed Julius Caesar*

Rome, superpower of its day, whose all-conquering legions subdued vast new lands, and where one man had triumphed to gain ultimate control, a man whose death could change history. Julius Caesar, genius and, perhaps, greatest general of all time, was murdered openly in the Roman senate. For centuries, no one questioned the facts of his death. But now, 2,000 years later, a top Italian investigator has returned to the earliest historical accounts and reopened the case. Using 21st century forensic techniques he revisits the key locations. With computer-generated models, he recreates the crime scene. Blow by blow, he stages a simulation of the murder itself. And the most startling revelation of all, the truth emerges, not from the assassins, but deep inside the mind of Julius Caesar himself.

Rome on the Ides, the 15th of March, 44 BC. Senators await the head of state. Julius Caesar, dictator of Rome, conqueror of Europe. First item on the agenda, murder. The nation's shrewdest and greatest general arrives at the Senate unguarded and dismissed all warnings. As bystanders look on in horror he is cut down. The deed is quick, bloody, and public. The identity of the culprits beyond doubt. But did the famous conspirators, Brutus and Cassius, really mastermind Caesar's murder? Or were they just the pawns of an unseen hand? For over two millennia, the case gathered dust, the preserve of historians and dramatists. But one man isn't happy that the received version of the events is the whole truth.

Table 3.2: Travel programme: *Globe Trekker: Vienna City Guide*

A: When Vienna was surrounded by a city wall the only way to expand was by digging down.
A: Barbara showed me around the cellars beneath the palace.
B: All around the cities.
A: How deep was it then?
B: Maximum of five stories.
A: What you're saying, there's like an underground city?
B: It was a city underneath a city.
A: Wow, there's, like, statues, huh?
B: Well, these aren't actually statues. These are the positives.
A: All right, all right. So the artists would make these first...
B: Yes.
A: ...take them to the emperor, and if he liked it then they'd make the big statue.
B: Make the real monument out of metal, ceramic...
A: This is...who's this?
B: That's Mozart.
A: That's Mozart? Is it?
B: Amadeus Mozart.
A: Wow. So the artist would go "Look, this is what...this is the bust of you which I made. Do you want a big one done?"
B: Yeah, there's a big one with legs...
A: Yeah.
B: ...and a huge monument in the imperial gardens.
A: Oh, I see. I like it, but I want it with legs and hands. So what are they all doing down here, then? It's just storage?
B: It's storage. Whatever the city of Vienna, or in the old days the imperial family, didn't need, they put down here in their wide cellars.
A: Barbara, I think I've done all my sightseeing in here.

In this study, both STs (English) and TTs (Chinese) of five documentaries and five travel programmes (each programme is about one hour long) were transcribed and analysed with a view to revealing the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles (see Appendix A for sample ST and TT transcriptions). The title of each programme and ST word counts and TT character counts of the documentaries and travel programmes are

shown in Table 3.3. The present study examined 10 hours of programmes in total: 5-hour documentaries and 5-hour travel programmes.

Table 3.3: Word counts of research materials

Documentary	ST (words)	TT (characters)	Travel Programme	ST (words)	TT (characters)
1. <i>Building the Biggest: The West Coast Line</i>	5,381	6,252	1. <i>Vienna City Guide</i>	5,472	6,886
2. <i>Man Made Marvels: Taipei 101</i>	5,069	6,837	2. <i>Indian Ocean Islands</i>	5,914	5,917
3. <i>Secrets of the Valley of the Kings</i>	6,155	8,457	3. <i>Venice City Guide</i>	5,866	6,871
4. <i>Who Killed Julius Caesar</i>	5,021	6,850	4. <i>Arab Gulf States</i>	5,585	6,709
5. <i>Hiroshima</i>	4,512	5,700	5. <i>Tokyo City Guide</i>	6,053	7,718
Total	26,138	34,096	Total	28,890	34,101

While both types of programmes are informative, they are somewhat different in function and style. Thorne (1997: 407) suggests that documentaries aim to present real life in an objective way, focus on facts, provide intensive information on a particular subject, such as science, history, and culture, and draw on many sources of information. By comparison, travel programmes provide useful information on a region, such as its nature, culture, and cuisine. Another difference between the two genres is that travel programmes are more audience-focused. Travel is a leisure activity that the audience could engage in as well, whereas documentaries are about issues that that will not directly affect the audience's own activities (watching the travel programme that introduces Vienna might inspire you to go there yourself, but you will probably not want to engage in or even observe repair works on the West Coast line). The general features of a stereotypical documentary and a stereotypical travel programme are shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Documentary vs. Travel Programme

Documentary		Travel Programme
Written to be spoken		Spoken
Formal	←-----→	Informal
Scripted		Spontaneous
Monologue		Dialogue
Talk about facts and knowledge	←-----→	Talk to the audience and people
Less interactive		More interactive
Formal interview	←-----→	Casual conversation
Serious		Lively
Slow-moving		Fast-moving
More informative	←-----→	Less informative
More educative		Less educative
Less entertaining		More entertaining

The distinction between documentaries and travel programmes mostly lie in discourse differences. The former is more written and formal than the latter. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Table 2.3), speech is characterised by incomplete sentences and little subordination, and thus is less structured than writing. Moreover, documentaries tend to be scripted while travel programmes are often spontaneous or attempt to come across as unscripted.

Nonetheless, the distinction between the two is not clear-cut. For example, both types of programmes are informative, but travel programmes may be less informative than documentaries, because documentaries tend to introduce more information and new knowledge than travel programmes. In addition, travel programmes seem to be less formal and more interactive than documentaries since travel programmes contain more casual conversation and dialogue due to their spontaneous nature.

Furthermore, the distinction between documentaries and travel programmes can be illustrated by the closeness-distance continuum of speech and writing as discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.4.3): spoken language involves communicative closeness and written language involves communicative distance (Koch and Oesterreicher 1990, cited in Hansen 1998: 92). Thus, documentaries characterised by monologue are closer to the “communicative distance” pole and tend to have more characteristics of written language, whereas travel programmes characterised by dialogue are close to the

“communicative closeness” pole and tend to have more characteristics of spoken language. Thus, when the general features of documentaries and travel programmes are considered, one may hypothesise that connectives could be translated differently in the two types of programmes. More specifically, a documentary may be translated more explicitly with more connectives retained and added, while a travel programme may be translated more implicitly with more connectives omitted, as discussed above. Therefore, this cohesion analysis aims to find out whether and how connectives are translated in these two different genres.

3.2 Procedures

The occurrences of each connective in STs and TTs were manually counted and classified into additive, adversative, causal, and temporal connectives as proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), (See Appendix B for the list of the four types of connectives). Continuatives or discourse markers such as *oh*, *well*, *OK*, and *right* were not counted in this study because they were not the focus of the present study. In addition, in order to limit the scope of this study, the analysis focused on how English ST connectives were translated, added and omitted in Chinese subtitles. Therefore, English ST lexical items that are often translated into Chinese connectives were excluded from this analysis. For example, *The reason is...* is often translated into 因為[yin-wei] (*because*) in Chinese subtitles in order to be more concise. Other examples include *The first thing is...* (首先[shou-xian] = *firstly*), *That is why...* (因此[yin-ci] = *therefore*), and *The result is...* (結果[jie-guo] = *consequently*). In addition, English connectives such as *in order to*, *in order that*, *so as to*, and *so that* were excluded from this analysis, because they could be mixed up with ‘infinitives’ (to+verb) that were also translated into Chinese purpose connectives such as 為了[wei-le] and 以便[yi-bian]. For example, in the sentence “Jack went home to get his bike”, *to* can be translated as 為了[wei-le] in Chinese just like *in order to*. However, *to* is not considered as a connective in the present study. Consequently, in order to avoid confusion, all purpose related English connectives and to-infinitives as well as all purpose-related Chinese connectives were excluded from this analysis.

Furthermore, in this analysis, occurrences of *and* in STs and TTs were counted separately because of that item’s high frequency and multifunctionality as discussed in

Chapter 2: *and* may function as a connective or a continuative, and conveys several types of relations, such as consequence, contrast, concession, or condition. Hence, in this study, *and* was analysed as a multifunctional connective, rather than a specific type of connective. However, it is not easy to distinguish the *and*-connective from the *and*-continuative. The present study distinguishes the two by whether *and* functions as a link between clauses and sentences. In other words, if *and* links clauses and sentences, it is considered a connective and counted in the present study. If it occurs clause-internally (e.g. *up and down* and *more and more*), then it is considered a continuative and not counted. Moreover, single markers in English can often become paired markers in Chinese. Thus, paired markers in TTs were counted as one marker, because in Chinese both cause (因為[yin-wei]: *because*) and effect (所以[suo-yi]: *so*) in a causal relation are marked. Similarly, antithesis is marked by both 雖然[sui-ran] (*although*) and 但是[dan-shi] (*but*).

3.3 Results

The results of the cohesion analysis are shown in Table 3.5 (see Appendix C for the amount of each connective in STs and TTs). The data shown in the table excluded *and*, and its results will be discussed separately in the next section.

Table 3.5: Results of the cohesion analysis without *and*

Documentary	ST	TT	Addition(+)/ Omission(-)	Travel programme	ST	TT	Addition(+)/ Omission(-)
Additive	101	202	+101	Additive	100	150	+50
Adversative	221	226	+5	Adversative	265	203	-62
Causal	147	120	-27	Causal	218	153	-65
Temporal	304	328	+24	Temporal	285	243	-42
Total	773	876	+103	Total	868	749	-119

As Table 3.5 shows, the amount of connectives in documentary TTs vis-à-vis documentary STs increased on the whole. The total amount of connectives in documentary TTs increased by 103, while in travel programme TTs, it decreased by 119. In terms of types of connectives, the amount of additive, adversative, and temporal connectives was increased in documentary TTs by 101, 5, and 24, respectively, whereas causal connectives decreased by 27. On the other hand, in travel programme TTs, the amount of additive connectives was increased by 50, while adversative, causal, and

temporal connectives decreased by 62, 65, and 42, respectively.

In order to find out how far these genre-related differences are significant, 2-by-2 chi-square tests were conducted. There were two categorical variables: genre (documentary/travel programme) and type of texts (ST/TT). Firstly, a chi-square test on the data of the total amount of connectives was conducted (see Table 3.6).

Table 3.6: Observed counts: all connectives

		<u>Type of text</u>		
		ST	TT	Row total
<u>Genre</u>	Doc	773	876	1649
	Travel	868	749	1617
Column total		1641	1625	3266

The association between genres and types of texts was highly significant ($\chi^2=15.11$, $p < 0.001$ at 1 d.f.). Therefore, the addition and omission of these connectives in subtitling is indeed closely related to genres. More specifically, the results show that when *and* was excluded from the analysis, connectives in documentary TTs tended to be added or made explicit, while in travel programme TTs, they were omitted or made implicit.

Secondly, chi-square tests were also conducted to ascertain whether the amount of connectives added and deleted within each connective type was genre-related. Table 3.7 shows observed counts of connectives in each type of connectives.

Table 3.7: Observed counts: connective types

		1. Additive			2. Adversative			3. Causal			4. Temporal		
		<u>Type of text</u>			<u>Type of text</u>			<u>Type of text</u>			<u>Type of text</u>		
		ST	TT	Row Total	ST	TT	Row Total	ST	TT	Row Total	ST	TT	Row Total
<u>Genre</u>	Doc	101	202	303	221	226	447	147	120	267	304	328	632
	Travel	100	150	250	265	203	468	218	153	371	285	243	528
Column total		201	352	553	486	429	915	365	273	638	589	571	1160

The results of chi-square tests for each type of connectives are shown in Table 3.8. Generally speaking, the tests yielded mixed results. With respect to adversative and

temporal connectives, the results show that the association between genres and types of texts was significant; therefore, how adversative and temporal connectives were translated in subtitling was related to genres. More specifically, the amount of adversatives and temporals stayed roughly steady in the documentaries but fell in travel programmes. With regard to additive and causal connectives, however, there was no significant association between genres and types of texts. That is, how additive and causal connectives were translated was not related to genres because of sharp rise of additive counts and sharp fall of causal counts in both genres.

Table 3.8: Results of chi-square tests

Pearson Chi-Square			
	χ^2 Value	d.f.	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
1. Additive	2.63	1	0.105 (not significant)
2. Adversative	4.74	1	0.030 (significant)
3. Causal	0.87	1	0.351 (not significant)
4. Temporal	3.97	1	0.046 (significant)

3.3.1 Results for *and*

In this cohesion analysis, *and* was counted separately due to its polyfunctionality. The total amount of *and* in the documentary STs and travel programme STs was 566 and 810, respectively. However, only those occurrences that functioned as a link between clauses and sentences were counted in this study as mentioned earlier. Thus, the amount of *and* counted in the documentary STs and travel programme STs was 261 and 505, respectively. As Table 3.9 shows, the amount of TT counterparts for *and* in the documentary TTs and travel programme was 62 and 62, respectively. That is, in the subtitling process, 199 and 443 occurrences of ST *and* were omitted respectively, and this massive decrease in both genres was not seen in other connectives.

Table 3.9: Occurrences of ST *and* with a TT counterpart

	ST	TT	Addition(+)/ Omission(-)
Doc	261	62	-199
Travel	505	62	-443

In addition, the 62 non-omitted *and*-connectives in each text-type were translated into different types of connectives. While most *and*-connectives were translated into additive connectives, some were translated into adversative, causal, and temporal connectives.

The amount of ST *and* in each type of TT connective is shown in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10: The amount of ST *and* in each TT connective type

TT	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	Total
Doc	42	10	6	4	62
Travel	38	11	7	6	62

A chi-square test was conducted to ascertain whether overall amounts of ST *and* retained in subtitles was genre-related. The data tested is shown in Table 3.11. The results show that there was a highly significant association between genres and types of texts ($\chi^2=11.70$, $p < 0.01$ at 1 d.f.). Therefore, how *and* was translated, added or omitted in subtitling was genre-related, and the ST *and* counts omitted in the travel programmes were proportionally twice as many as those in the documentaries.

Table 3.11: Observed counts: *and*

		<u>Type of text</u>		Total
		ST	TT	
<u>Genre</u>	Doc	261	62	323
	Travel	505	62	567
Total		766	124	890

3.3.2 Results of the cohesion analysis with *and*

In order to yield the results that included the occurrences of *and* in the STs and TTs, ST *and* was added to ST additives and its TT counterparts was added to all four TT categories, following Table 3.10. For example, as Table 3.12 shows, the occurrence of the additives in the documentary STs with *and* was 362, which was derived from 101 additives in the documentary STs without *and* plus 261 *ands* in the documentary STs. In addition, 188 additives in the travel programme TTs was derived from 150 additives in the travel programme TTs without *and* plus 38 *ands* in the travel programme TTs.

Table 3.12: Results of the cohesion analysis with *and*

Documentary	ST	TT	Addition(+)/ Omission(-)	Travel programme	ST	TT	Addition(+)/ Omission(-)
Additive	362 (101+261)	244 (202+42)	-118	Additive	605 (100+505)	188 (150+38)	-417
Adversative	226	236 (226+10)	+15	Adversative	265	214 (203+11)	-51
Causal	120	126 (120+6)	-21	Causal	218	160 (153+7)	-58
Temporal	328	332 (328+4)	+28	Temporal	285	249 (243+6)	-36
Total	1034 (773+261)	938 (876+63)	-96	Total	1373 (868+505)	811 (749+62)	-562

As Table 3.13 shows, the amount of adversative, causal, and temporal connectives in the documentary TTs and travel programme TTs was only slightly increased when *and* was included. For example, the amount of the additives in the documentaries was increased from 5 to 15 when *and* was included.

Table 3.13: Results with and without *and*

Documentary	ST-TT without <i>and</i>	ST-TT with <i>and</i>	Travel programme	ST-TT without <i>and</i>	ST-TT with <i>and</i>
Additive	+101	-118	Additive	+50	-417
Adversative	+5	+15	Adversative	-62	-51
Causal	-27	-21	Causal	-65	-58
Temporal	+24	+28	Temporal	-42	-36
Total	+103	-96	Total	-119	-562

However, Table 3.13 also shows that when *and* was excluded, the amount of additive connectives in both TTs was increased by 101 and 50 respectively, and the amount of total connectives in both TTs was increased by 103 and decreased by 119 respectively. By comparison, when *and* was included, the amount of additive connectives in both TTs was decreased by 118 and 417 respectively, and the amount of total connectives in both TTs was decreased by 96 and 562 respectively. The reductions of *and* (a very large category of connectives) had huge effect on the overall ST-TT differences: big reductions in connective counts from the STs to the TTs (-96 and -562) in both genres, though especially in the travel programmes.

In order to find out whether the amount of total connectives and additive connectives in

STs and TTs was genre-related when *and* was included, chi-square tests were conducted. The data tested is shown in Tables 3.14 and 3.15. The results show that the association between genres and types of texts was highly significant for both tests (see Table 3.16). How all connectives and additive connectives were translated, therefore, was closely related to genres when *and* was included. More specifically, the amount of all connectives and additives decreased proportionally more in the travel programmes than in the documentaries. As the previous statistical analysis shows, when *and* was excluded, there was also significant association between genres and the addition and omission of all connectives. However, there was no significant association between genres and types of texts for additive connectives when *and* was excluded, because the amount of TT additives in both genres increased sharply (see Table 3.8).

Table 3.14: Observed counts: all connectives with *and*

		<u>Type of text</u>		
		ST	TT	Total
<u>Genre</u>	Doc	1034	938	1972
	Travel	1373	811	2184
Total		2407	1749	4156

Table 3.15: Observed counts: additive connectives with *and*

		<u>Type of text</u>		
		ST	TT	Total
<u>Genre</u>	Doc	362	244	606
	Travel	605	188	793
Total		967	432	1399

Table 3.16: Result of chi-square tests

Pearson Chi-Square			
	χ^2 Value	d.f.	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
1. All	46.27	1	0.000
2. Additive	44.12	1	0.000

The initial conclusion drawn from these data is that how connectives are translated in subtitling seems to depend on genres, types of connectives, and whether *and* is included in the analysis, and these three factors are closely related to each other. In the following sections, the results of this analysis will be examined in relation to the hypotheses and rationales of the study.

3.4 Discussion

The results of the cohesion analysis can be summarised as follows:

- a. In general, how the connectives were translated (added or omitted) was genre-related in subtitling. More specifically, when the types of connectives were considered, the addition/omission of adversative and temporal connectives was genre-related, whereas those of additive and causal connectives were not when *and* was excluded.
- b. The documentaries were translated more explicitly, whereas the travel programmes, more implicitly. When *and* was excluded in the analysis, the total amount of connectives in documentary TTs was increased by 103, while in travel programme TTs, it was decreased by 119. In terms of types of connectives, the amount of additive, adversative, and temporal connectives was increased in documentary TTs by 101, 5, and 24, respectively. On the other hand, in travel programme TTs, the amount of adversative, causal, and temporal connectives decreased by 62, 65, and 42, respectively.
- c. The connective *and* was mostly omitted, and how it was translated was related to genre. When it was included in the analysis, the addition/omission of additive, adversative, and temporal connectives was genre-related, and only the translation of causal connectives was not related to genre. More specifically, additives decreased more sharply in the travel programmes than in the documentaries. Both adversatives and temporals increased in the documentaries while decreased in the documentaries, whereas causals stayed relatively steady in both genres.

It is also worth noting that although the addition/omission of continuatives like *oh*, *well*, and *you know* was not counted in this analysis, they were almost all omitted in subtitles as had been predicted. Moreover, the results of the cohesion analysis were altered by whether *and* was included in the analysis. Hence, it is essential to examine its function and how it was translated in the texts analysed before the results including or excluding *and* can be discussed.

3.4.1 *And as a connective or a continuative*

The results shows that ST *and* that links clauses and sentences was drastically reduced in both documentary TTs and travel programme TTs from 261 to 62 and 505 to 62, respectively (see Table 3.11). There are a number of possible explanations for the drastic reduction of *and* in the TTs. First, the drastic reduction of *and* may result from its lack of semantic information and its function as a continuative. First, *and* was omitted whenever it was used in combination with a connective, e.g. *and so*, *and yet*, *and now*, and *and then*. As Peng (2006: 102) suggests, when *and* is combined with a conjunctive word, it merely functions as an “empty” marker that contains no semantic information, and hence it was omitted.

Second, the omission of *and* in the TTs, especially in those of travel programmes, may result from the fact that it may also function more like a continuative than as a connective. That is, *and* was also omitted when it functions as a syntactic link between clauses and sentences and indicates the continuity in discourse. As Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 81) point out, a continuative may signal a move in the discourse, especially in dialogue: a response or a new move to the next point if the same speaker is continuing, e.g. *well*, *oh*, and *now*. The following example is an excerpt taken from the travel programme STs analysed in the study:

“Vienna is famous for its buildings and its architecture, and (1) I’ve been all around the city and (2) I’ve seen a lot, but I like the fact that my favourite building is the city wastage incinerator. And (3) that is there. What a beauty. And (4) I also like the fact that the guy that designed it thought that the straight line was evil.” (from *Globe Trekker: Vienna City Guide*)

Its Chinese subtitles are as follows (the symbol “//” in subtitles means the breaking of subtitles into two lines on the screen):

維也納以建築聞名於世
我參觀過維也納各地//看了很多建築物
但我最喜歡的建築物是市立焚化爐
就是那裡,真漂亮
設計者認為直線很醜陋//我很贊同他的看法

Back translation:

Vienna is famous for its architecture.

I've been all around the city, // seeing a lot of buildings.

But my favourite building is the city wastage incinerator.

That is there. What a beauty.

Its designer thought the straight line was ugly. // I agree with him.

In the Chinese subtitles, the four *ands* were all omitted. The drastic reduction of *and* strongly supports the continuity hypothesis, which postulates that readers tend to interpret sentences in a narrative in a continuous manner unless there are signals to the contrary (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3.4). Hence, signals of discontinuity such as adversatives play a more facilitating role in text processing than signals of continuity like additives (Murray 1997: 235). Therefore, when *and* simply signals continuity in discourse, it can safely be omitted in subtitles that demand clarity and concision because of the polysemiotic elements of subtitling discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.4.2). In addition, the drastic reduction of *and* may be explained by the transition from spoken to written discourse as well as the fact that Chinese is more tolerant of strings of main clauses linked simply by comma (rather than by an explicit connective). One of the aims of the present study is to investigate whether reduction in subtitling is systematic or random, and as far as the omission of *and* is concerned, it may be concluded that it is systematic, and it largely depends on the semantic information and function of *and*.

Moreover, *and* is not a “pure” additive due to its polysemy and multifunctionality. The semantic meaning of *and* is usually ambiguous because of its multifunctionality discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.2.3) and needs to be worked out by the reader (or the translator). The results of the cohesion analysis show that while most *and*-connectives were translated into additive connectives, some were translated into adversative, causal, and temporal connectives (see Table 3.10). Therefore, it may be concluded that *and* may function as a connective or a continuative. When it functions as a connective, it may connote several types of relations, such as consequence, contrast, concession, or condition, and tends not to be omitted in subtitles. On the other hand, when it functions as a continuative, it tends to be omitted in subtitles. However, it should be noted that whether *and* functions as an additive connective or a continuative is not always clear-cut, and it may depend on the interpretation of the reader or the translator.

In addition, the results of the chi-square test show that how *and* was translated, added, and omitted was genre-related, and the omission of *and* was more drastic in the travel programmes than in the documentaries. One possible explanation for this is that the travel programmes are characterised more by spoken discourse (i.e. more conversational exchanges and spontaneous narratives), whereas the documentaries are characterised more by written discourse (i.e. more scripted narratives). According to McCarthy (1991: 49), in spoken discourse, some conjunctions like *and* and *so* may be regarded as discourse markers (or continuatives) when they are used to link individual utterances within turns, link one speaker's turn with another speaker's, link back to an earlier turn of the current speaker, or mark a shift in topic. This may explain why, *and* tends to be more drastically reduced in the travel programme TTs than in the documentary TTs.

The present study, therefore, shows that the translation of *and* in subtitling depends on its semantic information and function. More specifically, *and* tends to be omitted in subtitling, especially when it functions a continuative. As Leech and Short (1981: 250) put it, *and* is the vaguest connective, that serves as a general purpose link. The discussion below will focus on the connective counts that exclude *and* and its counterpart in the TTs so as to give a clearer picture of how connectives are translated in subtitling.

3.4.2 Genre and reduction of connectives

The results of the cohesion analysis show that how connectives were translated in subtitling seems to depend on genre despite the fact that time and space constraints and paratactic features of Chinese (less use of connectives) might be expected to lead to the reduction of connectives in subtitling. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.5.6), documentaries and travel programmes were considered two different TV genres for the purpose of this study following the definition of Reiss (1977). When *and* was excluded from the analysis, the total amount of connectives in the documentary TTs actually increased by 103, while in the travel programme TTs, it was decreased by 119—a significant difference (see Table 3.5). That is, the connectives in the documentaries were translated more explicitly than those in the travel programmes. This confirms the hypothesis discussed in Section 3.1. There are several possible reasons that contribute to the difference between explicitation of the documentaries and implicitation of the travel programmes

First, subtitlers may consciously or unconsciously believe that the information contained in documentaries needs to be made clearer by adding connectives in subtitles. In terms of topics, documentaries convey a wide range of information and sources, while travel programmes focus on travelling information of a particular place or region. House (2004) suggests that explicitation (including the addition of connectives) may make translations more informative and comprehensible by elaborating, extending, and enhancing what has been mentioned (cited in Chen 2006: 110-1). Hence, one may conclude that information load would dictate how connectives are translated in subtitling. That is, more information-intensive programmes like documentaries would be translated more explicitly than less information-intensive programmes such as travel programmes for the reason that connectives are believed to be able to organise information and make it easier to follow and understand, especially when there is a lot of information.

Second, the difference between the results of the documentaries and travel programmes may be explained by the mode of language (written vs. spoken) and degree of planning (scripted vs. spontaneous). The reason why the connectives in the travel programmes were reduced is that this type of programme is characterised by spoken features such as repetitions, false starts, overlaps, hesitations, reformulation, and incomplete sentences that may be omitted or condensed when speech is turned into writing in subtitling. Thus, in addition to paratactic features of Chinese (i.e. less use of connectives) and subtitling constraints, another reason why the total amount of connectives in travel programme TTs was decreased vis-à-vis travel programme STs may be that when those spoken features were totally eliminated or restructured into more complete forms, connectives in them were omitted too. The following example is taken from the travel programme STs analysed in the study:

“Part of the prayer ritual is a cleaning ritual, so this is the men’s bath and it’s gorgeous, isn’t it? And quiet and cool and the ritual is something like this. First, they wash their hands, then (1) their mouth, then (2) their nose then (3) their face. Then (4) they go to their right hand and wash the elbow, then (5) the left. Then (6) they clean their head, their ears, their neck, and finally, their right and then (7) left foot. Then (8) they’re ready.” (from *Globe Trekker: Arab Gulf States*)

Its Chinese subtitles are as follows:

淨身是祈禱儀式的一部份
這裡是男用浴池,很壯觀
既安靜又涼爽,淨身步驟是這樣的
先洗手,嘴,鼻子,接著洗臉
然後洗右手,清洗手肘,再換左手
接著洗頭,耳朵,脖子
最後是右腳和左腳,就準備完畢了

Back translation:

Part of the prayer ritual is a cleaning ritual.
This is the men's bath. It's gorgeous.
And quiet and cool.
The ritual is something like this.
First, they wash their hands, mouth, nose, then (1) their face.
Then (2) they go to their right hand, wash the elbow, then (3) the left.
Then (4) they clean their head, ears, neck.
Finally, their right foot and left foot, and they're ready.

In this source-text example, *then* was repeated eight times to show the sequence of the cleaning ritual. However, in the Chinese subtitles, *then* was used only four times. It may be argued that although the amount of *then* was reduced in the subtitles, the meaning of the original is intact. In fact, the reduction of *then* seems to lead to more explicit subtitles, which appear to be more concise and organised than the original, and hence it would be more readable to the audience. Moreover, the layout or line breaks of the subtitles on screen also contribute to the readability of the subtitles. Therefore, one may conclude that the mode of language and degree of planning would prescribe how connectives are translated in subtitling. That is, the more spoken and spontaneous the STs are, the more the omission of connectives would be in TTs due to the process of turning speech into writing that is characteristic of subtitling. This seems to confirm the claim made by Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 145) that “the written version of speech in subtitles is nearly always a reduced form of the oral ST”, which may be particularly true when the speech is informal and spontaneous. Furthermore, as a result of the omission of spoken features and connectives, travel programme TTs would appear in a style that is more formal vis-à-vis their ST counterparts.

Finally, the addition/omission of connectives in the documentaries and travel

programmes may also be viewed from the perspective of explicitation and implicitation. According to the explicitation hypothesis, the translator tends to make the target text more redundant or explicit than the source text (see Chapter 2, Section 2.5.5). Chen's (2006) study confirms this hypothesis by showing that explicitation of connectives is typical of Chinese translations of popular science texts despite the fact that Chinese is a language that tends to use fewer connectives. Nevertheless, the results of this analysis partially contradict the hypothesis: while the amount of connectives in the documentary TTs was increased, it was decreased in the travel programme TTs. That is, the documentaries were translated more explicitly, whereas the travel programmes were translated more implicitly. Thus, it seems that the explicitation hypothesis may not be applicable to all kinds of translations or all types of texts, or at least it is not applicable to subtitling, where there are two opposite pressures: general-translation explicitation and genre-specific text reduction. Moreover, the reason why the explicitation hypothesis seems to apply to the documentaries may be that they are more written and compact, and thus more open to explicitation.

In addition to the addition/omission of connectives in different genres, the present study aims to find out how each type of connectives is translated in subtitling and whether their reduction is systematic or random.

3.4.3 Connective types and the facilitation level

As Table 3.5 shows, when each type of connectives was considered, the results show that the amount of additive, adversative, and temporal connectives in the documentary TTs was increased, whereas in the travel programme TTs, only the amount of additive connectives was increased. That is, most types of connectives in the documentary TTs were made more explicit. Again, it may be argued that the difference between the results of the documentaries and travel programmes in terms of each type of connectives may result from subtitling constraints, less use of connectives in Chinese, and, more importantly, genre differences. As discussed in the previous section, the differences between the documentaries and travel programmes mainly lie in the fact that although both are informative programmes, the former is scripted and formal in style, while the latter is non-scripted and characterised by casual conversations.

Furthermore, the results of the four types of connectives in the documentaries and travel programmes may be explained by their facilitation level in reading comprehension,

which in turn may indicate that the translation of connectives is systematic. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.3.3.), the findings of the facilitation level, the constraint level, and the continuity hypothesis of connectives are combined to formulate the facilitation level of the four types of connectives: additive < causal < adversative < temporal (the sign “<” means “less than”). This will be applied to the discussion of the addition and omission of connectives in the documentaries and travel programmes.

In the documentaries, when *and* was excluded, the amount of additives was increased the most, followed by temporals and adversatives, while the amount of causals was decreased (the sign “<” means “less than”):

$$\text{causal } (-27) < \text{adversative } (+5) < \text{temporal } (+24) < \text{additive } (+101)$$

The results of the travel programmes show similar tendency, but the amount of connectives in most types of connectives was decreased. In the travel programmes, the amount of temporals was decreased the least, followed by adversatives and causals, while the amount of connectives was increased:

$$\text{causal } (-65) < \text{adversative } (-62) < \text{temporal } (-42) < \text{additive } (+50)$$

The addition/omission level of connectives in the documentaries and travel programmes was largely in accordance with the facilitation level: causal < adversative < temporal, but the result of additives seems to contradict the continuity hypothesis that additives play the least facilitating role in discourse comprehension. Nevertheless, when *and* was included in the data, the order of the four types of connectives was entirely consistent with the order of the facilitation level as shown in Table 3.17.

Table 3.17: Type of connectives (including *and*)

	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal
Doc	-118 <	-21 <	+15 <	+28
Travel	-417 <	-58 <	-51 <	-36

Table 3.17 shows that both documentaries and travel programmes show similar tendency in the addition/omission of connectives: additives were omitted the most, followed by causals, while temporals were added the most in the documentaries or omitted the least in the travel programmes, followed by adversatives. However, this result does not hold when *and* is excluded because the amount of *and* in the documentary and travel programme STs was huge (261 and 505 respectively), and thus whether it was included in the analysis or not makes a huge difference in the results of

the facilitation level of additives. Consequently, the findings of the facilitation level may be massively skewed by taking additives into consideration, and hence it may be safe to conclude that the addition/omission level of connectives in subtitling is largely systematic and in accordance with the facilitation level: causal < adversative < temporal.

In addition, the results show that the amount of adversatives and temporals tended to be increased in the subtitles, while the amount of causals and additives tended to be decreased. This may be explained by the facilitation/constraint level of connectives as discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.3.3). First, temporals are used to signal a diverse set of relations pertaining to discourse structure (e.g. temporal sequence, enumeration, summary, and conclusion). Hence, their presence may facilitate text processing by explicitly indicate one of the logical relation. Second, adversatives also play a facilitating role by signalling that the subsequent text is contrary to the content of the preceding text, which would require complex computation of the meaning if adversative are absent. Third, causals are used to indicate that the subsequent text is related to the preceding text in several ways like cause and effect. The reason that temporals play a more facilitating role than adversatives and causals is that temporals often signal the general organisation of discourse, which is more important to text processing than the local sentence-to-sentence context provided by adversatives and causals (Goldman and Murray 1992). Finally, additives, especially *and*, are considered the least constraining connectives that contribute to little facilitation in discourse comprehension (ibid). Hence, it may explain why additives (including *and*) were omitted more often than other types of connectives as shown in this cohesion analysis. Thus, it may be concluded that the addition/omission level of different types of connectives in subtitling is to some extent related to their constraint and facilitation level in reading comprehension.

In conclusion, connective counts were reduced drastically from the STs to the TTs in both documentaries and travel programmes, except with the documentaries when *and* was excluded as discussed above. This leads to the hypothesis examined by the present study—reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to information loss or hinder audience comprehension.

3.4.4 Information loss and audience comprehension

This hypothesis can be examined from several perspectives. First, from the perspective

of subtitling strategies, condensation as the major subtitling strategy may ensure that the meaning of the original is intact. Furthermore, even though there may be some omissions in subtitling, they are usually considered redundant or not necessary for understanding a film, as shown in the examples of *and* and *then* mentioned above. As Gottlieb (1992: 166-7) suggests, subtitles convey the meaning and most of the stylistic content of the original, and the only loss may be the loss of redundant oral language features. Therefore, as far as information is concerned, the reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to any loss.

Moreover, the issue of the reduction of connectives may be viewed from the perspective of language functions. Kovačič (1992, 1998, 2002) suggests that reduction in subtitling may be seen in terms of Halliday's three language functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual (see Chapter 2, Section 2.5.3). Kovačič's (1992) study shows that textual elements like connectives were often omitted in subtitling, which is in line with the results of the present study. She argues that these reductions may not hamper audience comprehension because subtitles are complemented by image (e.g. gestures and facial expressions) and sound (e.g. music and sound effects) (2002: 104). As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.4.2), subtitling involves the interaction of subtitles, image and sound, and subtitles would be difficult to understand when they stand alone. Therefore, it is important to take the polysemiotic nature into consideration whenever we discuss issues concerning subtitling.

In addition, the reduction of connectives in subtitling may be related to the notion that subtitling is no different from writing, or even rewriting. According to Nida (2001: 183),

“Professional translators are usually so concerned with the meaning of a text that they seldom give much thought to the grammatical structure of source or receptor languages, because their task is to understand texts, not to analyse them....If a translator adequately controls both source and receptor languages, translating is essentially no different from writing”.

One could say all translation is rewriting, but it may be especially true in subtitling that requires condensation and omission, which need to be made by considering the polysemiotic features and extra-linguistic elements characterised by subtitling. Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 146) suggest that condensation and omission lead to rewriting in subtitling, because the subtitler may “eliminate what is not relevant for the comprehension of the message and/or reformulate what is relevant in as concise a form as is possible or required” (ibid).

Moreover, although the subtitlers may automatically or subconsciously omit lexical elements like connectives, the results of the cohesion analysis show that the reduction of connectives was to some extent systematic and in accordance with the facilitation level of each type of connectives. Therefore, it may be concluded that the subtitlers' decisions are justified, and what they have omitted in subtitling may not be necessary for discourse comprehension.

Another important issue related to audience comprehension is the relationship between cohesion in text and coherence in mind. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.3), connectives contribute to textual cohesion by marking semantic relations explicitly, and a text without connectives is not considered cohesive. As the results of the cohesion analysis show, the documentaries were translated more cohesively, while the travel programmes less cohesively than the source texts. Nonetheless, it may be argued that although the presence of connectives may enhance textual cohesion, it does not necessarily contribute to coherence or comprehension, which according to Brown and Yule (1983) derives not so much from the presence or absence of connectives, but from the interpretation of the reader. As a result, the reduction of connectives may lead to less cohesive subtitles, but it may not necessarily obstruct comprehension. The issue of coherence in mind will be further discussed in Chapter 4 in relation to the results of the audience reception study.

In summary, the results of the cohesion analysis show that connective counts were reduced drastically from the STs to the TTs in both documentaries and travel programmes, except with the documentaries when *and* was excluded. The reasons for this exception may be that the documentaries are more written, scripted and information-intensive than the travel programmes as discussed earlier. In addition, *and* was a very category of connectives in this analysis. Consequently, whether it was included or not made a difference on the results.

3.4.5 Conclusion

The results of the cohesion analysis have been described and discussed. The addition/omission of connectives in the documentaries and travel programmes was related to genre and types of connectives, and when *and* was excluded, the documentaries were translated more explicitly, while the travel programmes were translated more implicitly. Furthermore, from the results of each type of connectives it

may be concluded that the addition/omission of connectives is largely systematic.

As discussed above, the addition/omission of connectives in subtitling is influenced by a number of factors. These include less use of connectives in Chinese, time and space constraints of subtitling, genre/discourse differences (information load, mode of language, degree of planning), subtitling strategies (condensation and omission), types of connectives (additive, adversative, causal, and temporal), and explicitation as a translation universal. Moreover, it has been illustrated that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to information loss or hamper comprehension, because subtitling is different from other types of translations, since it involves polysemiotic and extra-linguistic factors as discussed previously.

These findings have implications for the teaching and assessment of subtitling. It was found that even superficially minor differences in genre have given differences in subtitling strategies. This implies that what is important is not the genre per se, but the discourse of the source texts, for example, speech vs. writing and scripted vs. unscripted. Thus, how to add or omit connectives according to discourse should be an important lesson in the teaching of subtitling.

Furthermore, it may be argued that quantitative reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to qualitative reduction of comprehensibility. Therefore, the quality of subtitling should not be judged by the amount of reduction in subtitling. Rather, it should be judged from the perspectives of the overall context of subtitling and audience reception. Consequently, in addition to the quantitative analysis of the addition/omission of connectives in subtitling, an audience reception study was conducted to investigate the effect of reduction in subtitling on audience comprehension, which will be described and discussed in the next chapter. In addition, the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may be justified because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction will be further examined.

Moreover, it may be argued that the subtitlers seem to assume quantitative reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to qualitative reduction of comprehensibility, but it is not known whether this assumption is justified. Consequently, in addition to the quantitative analysis of the addition/omission of connectives in subtitling, an audience reception study was conducted to investigate the effect of reduction in subtitling on

audience comprehension, which will be described and discussed in the next chapter. In this study, the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may be justified because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction will be further examined.

Chapter 4. Audience Reception Study

This chapter describes the method used in the second-phase audience reception study, followed by the report of its results. In this study, a questionnaire survey was conducted to find out how the participants responded to the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles when they viewed clips specifically designed for the study. The collected data were analyzed statistically. This will be reported and discussed from the perspectives of genre, the addition/omission of connectives, and theories concerning coherence and comprehension.

Following the results derived from the cohesion analysis, the reception study was designed to answer the following questions:

- Does the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles of the two different TV genres examined earlier affect coherence and audience comprehension? If yes, in which way, and to what extent?
- Does the audience find subtitles explicitly marked with connectives easier to understand than those without connectives? And if yes/no, why?

4.1 Materials

The study used four English clips (two documentaries and two travel programmes from Discovery Channel) to test the response of audiences on the reduction of connectives in Chinese subtitles. Each clip was about eight minutes long with 800 to 1,000 words. The connectives in the four clips were either increased or decreased to a maximum or minimum amount by the researcher who has professional subtitling experience to enhance or reduce the cohesion level of Chinese subtitles, and to make the logical relations between sentences either explicit or implicit without impairing their original meaning and grammar. Thus, each clip had two versions: one ('max') with maximum amount of connectives, the other ('min') with the minimum amount, and there were eight clips in total. To illustrate, consider the following examples (the symbol “//” in the subtitles means the breaking of subtitles into two lines on the screen):

a. Original clip:

English source text: Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, make sure they're strong enough, **but also** make sure they actually work.

Chinese subtitles: 科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//確保它們夠堅固
但也確保它們真的能使用

Back translation: Technology has enabled us to design and analyze things, //make sure they're strong enough, **but also** make sure they actually work.

b. Max clip:

Chinese subtitles: 科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//**並**確保它們夠堅固
但也確保它們真的能使用

Back translation: Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, //and make sure they're strong enough, **but also** make sure they actually work.

c. Min clip:

Chinese subtitles: 科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//確保它們夠堅固
確保它們真的能使用

Back translation: Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, //make sure they're strong enough
make sure they actually work.

In the original source text, there is one connective *but also*. In the max clip, *and* was added, whereas in the min clip, both *and* and *but also* were omitted (see Appendix G for more sample materials).

The subtitles of the eight clips were created using *Subtitle Workshop*, a subtitling editing software. In the following, they will be referred to as Doc1 (max), Doc1 (min), Doc2 (max), Doc2 (min), Travell (max), Tavel1 (min), Travel2 (max), and Travel2 (min), respectively. Table 4.1 shows the amount of connectives in each clip. Take Clip Travell for example, its original amount of connectives in subtitles was 34, but the present study increased its amount to the maximum 54 and decreased it to the minimum 16. The difference between the maximum clip and the minimum clip was 38.

Table 4.1: Amount of connectives in each clip

	Original subtitles	Manipulated subtitles		Difference between max & min
		max	min	
Travel 1	34	54	16	38
Travel 2	32	45	13	32
Doc 1	33	39	4	35
Doc 2	53	64	15	49

4.2 Questionnaire Design

In order to answer the research questions above, a questionnaire was constructed. The questionnaire used in the survey was originally created both in Chinese and English, but only the Chinese questionnaire was used in the survey (see Appendices D and E). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part aimed to elicit general information about the respondents, e.g. their English listening comprehension ability, the importance of subtitles to their comprehension of English TV programmes, and their general view on the subtitling quality of English TV programmes. Furthermore, in order to understand what kind of criteria was considered important to the respondents when they watched subtitled foreign TV programmes, a Likert-scale checklist was designed and included at the end of the first part (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Likert scale for importance of criteria

	Very important	Important	So-so	Not important	Not at all important
a. Clarity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Concision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Fluency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Faithfulness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Coherence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Completeness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Readability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Diction & Register	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Speed of Subtitles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of Likert-scale items and open-ended questions. The Likert-scale checklist was designed around variables concerning the perception of the audience on the subtitles they had just viewed, e.g. coherence, conciseness, completeness, and information loss, and consisted of 12 items using a 5-point scale (“Strongly Agree”=5, “Agree”=4, “So-so”=3, “Disagree”=2, “Strongly Disagree”=1) (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Likert scale for the reception study

	Strongly Agree	Agree	So-so	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The subtitles are concise.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The subtitles are difficult to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The subtitles are too succinct to convey the meaning completely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I can understand the subtitles immediately without much thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The subtitles do not omit any essential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The subtitles cannot reflect the style of the clip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The subtitles are too fast to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The subtitles are too long to be understood at a glance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The connection between the subtitles is not obvious.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The subtitles are fluent and smooth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The overall quality of the subtitles is good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Among the 12 items, a half of them were expressed positively (Items 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12), and the other half, negatively (Items 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10), to avoid a response set where the respondents mark only one side of a rating scale and thus to reduce any harmful effects of acquiescence bias. That is, the respondents were encouraged to think about every item carefully, rather than to respond automatically.

A pilot test was conducted using a convenience sample of 30 final-year undergraduates from the Translation Department of Chang Jung University, primarily to ensure the clarity of questions and instructions to the participants. Like the participants in the main study, they filled in the first part of the questionnaire, watched the clips as outlined below, and then filled in the second part of the questionnaire. After the survey, the participants were asked to raise questions whenever they had difficulty in completing the questionnaire. Secondly, the time needed to complete the questionnaire was measured in the pre-test, which was about one hour. The pre-test shows that the

participants generally had no difficulty in completing the questionnaire.

4.3 Participants

The participants of the main study were 158 students who had not done the pilot test (30 males and 128 females) from Chang Jung University in Taiwan. They were selected partly because they were translation majors, who might pay more attention to the quality of translated subtitles than those non-translation majors. Another reason was that it was easier to obtain a large sample size if the survey was conducted in groups at a school with sufficient space, computing facilities, and audiovisual equipment.

The first-part questionnaire was analysed to provide summary background information about the respondents (see Appendix F for complete results). The 158 respondents were composed of 68 sophomores, 45 juniors, 23 seniors, and 22 first-year graduate students, and they were all translation majors except one. In addition, 52 of the respondents had taken a subtitling course, while 106 had not. Moreover, only 16 respondents rated their English listening comprehension ability as “Good”, while 94 rated “So-so”, 41 “Poor”, and 7 “Very poor”.

4.4 Procedures

From the outset, the participants of this survey were assured that the information they provide would be kept in strict confidentiality and only used for research purposes. Moreover, the participants were asked to state their name and email address with the purpose of informing them of the survey results or in case they did not properly complete the questionnaire for any reason, but it was verbally explained that it was optional, not mandatory.

The 158 respondents were first divided into Group A and Group B randomly by classes (see Table 4.4). Group A was composed of classes of Sophomore A, Junior (Economic and Trade Programme), and first-year graduate students, while Group B, Sophomore B, Junior (Journalism Programme), and Senior (Economic and Trade Programme). Thus, there were 75 respondents in Group A (18 males and 57 females), and 83 in Group B (12 males and 71 females).

Table 4.4: Groups A & B

Groups A	No. of respondents	Group B	No. of respondents
Sophomore A	31	Sophomore B	38
Junior (Economic and Trade Programme)	22	Junior (Journalism Programme)	23
First-year graduate students	22	Senior (Economic and Trade Programme)	22
Total	75	Total	83

There were eight clips in this study, and each group watched four of them. As Table 4.5 shows, Group A watched Clips 1 to 4 and Group B, 5 to 8. Both groups watched Travell1, Travel2, Doc 1, and Doc2, but the amount of connectives in the clips was either maximum or minimum. For example, Group A watched Travell1 (max), while Group B watched Travell1 (min).

Table 4.5: Max and min clips

Group A	Group B
1. Travell1 (max)	5. Travell1 (min)
2. Travel2 (min)	6. Travel2 (max)
3. Doc1 (min)	7. Doc1 (max)
4. Doc2 (max)	8. Doc2 (min)

The respondents were asked to complete the first part of the questionnaire concerning their general information first. Then they answered questions in the second-part questionnaire immediately after watching each clip. It took about one hour to complete the questionnaire, and the whole survey was conducted in eight groups in four days.

4.5 Results: Questionnaire Part I

As to the importance of subtitles to their comprehension of English TV programmes, 26 respondents thought they were “Very important”, 96 “Important”, 35 “So-so”, and only one “Not important”, suggesting that most respondents considered subtitles were important. As for the question of the subtitling quality of English TV programmes in general, 4 respondents answered “Very good”, 78 “Good”, 73 “So-so”, and only one

“Poor”.

Furthermore, in order to find out the relationship between the respondents’ English listening comprehension ability (Item 8) and their view on the importance of subtitles (Item 9), correlation analysis was conducted. The results show that any correlation between the two variables, although statistically significant, was negligible in strength: $r = -0.197$, $p < 0.05$. Therefore, whether the respondents’ English listening comprehension ability was good or not was, to all intents and purposes, unconnected to their view on the importance of the subtitles.

In order to understand what kind of criteria was considered important to the respondents when they watched subtitled foreign TV programmes, responses to the Likert items listed in Table 1 above were analysed. Each response option was assigned a number for scoring purposes (“Very important”= 5, “Important”=4, “So-so”=3, “Not important”=2, “Not at all important”=1), and all respondents’ scores for each item were summed up and averaged. The results show that the average scores of “Clarity”, “Coherence” and “Readability” were the three highest, while “Concision”, ”Faithfulness” and “Completeness” were the three lowest (see Table 4.6). However, there was relatively little difference between highest and lowest, with the scores ranging from 3.9 to 4.5.

Table 4.6: Average score of each item

	Average score
a. Clarity	4.5
b. Accuracy	4.4
c. Concision	3.9
d. Fluency	4.4
e. Faithfulness	4.0
f. Coherence	4.5
g. Completeness	4.1
h. Readability	4.5
i. Diction & register	4.3
j. Speed of subtitles	4.3

4.6 Results: Questionnaire Part II

The results of the second-part questionnaire were analysed statistically by conducting paired-samples t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multivariate

analysis of variance (MANOVA) using SPSS. Each response option in the Likert scale was assigned a number for scoring purposes (“Strongly Agree”= 5, “Agree”=4, “So-so”=3, “Disagree”=2, “Strongly Disagree”=1). With negatively worded items (Items 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10), the scores were reversed and recoded before analysis.

In order to ensure the internal consistency of the scales used in the questionnaire survey, reliability analysis was conducted based on the scores derived from each clip and four clips combined. The variables analysed were the 12 items in the Likert scale, and the data were the average scores of the 12 item from each respondent. The total sample size was 158. Internal consistency is used to judge the consistency of results across items on the same test. The smaller this variability (or stronger the correlation), the greater the internal consistency reliability of this survey instrument. One of the most commonly used indicators of internal consistency is the Cronbach alpha coefficient. Ideally, the Cronbach alpha coefficient should be above 0.7. The results show that the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Clip 1 scale was 0.90, the Clip 2 scale, 0.89 , the Clip 3 scale, 0.90, the Clip 4 scale, 0.90, and the scale of four clips combined, 0.94, suggesting very good internal consistency reliability for the scales used in the survey.

4.6.1 Quantitative analysis of Likert-scale items

The scores of each item in the Likert scale were summed up and averaged for the analysis of the eight clips the respondents watched. Four sets of scores were from Group A, and four from Group B (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7: Average scores of 8 clips for each item

No. Item	Group A (75)				Group B (83)			
	Travel1 (max)	Travel2 (min)	Doc1 (min)	Doc2 (max)	Travel1 (min)	Travel2 (max)	Doc1 (max)	Doc2 (min)
1. Concise	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	4.0
2. Understandable	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.9
3. Complete	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9
4. Processing effort	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1
5. Major info	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0
6. Subtle meaning	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.8	4.0
7. Style	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.6
8. Speed	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0
9. Length	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.0
10. Connection	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.8
11. Fluency	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.1
12. Overall quality	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1
Average	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.0

The Likert scores were rounded up to one decimal place, because this combines statistical sensitivity (hence at least one decimal place) with the fact that Likert numbers actually represent roughly-defined categories (hence finer distinctions than one decimal place have no real-world meaning). The average scores of the eight clips on all 12 items combined were very similar, ranging from the lowest 3.8 (Travel1 (min) and Travel2 (max)) to the highest 4.0 (Doc2 (max) and Doc2 (min)): hence their difference was merely 0.2. This seems to suggest that the addition/omission of connectives did not affect how the respondents scored the four clips they watched.

Moreover, the difference between the highest and lowest scores of each questionnaire item was mostly not significant, and the consensus was so big that the maximum difference on any question within a group was 0.5 (see Table 4.8).

Table 4.8: Lowest-highest score difference by groups

Item	Group A	Group B
1. Concise	0.3	0.2
2. Understandable	0.1	0.2
3. Complete	0.0	0.1
4. Processing effort	0.2	0.2
5. Major info	0.1	0.1
6. Subtle meaning	0.1	0.5
7. Style	0.1	0.3
8. Speed	0.1	0.3
9. Length	0.1	0.3
10. Connection	0.1	0.2
11. Fluency	0.1	0.3
12. Overall quality	0.1	0.1
Average	0.1	0.2

Furthermore, in order to further investigate and answer the research questions of the reception study, these findings were tested statistically. The results of the statistical tests will be discussed next.

4.6.2 *T-tests*

In order to answer the research question of whether and how the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles of different genres affects audience comprehension, one first needs to check whether inter-group differences might have disrupted the findings. Hence, all the scores of Group A and Group B were combined respectively. In order to find out whether there is a significant difference between the mean scores of Group A and Group B, an independent-samples t-test was conducted. The results show that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of Group A ($M = 3.92$) and Group B ($M = 3.87$): $t(156) = 0.78$, $p = 0.44$ (see Table 4.9). That is, Group A and Group B did not differ significantly in terms of how they scored the clips they watched.

Table 4.9: Independent samples statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Group A	3.92	0.42	75
Group B	3.87	0.39	83

Then, in order to find out whether the addition/omission of connectives and genre affect audience comprehension, the scores of max and min clips of documentaries and travel programmes were combined in two ways. Firstly, Travels (max) and Docs (max) were combined to become a new variable “Max” to represent the average score of all clips with a maximum amount of connectives, and Travels (min) and Docs (min) were combined to become “Min” to represent the average score of all clips with a minimum amount of connectives. Secondly, the scores of Travels (max), Travels (min), Docs (max) and Docs (min) were further mixed and combined: Travels (max) and Travels (min) were combined to become a new variable “Travel” to represent the average score of all clips of travel programmes, and Docs (max) and Docs (min) were combined to become “Doc” to represent the average score of all clips of documentaries. With the two sets of new variables, two paired-samples t-tests were conducted to evaluate whether there was a statistically significant difference between their mean scores. Table 4.10 shows the means and standard deviations of the variables in the tests.

Table 4.10: Paired samples statistics

		Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pair 1	Max	3.90	0.43	158
	Min	3.90	0.44	158
Pair 2	Travel	3.87	0.44	158
	Doc	3.93	0.44	158

There was no significant difference between the scores of the Max clips ($M = 3.90$) and the Min clips ($M = 3.90$): $t(157) = 0.19, p = 0.85$. However, there was a significant but very small difference between the scores of the Travel clips ($M = 3.87, SD = 0.44$) and the Doc clips ($M = 3.93$): $t(157) = -2.31, p = 0.02$. It may be initially concluded that the addition/omission of connectives does not affect the respondents’ perception on the coherence of subtitles, and any difference made by genre on the perception of subtitles is negligible.

Despite the lack of overall significant difference between the Max clips and the Min clips, it is worth investigating individual items to shed light on whether there was significant difference on important items such as understandability and overall quality between the max and min clips. Thus, the average item-by-item scores and score

differences between the max and min clips for each questionnaire item are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Max vs. Min, by item

Item	Max	Min	Max-Min Score
1. Concise	3.9	3.9	0
2. Understandable	3.9	3.9	0
3. Complete	4.0	3.9	0.1
4. Processing effort	4.0	4.0	0
5. Major info	4.0	4.0	0
6. Subtle meaning	3.8	3.8	0
7. Style	3.8	3.7	0.1
8. Speed	3.8	3.8	0
9. Length	3.8	3.9	-0.1
10. Connection	3.7	3.7	0
11. Fluency	3.9	4.0	-0.1
12. Overall quality	4.1	4.1	0
Average	3.9	3.9	0

As Table 4.11 shows, all score differences between the max and min clips are less than 0.1; none were statistically significant. This seems to suggest that there was no difference on various quality indicators, including comprehensibility.

4.6.3 One-way repeated measures ANOVA

In order to see if there is any interaction between genre and subtitling compression, one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted comparing the average scores of Travels (max), Travels (min), Docs (max), and Docs (min). The reason for adopting repeated measures ANOVA was that all the 158 respondents watched four clips and scored them one by one using the same scale. Hence, every score compared in the analysis came from the same person, which gives a more precise analysis than comparing scores from different persons would. The means and standard deviations of the variables in the test are presented in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Descriptive statistics of four variables

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Travels (max)	3.89	0.49	158
Travels (min)	3.85	0.49	158
Docs (max)	3.92	0.48	158
Docs (min)	3.94	0.47	158

The results show that the scores given by different respondents across the four categories were significantly different, $F(2.77, 434.92) = 2.75, p = 0.047^3$. The eta squared statistic (0.02), however, indicated a small effect size. In addition, the results of pairwise comparisons show that only the scores of Travels (min) ($M = 3.85$) and Docs (min) ($M = 3.94$) were significantly different, $p = 0.03$ (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13: Pairwise comparisons among four groups

(I) Score	(J) Score	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
1. Travels (max)	2. Travels (min)	0.04	1.00
	3. Docs (max)	-0.03	1.00
	4. Docs (min)	-0.06	0.87
2. Travels (min)	1. Travels (max)	-0.04	1.00
	3. Docs (max)	-0.07	0.23
	4. Docs (min)	-0.09	0.03
3. Docs (max)	1. Travels (max)	0.03	1.00
	2. Travels (min)	0.07	-0.23
	4. Docs (min)	-0.03	1.00
4. Docs (min)	1. Travels (max)	0.06	0.87
	2. Travels (min)	0.09	0.03
	3. Docs (max)	0.03	1.00

³ Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(5) = 17.98, p < .05$). Therefore, degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = .92$).

Therefore, there was a significant but slight difference between Travels (min) (with the lowest score of 3.85) and Docs (min) (with the highest score of 3.94) when connectives were omitted. In other words, when both of them were less explicitly marked with connectives, Docs (min) were overall considered to be more coherent than Travels (min) if it is a real effect. Thus, it may be concluded that the differences among the four variables, though significant, are small.

4.6.4 MANOVA (or four-way ANOVA)

Moreover, in order to investigate how Travels (max), Travels (min), Docs (max), and Docs (min) differ on the individual Likert-scale items, MANOVA was employed to test the difference between the four variables across the twelve items. The means and standard deviations of the variables in the test are shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Descriptive statistics of 12 items

Item		Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Concise	T (max)	3.96	0.69
	T (min)	3.89	0.69
	D (max)	3.91	0.70
	D (min)	3.96	0.66
2. Understandable	T (max)	3.99	0.71
	T (min)	3.86	0.75
	D (max)	3.87	0.79
	D (min)	3.92	0.78
3. Complete	T (max)	3.99	0.64
	T (min)	3.94	0.63
	D (max)	4.03	0.61
	D (min)	3.94	0.63
4. Processing effort	T (max)	3.98	0.75
	T (min)	3.89	0.84
	D (max)	3.96	0.76
	D (min)	4.04	0.74
5. Major info	T (max)	3.96	0.69
	T (min)	4.02	0.66
	D (max)	3.96	0.61
	D (min)	4.02	0.59
6. Subtle meaning	T (max)	3.78	0.70
	T (min)	3.65	0.77
	D (max)	3.79	0.69

	D (min)	3.89	0.69
7. Style	T (max)	3.79	0.87
	T (min)	3.75	0.85
	D (max)	3.85	0.84
	D (min)	3.72	0.99
8. Speed	T (max)	3.77	0.76
	T (min)	3.72	0.82
	D (max)	3.85	0.78
	D (min)	3.90	0.73
9. Length	T (max)	3.77	0.85
	T (min)	3.85	0.78
	D (max)	3.89	0.71
	D (min)	3.98	0.64
10. Connection	T (max)	3.67	0.75
	T (min)	3.61	0.87
	D (max)	3.78	0.85
	D (min)	3.77	0.75
11. Fluency	T (max)	3.85	0.75
	T (min)	3.89	0.72
	D (max)	3.96	0.75
	D (min)	4.01	0.66
12. Overall quality	T (max)	4.02	0.63
	T (min)	4.05	0.63
	D (max)	4.08	0.64
	D (min)	4.14	0.60

The results show that there was a statistically significant difference between the four variables and the twelve items, $F(36, 1823.72) = 1.44, p = 0.045$, Wilks' Lambda=0.92, partial eta squared = 0.03. In other words, the four variables differ in terms of the scores of the twelve items. When the results for the twelve items were considered separately, however, the only difference to reach statistical significance was Item 6 (“The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning”), $F(3, 628) = 3.04, p = 0.03$, partial eta squared = 0.014. An inspection of the mean scores revealed again a significant difference between Docs (min) ($M = 3.89$) and Travels (min) ($M = 3.65$) on Item 6, $p = 0.02^4$. The results suggest that the omission of connectives produced a small difference between min-subtitled documentaries and min-subtitled travel programmes in terms of the conveying of subtle meaning (the partial eta squared value of 0.014 confirms that

⁴ The results for multiple comparisons were Bonferroni adjusted.

this is quite a small effect). Thus, although there was a significant difference between Docs (min) and Travels (min) on “Subtitle Meaning”, the strength of association was small, and it is possible that this might be a statistical artefact because of high number of tests conducted and the relatively high p-value (0.03). However, it was expected that Docs (min) would lead to a slightly higher loss of subtle meaning than Travels (min) because of the differences between documentaries and travel programmes as discussed in Chapter 3 (e.g. information load, mode of language, and degree of planning), and this result will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

Having reported the results of the statistical analysis, this chapter will conclude with the summarised results and brief discussion of the results.

4.6.5 Conclusion

The results of the audience reception study can be summarised as follows:

- a. In general, based on the Likert scale analysis, the average scores of the eight clips were similar, ranging from the lowest 3.8 to the highest 4.0—a difference of merely 0.2. This seems to suggest that the addition/omission of connectives had very little effect on how the respondents scored the clips they watched.
- b. There was no significant difference between the Max clips and the Min clips. Moreover, any difference between the Travel clips and the Doc clips was very small or even negligible (see Table 4.8). Thus, it may be concluded that the addition/omission of connectives did not affect how the respondents scored the clips they watch, and genre had little effect on how the participants perceived the coherence of subtitles.
- c. Similarly, there was a significant but slight difference between the scores of Travels (min) and Docs (min) (see Table 4.13). This overall difference between Travels (min) and Docs (min) was caused by a small difference on Item 6 (“The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning”) (see Table 4.14). As this one difference out of many potential differences may be a statistical artefact, it should be treated with caution. Otherwise, it may be concluded that the effect of the addition/omission and genre on the coherence of subtitles was negligible.

Overall, the results of the reception study show that there were very few significant differences, and the significant differences that existed were small. More specifically, no matter if the connectives were added or omitted, the documentaries were scored slightly

higher than the travel programmes. The reasons why the respondents seemed to have a slight preference of the documentaries over the travel programmes may be related to several issues discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

First, as discussed in Chapter 3, documentaries and travel programmes are somewhat different in style and function. The pace and flow of the travel programmes tend to be faster than the documentaries. Hence, the respondents may find the subtitles of the travel programmes slightly more difficult to keep up with.

Second, as discussed in Chapter 2, the slight difference between the two genres may be caused by the degree of advance planning. The documentaries are more organised and logical (by thematic organisation) because they are scripted and planned in advance. By contrast, the travel programmes are more spontaneous and less structured. Thus, the respondents may find the subtitles of documentaries were easier to follow than those of the travel programmes.

Finally, the slight difference between the two genres may be caused by the degree of “spokenness” or “writtenness”. The documentaries are more written and formal, while the travel programmes are characterised more by spoken features such as false starts, overlaps, hesitations, incomplete sentences, repetitions, and self-corrections. Hence, in the process of subtitling, those spoken features may be omitted or condensed to fit into the constrained space on screen. Furthermore, discourse markers such as *oh* and *well* in the travel programmes were almost all omitted. As a result, it may be considered by the respondents that something was not translated or mistranslated by the subtitler.

From the above discussion, it may be concluded that despite the addition/omission of connectives, the respondents had a slight preference of the documentaries over the travel programmes. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that the difference was very small and that there were no significant differences between the Max clips and the Min clips within the same genre.

Furthermore, it seems that the respondents had no particular preference between the max clips and the min clips of different genres with the exception of the slight difference between Docs (min) and Travels (min) on the Subtle Meaning item as mentioned above. In other words, the addition/omission of connectives did not seem to

affect the respondents' perception on the coherence of subtitles. This may be explained by several issues discussed in the previous chapters, such as cohesion in text, construction of coherence, and features of subtitling, and they will be briefly discussed next.

Firstly, it can be explained from the perspective of cohesion in text. As discussed in Chapter 2, connectives contribute to textual cohesion by marking semantic relations explicitly, and a text without connectives is not considered cohesive. Nonetheless, in addition to connectives, textual cohesion can be achieved by repetitions (of wording and meaning), references, cohesive phrases, adjectives, and verbs, etc. that were retained even in the clips with a minimum amount of connectives. The following examples are taken from the clips used in this study. Cohesion can be expressed by references like *this* and *that*, and a variety of phrases such as *the result...* to indicate a causal relation, *the first stage...* and *first item...* to indicate a temporal relation. In addition, adjectives like *different* and *same* indicate comparison. All these example links were retained even in the Min clips. This is one potential reason why the omission of connectives did not affect how the respondents scored the clips they watched.

Secondly, the reason why there was no significant difference between the max and min clips may be explained by the concept of coherence. As discussed in Chapter 2, coherence exists in mind, and it is the mental representation of the text rather than the text itself that leads to coherent discourse and successful comprehension. Thus, coherence could be created even if overt cohesion is lacking. Moreover, as the results of the reception study show, in subtitling, the level of coherence seems to remain the same with varying levels of cohesion, because the respondents were able to make sense of what they read and hear when some connectives were omitted. Thus, it may be concluded that the presence of connectives may not necessarily contribute to easier comprehension, and the absence of connectives may not necessarily impair comprehension. This also strongly supports the conclusion derived from the cohesion analysis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may not lead to information loss or hamper comprehension.

Lastly, it can be explained by the multiple semiotic channels of subtitling as discussed in Chapter 2. The audience is not only reading subtitles in the viewing process. They are taking information from other audiovisual channels such as image and sound so that

they are able to supplement the content of the subtitles. With increased time of viewing, the audience gradually builds up a semiotic context based on those channels, and by which they may draw inferences and make better interpretation. As a result, the omission of connectives may not affect the perception of the audience on the coherence of subtitles. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.3.1), cohesion and coherence should be complementary to each other. That is, if coherence is low, cohesion will need to be increased to keep the text interpretable, and vice versa. However, in subtitling, the level of coherence may remain the same with varying levels of cohesion in text if the pragmatic and semiotic factors are taken into consideration.

The purpose of the audience reception study was to investigate whether and how the addition and omission of connectives affect the audience's perception on the coherence of subtitles. As discussed above, the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles of different genres may not affect the perception of subtitles although the audience may have a slight preference for the genre that is characterised more by written and formal discourse. An implication of this might be that connectives are not really used (contrary to received wisdom) for text comprehension but merely to indicate a particular style. Moreover, it may be concluded that the audience may not find subtitles explicitly marked with connectives easier to understand, because greater explicitness may be counterbalanced by greater cognitive effort needed to process them (Gutt 1998: 43). Also, as the results of the reception study show, with many connectives and some logical relations missing, the respondents' perception on the coherence of subtitles was not affected. As a result, it may be concluded that coherence could be created when textual cohesion is lacking.

Furthermore, the present study aims to examine the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling due to the constraints of time and space may also be justified, because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction. From the results of the cohesion analysis and the reception study, one may conclude that the audience may make sense themselves when connectives are omitted, and thus the reduction of connectives are justified in subtitling. In addition, from the subtitlers' point of view, they make reductions due to time and space constraints in subtitling, but the reductions they make do seem to be those that do not impair audience comprehension.

As mentioned at the end of Chapter 2, Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest that context

plays an important role in translating and propose three dimensions of context: communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction. From the audience's point of view, the viewing process is a process of "contextualisation", which involves the act of making sense of information from the situation or location in which the information was found, and both verbal and non-verbal signs are essential to the generation of context in subtitling. As Jakobson (1959: 116) suggests, "the richer the context of a message, the smaller the loss of information". Therefore, in the next chapter, all the linguistic and non-linguistic elements that may constitute the context in subtitling will be discussed based on the three dimensions of context proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990) in relation to the findings derived from the cohesion analysis and the audience reception study.

Chapter 5. Discussion

This chapter begins with the review of the research problem and the major methods used in the study, followed by the discussion of major findings derived from the results of the present study in relation to the notion of coherence and context as discussed in Chapter 2.

5.1 Review of the Study

As discussed in Chapter 1, subtitling plays an increasingly important role in translation studies due to the omnipresence of audiovisual materials in our society from sources like television sets, cinemas, computers and mobile phones. However, there have been few empirical studies on how reduction in subtitling may affect the perception of the audience. Consequently, the present study tries to answer the question whether and how reduction in subtitling affects cohesion and coherence of subtitles with reference to connectives in English and Chinese.

As discussed in Chapter 2, reduction in subtitling is often inevitable due to the constraints of time and space. The risk, however, is that it may lead to information loss and poorer quality of subtitles, which may in turn hamper comprehension (see Section 2.5). Thus, it seems that there is potential conflict between reduction in subtitling and comprehension of subtitles. However, it may be argued that reduction in subtitling may not necessarily lead to information loss because of the polysemiotic elements, such as picture and sound, as discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, the present study set out to investigate whether and to what extent reduction in subtitling, particularly the reduction of connectives, affect coherence and comprehension of subtitles of different genres. Furthermore, this study tries to explain how coherence in subtitling is achieved by drawing on the notion of context. As discussed in Chapter 2, the contextual factors encompass register variables such as field, tenor and mode, pragmatic principles including Gricean maxims, and semiotic elements involving the interaction of texts, discourse, and genre as signs (Hatim and Mason 1990).

The present study has set up the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may be justified, because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction. In order to test the hypothesis, a two-phase study

was designed to answer two sets of specific research questions. As discussed in Chapter 3, the first-phase cohesion analysis was designed to answer two research questions: How are connectives translated in subtitles of different genres? Is the addition/omission systematic or random, and to what degree? This study conducted a textual analysis of source texts and target texts of two TV genres: scripted documentaries and non-scripted travel programmes. The occurrences of connectives in STs and TTs were classified in additive, adversative, causal, and temporal connectives. The results of the cohesion analysis showed that the addition or omission of connectives was closely related to their facilitation level and genres. In addition, as discussed in Chapter 3, the addition/omission of connectives is also influenced by other factors, which will be discussed in connection with the results of the audience reception study in the following sections. The second-phase audience reception study as reported in Chapter 4 was conducted to find out how the addition/omission of connectives in subtitles of different genres affects the perception of the respondents. In order to answer the question, a questionnaire survey was conducted.

Moreover, the difference between the cohesion analysis and the reception study mainly lies in the fact that the former examined the actual subtitles and the relations between sentences and the latter manipulated the subtitles and looked at whole-text comprehension. The results of the cohesion analysis and the reception study strike a contrast in that the subtitlers seemed to believe that it was necessary to add and omit connectives for different genres, but it turned out that the connectives did not seem to be necessary for audience comprehension. The conflicting results may be explained by two levels of comprehension. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.1.3), the comprehension process is guided by two modes of information processing: bottom-up and top-down processing, and the two processes should be occurring simultaneously to achieve comprehension. This is similar to the notion proposed by Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) that a distinction can be made between the micro- and macro-level comprehension. The former refers to comprehension of individual propositions and their relations at the word and sentence level, the latter to the comprehension of larger parts or the text as a whole on the basis of context. It is often believed that readers need to operate on both levels to fully understand a text, but the results of the present study do not confirm this view.

In the cohesion analysis, both a micro-level sentence-by-sentence analysis and a

whole-text summing-up of these analyses were done, whereas the audience reception study only looked at macro-level whole-text comprehension. As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.3.3), connectives may facilitate reading comprehension by making the relation between sentences explicit. Consequently, it may be speculated that the addition and omission of connectives might have affected sentence-by-sentence comprehension. However, the results of the reception study show that the amount of connectives was not important for whole-text comprehension. Therefore, it may be initially concluded that to some extent full micro-level comprehension is not necessary for the macro-level comprehension in subtitling.

In the following sections, the present study tries to explain how the audience may achieve the macro-level comprehension when the micro-level comprehension is hindered from the perspectives of coherence and contextual factors that include register, pragmatic principles, and the interaction of text, genre and discourse.

5.2 Coherence and Context

The results of the cohesion analysis show that how connectives are translated (added/omitted) in subtitling seems to depend on genres, and the reduction of connectives was to some extent systematic and in accordance with the facilitation level of each type of connectives. As discussed in Chapter 3, the subtitlers tend to add and/or omit connectives in the subtitling process due to a number of factors: less use of connectives in Chinese, time and space constraints of subtitling, genre differences (information load, mode of language, degree of planning), subtitling strategies (condensation and omission), and types of connectives (additive, adversative, causal, and temporal).

Nevertheless, the results of the cohesion analysis seem to contradict those of the reception study discussed in Chapter 4. Contrary to the conventional wisdom that connectives play an important role in guiding or facilitating the reader's comprehension, the results of the reception study show that connectives appear to play a lesser role in subtitling. That is, from the perspective of the audience, the presence or absence of connectives did not seem to affect their perception on the coherence of subtitles. While Enkvist (1989: 375) claims that both textual cohesion and inferential coherence are needed in the interpretation and comprehension of a text as discussed in Chapter 2, the results of the present study show that the respondents were able to make sense of what

they read and hear when some connectives were omitted. Consequently, it may be concluded that connectives contribute to coherence to a much lesser extent in subtitling, which leads to the question of how coherence is achieved in subtitling, i.e. how the respondents made sense of what they read because coherence might well be stepping in to compensate for the loss of connectives and cohesion, and coherence in subtitling may be explained by context.

This study draws on the three dimensions of context in translating proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990) to explain how the audience may fill in a missing link when subtitles are less cohesive as the results of the present study show. The three dimensions are communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction, and the contextual factors related to the three dimensions will be discussed respectively in the following sections.

5.2.1 *Communicative factors*

First, the present study tries to explain how the respondents made sense of what they read when most connectives were absent from the perspective of the communicative context that is formed by three register variables: field, tenor and mode. Also, the translation shifts of the three variables in the subtitling process lead to issues like style and rewriting of subtitling, which will be discussed in the following sections.

5.2.1.1 *Field, tenor and mode*

The first element in the communicative context is field. At its simplest, field refers to subject matter or content of the specific language event. Broadly speaking, it involves physical circumstances surrounding a speech event, such as time and place. In terms of language function, the ideational elements represented by field are usually encoded in language used to convey information, ideas or experience, e.g. nouns and verbs. In the context of subtitling, the elements included in field are mostly translated word by word. According to the study of Kovačič (1992), as discussed in Chapter 2, the ideational elements were mostly preserved in subtitling. That is, content words like nouns and verbs tend to be translated as they are in subtitling.

Similarly, in the present study, the ideational elements in the source text were mostly translated without undergoing additions or omissions in the target texts (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5). Consequently, the ideation or content of the source text was not lost in the

subtitling process. This may explain why the respondents were able to make sense of what they read when connectives were absent. Thus, it may be initially concluded that field or ideation form the most important part of context in subtitling, and as long as it is not lost in subtitling, the audience may make sense of what they read even if there are some omissions in the subtitles relating to other elements of the context.

The second element of the communicative context is tenor. To put it simply, tenor refers to the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, which in turn determines the degree of formality (formal or informal). In terms of language function, the interpersonal elements represented by tenor are usually expressed in language to establish relationship, e.g. phatic expression, terms of address, emotional exclamations, and modality. In addition, Crystal (1985: 292) points out that Halliday's "tenor" stands as a roughly equivalent term for "style".

As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.2), in this study, connectives are defined as words or short phrases that link clauses or sentences and their function is to explicitly specify a particular semantic relationship between two clauses or sentences in this study. Hence, according to the definition of the present study, the omission of connectives did not lead to the loss of interpersonal touch or affected the relationship between participants in any other significant way. However, as mentioned in Chapter 2, Kovačič (1998: 78) suggests that interpersonal elements like phatic expression and exclamations were frequently omitted, because they were redundant when combined with image and sound. Similarly, the results of the reception study show that, although the interpersonal elements such as discourse markers (e.g. *oh*, *well*, *OK*, and *right*) in the source text were mostly omitted in the target texts, the respondents' perception on the coherence of subtitles was not affected. Thus, it may be initially concluded that tenor or the interpersonal elements form a less important part of context in subtitling, and the audience may make sense of what they read even if the interpersonal elements are lost in subtitling. Nonetheless, because of the loss of the interpersonal elements, the subtitles appeared to be more formal in style than the source text, which in turn results in shift in tenor from informal to formal. However, this shift may not hinder the audience's perception on the coherence of subtitles since the semiotic factors (e.g. picture and sound) may compensate for what was lost in the subtitles.

As the results of the audience reception study show, the addition/omission of

connectives did not affect how the respondents scored the clips they watch, and genre had little effect on how the respondents perceived the coherence of subtitles. However, there was one exception: the omission of connectives produced a small difference between min-subtitled documentaries and min-subtitled travel programmes in terms of the conveying of subtle meaning, and the former was scored slightly higher than the latter by 0.24 Likert points. This result may be explained by the shift of tenor in the travel programmes, where almost all discourse markers, such as *oh* and *well*, were omitted. Consequently, it may be considered by the respondents that subtle meaning or minor details were not translated by the subtitler.

Finally, mode refers to the symbolic organisation of the situation, which includes the channel/medium used to convey the message (Halliday and Hasan 1985: 12). In the Hymes model, mode is equivalent to channels referring to the choice of oral, written, or other medium of transmission of speech. As discussed in Chapter 2, the discourse of subtitling is characterised by a crossover between speech and writing, and some spoken features such as fragments and repetitions tend to be omitted in the subtitling process. Moreover, in terms of language function, mode is related to the textual function of language that is partly realised through cohesion (the way the text hangs together lexically, including the use of anaphoric reference and connectives). In addition, in the context of subtitling, according to Kovačič (1998: 78), textual elements like connectives are often omitted because “coherence of dialogue is supported by continuity of visual material”.

As discussed in Chapter 4, due to the omission of some spoken features, the subtitles appeared to be more “written” than the source text, which in turn leads to shift in mode from spoken to written. Nevertheless, as the results of the reception study show, the addition/omission of connectives did not affect the respondents’ perception on the coherence of subtitles. Thus, it may be concluded that mode or the textual elements, as well as tenor, form a less important part of context in subtitling than field or the ideational elements.

To sum up, field, tenor and mode form the communicative context in subtitling, but their importance varies. As discussed above, it seems that if field or ideation is preserved in the subtitling process, the audience may make sense of the subtitles with some omissions (including the omission of discourse markers and connectives). As a

result, it may be concluded that from the perspective of the audience, the fulfilment of ideational function is more important than that of interpersonal and textual functions in subtitling, because the latter two functions may be supported by semiotic features such as picture and sound.

5.2.1.2 Content, form and style

It may be said that subtitling is a special type of translation in which content (represented by field) outweighs form and style (represented by mode and tenor respectively). As the results of the reception study show, the addition and omission of connectives had little effect on the coherence of subtitles. Consequently, it may be concluded that content (i.e. ideation formed by nouns and verbs) is more important than form (i.e. connectives and textual cohesion) in subtitling.

Furthermore, the form of translation is closely related to the issue of style. Although Hatim and Mason (1990: 9) suggest that style is an indissociable part of the message to be conveyed, the results of the reception study show that the respondents were able to comprehend the subtitles when there was loss of interpersonal elements such as discourse markers. One of the possible reasons for this is that the importance of style differs among types of text. There are some texts where style clearly matters (e.g. poems and novels as literary texts), and some texts where it matters much less (e.g. weather reports and legal documents as non-literary texts) (Boase-Beier 2006). Thus, not all translation is concerned with style to the same degree, and its importance is largely determined by the function of a text or text type.

As discussed in Chapter 2 (see Section 2.5.6), the present study investigated two types of informative audio-medial texts: documentaries and travel programmes from Discovery Channel. Reiss (2000: 48) suggests that the translation of informative texts must give priority to the conveyance of information, and audio-medial texts to the non-linguistic factors such as picture and sound. Consequently, it may be concluded that as long as the content of the source text is preserved, loss of form and style may not hinder the audience's perception on the coherence of subtitles, because the audio-medial factors may compensate for the textual and stylistic elements lost in the subtitles.

Hatim and Mason (1990: 9) claim that to modify style is to deny the reader access to the world of the source text, and it may lead to the "adaptation" of the source text, which

brings up the issue of whether subtitling is a case of translation or adaptation.

5.2.1.3 Subtitling as rewriting

Bastin (2009: 4) suggests that adaptation is often associated with subtitling, because its emphasis is to preserve the function of the original text rather than the form or even the semantic meaning when acoustic and/or visual factors have to be taken into consideration. He defines adaptation as “a set of translative interventions which result in a text that is not generally accepted as a translation but is nevertheless recognized as representing a source text” (ibid: 3). In addition, Gottlieb (1997: 335) suggests that adaptation is to change something so that it becomes suitable for a new purpose or a new situation.

According to Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007: 9), subtitling has not been regarded as a form of translation by some translation scholars. Instead, they consider subtitling as a type of adaptation. As Pommier (1988: 22, cited in Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 27) put it, “It has to be understood that the subtitled text is not a proper translation, but rather *a simple adaptation* that preserves the general meaning of the original”. Díaz Cintas and Remael (ibid) argue that this is one of the main reasons why subtitling has been ignored by translation scholars until recently. As a result, the present study tries to show that although subtitling is constrained by many limitations such as time and space, it is not a form of adaptation but a form of translation with a certain degree of rewriting. Subtitling, in fact, may be seen as a special type of translation that entails the shift of the register variables: field, tenor and mode. As discussed above, the three variables may be shifted due to some omissions. First, subtitling covers a wide variety of topics such as history, engineering, physics, and technology to name just a few, and it is easy for the audience to identify them since content words (e.g. nouns and verbs) are mostly translated as they are in subtitling. Consequently, there is not usually a shift in field in subtitling, and thus it should not be considered as a form of adaptation. Second, although tenor and mode may be shifted because of some omissions in the subtitles, they are not entirely changed or lost in subtitling, because the semiotic elements (e.g. picture and sound) may compensate for what is lost in the subtitles as discussed above. As a result, it may be said that subtitling is a form of translation with some shifts in tenor and mode, and hence it is a form of rewriting, not adaptation.

Hatim and Mason (1990: 64-5) suggest that “Seeing the meaning of texts as something

which is negotiated between producer and receiver and not as a static entity, independent of human processing activity once it has been encoded, is, we believe, the key to an understanding of translating, teaching translating and judging translations”. Therefore, the discussion of pragmatic action next will focus on how the meaning of texts is negotiated particularly from the perspective of the receiver or the audience in the present study.

5.2.2 Pragmatic factors

The results of the audience reception study show that the respondents seemed to be able to make sense of the subtitles with most connectives omitted. This may be explained by speech act theory, which aims to explain how the receiver can reason from the literal meaning of what is said to the implied meaning and induce what the sender is intending to do with his or her words (Cook 1994: 40) (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.4). To illustrate, consider the following example taken from the materials of the cohesion analysis:

Original: It's like about 2:00 a.m. in the morning now and I can't sleep because I'm a bit worried about the volcano, yeah? Because it's erupted like, I think it's 30 times in the last seven years, and this hut is right at the foot of the volcano, yeah.

Subtitles: (Back translation)
現在大概凌晨 2 點,我睡不著 (It's like about 2:00 a.m. now, I can't sleep)
我有點擔心火山 (I'm a bit worried about the volcano)
過去 7 年它大概爆發了 30 次(It's erupted like 30 times in the last seven years)
這間小屋就在火山腳下 (This hut is right at the foot of the volcano)

In this example, the connectives *because* were omitted in the subtitles, but it may be argued that the omission would not affect the respondents' comprehension of the subtitles because it is easy for them to infer that his insomnia is caused by the frequent eruption of the volcano in recent years and the fact that the hut is close to the volcano. Based on the classification of speech acts proposed by Searle (1976), the speech acts of the subtitles (represented in back translation) may be presented as follows:

- a. It's like about 2:00 a.m. now, I can't sleep
(a representative act seeking to represent a state of affairs)
- b. I'm a bit worried about the volcano
(an expressive act giving expression to the speaker's mental and emotional attitude towards a state of affairs)
- c. It's erupted like 30 times in the last seven years

(a representative act stating the reason for insomnia)

- d. This hut is right at the foot of the volcano
(a representative act stating the reason for insomnia)

As Lautamatti (1990) suggests, these speech acts may work together to help create a coherent sequence when the utterances are not formally connected. Consequently, speech acts may form a part of the pragmatic context that may be used to explain why the omission of connectives may not adversely affect the respondents' perception on the coherence of subtitles as the results of the audience reception study show.

Moreover, the results of the audience reception study may be explained by the principle of relevance.

5.2.2.1 *Economical translating*

The results of the reception study may be explained by the Gricean maxim of relevance (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.5). Relevance is the most important feature of successful communication. In a broader sense, relevance means that each sentence must be relevant to an underlying topic and to the context, which in turn leads to coherence in the mind of the receiver and successful comprehension. Thus, from the perspective of the subtitlers, the principle of relevance may be used as a guideline to decide what is not relevant or redundant to the audience, and hence can be omitted without affecting the audience's comprehension process.

Furthermore, relevance refers to the aim to achieve maximum benefit at minimum processing cost as asserted by Sperber and Wilson (1986) in Relevance Theory. As they suggest, the degree of relevance is determined by contextual effects and processing effort. The greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance; the smaller the effort needed to achieve those effects, the greater the relevance (see Section 2.1.6). In order to achieve optimal relevance in subtitling, the subtitler must omit or reduce a word or information in the original if the word or the information does not increase benefit but incurs processing efforts. Thus, as the audience is reading, viewing, and listening at the same time, reducing the number of words is crucial. According to the results of the reception study, connectives did not seem to increase benefit to the audience, and their omission did not seem to affect the comprehension process although there is clearly some loss of both subtleties of content and interpersonal stylistic qualities when

connectives are omitted. In other words, omitting them means reducing processing cost without detracting greatly from benefit. In the following examples taken from the materials of the cohesion analysis, the information was either reduced or omitted in the subtitles, as the subtitlers consider the information redundant or not relevant (the symbol “//” in the subtitles means the breaking of subtitles into two lines on the screen):

Example 1.

Original:

A: 50 euro.

B: 50? 50 euro, and it's nearby, no? It's close?

Subtitles: (Back translation)

50 歐元 (50 euro)

50 歐元?那兒很近不是嗎? (50 euro? It's close, isn't it?)

Example 2.

Original:

The Grand Canal has only three bridges including the famous Rialto bridge, made of marble and completed in 1592. But the most impressive feature of the canal is its palaces, or palazzi.

Subtitles: (Back translation)

大運河上只有 3 座橋 (the Grand Canal has only three bridges)

一座是知名的利亞托橋 (one of them is the famous Rialto bridge)

以大理石造成,1592 年完工 (made of marble, completed in 1592)

但運河最大的特色在於//兩岸的華麗宮殿建築

(But the most impressive feature of the canal is // its palaces)

In Example 1, the sentence “50? 50 euro, and it's nearby, no? It's close?” was reduced to “50 euro? It's close, isn't it?”, but the reduction makes the sentence more readable at a glance. In Example 2, “and” and “or palazzi” were omitted. The word “palazzo” was omitted for the sake of conciseness. Otherwise, the subtitler needs to explain that it is an Italian word if he/she wants to keep the word. However, the information is redundant and irrelevant (especially for Chinese audiences, for whom “palazzo” might be less familiar and hence more disruptive than to English audiences) in the sense that the travel programme is not about teaching a language. Consequently, relevance is about how to achieve communication in an economical way, which is exactly an important issue in subtitling. That is, subtitling is a way of economical translating in which the subtitler strives to achieve highest readability with the least words in subtitles. As a result, reduction in subtitling may minimise the processing effort of the audience, which

may in turn enhance the readability and comprehension of subtitles.

However, the subtitler must take a potentially variable audience into consideration upon deciding what and how much to reduce.

5.2.2.2 Audience-centred translating

According to the cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975), if the speaker's utterance seems irrelevant or redundant, the hearer will, based on the assumption of cooperation, seek to construct a sequence of inferences. As Brown and Yule (1983) point out, coherence of a text derives not so much from the presence or absence of formal linguistic links such as connectives, but from the interpretation of the reader, who readily fills in any missing links as required. As the results of the audience reception study show, the respondents seemed to follow the cooperative principle and make an effort to interpret the relationships between ideas and units of talk despite the fact that these ideas were not connected. However, the degree and success of cooperation may be determined by several factors concerning the audience.

First, background knowledge or schemas may also play an important role in the interpretation made by the audience. As discussed in Chapter 2, inferences made by the reader are partly based on his/her knowledge of the world. As a result, whether the audience is familiar with the topic or subject matter of a film may partly determine whether they can make sense of what they read at the bottom of the screen. The participants in the audience reception study were undergraduate and postgraduate students who were taught the history of Rome and the life of Julius Caesar when they were in senior high school. Consequently, this kind of knowledge might help them understand the clips they watched even if there were some omissions in the subtitles.

Second, reading purposes will determine the depth of text processing since it is not the same to read for pleasure, for information, for an examination, etc. In the audience reception study, the participants were asked to answer the questions after watching the clips, so their reading purpose was more for information than for pleasure. Consequently, they might make more efforts in processing the information they got from the clips and interpreting the relationships between ideas and units of talk even if these ideas were not connected.

Third, English proficiency may also play a role in the comprehension of subtitles, especially in Taiwan where many people learn English. As all participants of the reception study have studied English for many years, it is reasonable to assume that it may help them understand what they watched when most of the connectives were omitted. Finally, reading speed, personal interests, and educational background may also determine the degree of cooperation from the audience and contribute to the outcome of the audience reception study. For example, if the viewers can read subtitles fast, they will have more time to process information coming from picture and sound.

In conclusion, as the results of the reception study show, coherence and successful comprehension of subtitles requires the interpretation of subtitles beyond the word and sentence level on the part of the audience. From a pragmatic perspective, subtitling is a type of sense-for-sense translating, which is in-between of literal and free translation, and the sense here may refer to the sense made by the audience based on their knowledge of the world.

5.2.3 Semiotic factors

The third dimension of context in translating is semiotic interaction. From a semiotic point of view, text, genre and discourse as signs may offer a complementary perspective on the process of communication, and the appropriateness of translations can be judged in the light of these considerations (Hatim and Mason 1990: 144).

5.2.3.1 Text, genre and discourse

Text, genre and discourse relay vital signals which link a given utterance with what it basically reminds us of: some social occasion conventionally enshrined in language (a genre structure), some attitudinal statement (a discursal element), or some rhetorical purpose (a textual matter) (Hatim 1997: 4).

The results of the present study may be explained by the fact that the conventions of text, genre and discourse may provide guidelines to the subtitler on what and how to translate as well as to the audience on the comprehension of subtitles. Both documentaries and travel programmes examined in this study are informative TV programmes that aim to inform the audience about objects and phenomena in the real world. However, their choice of linguistic and stylistic forms is somewhat different. As discussed in Chapter 3, the distinction between documentaries and travel programmes

mostly lies in discourse differences: a documentary is more formal and impersonal in language and style, while a travel programme more informal and personal. To illustrate the point, let's look at two brief extracts of the documentaries and travel programmes analysed in the cohesion analysis (see Tables 5.1 and 5.2).

Table 5.1: Documentary: *Building the Biggest: The West Coast Line*

One of the world's busiest railways is facing a mammoth task. The London to Glasgow line is getting ripped up and replaced in an eight billion pound makeover. It's a time consuming job that can only take place at the weekends on a line that zigzags from England to Scotland. The planning has to be meticulous. If any one of these metal monsters is out of position then the whole operation will grind to a halt. It's a giant game of chess and it's being played out against the clock. It's all about getting ready for the weekends all the planning work, what you do is all about the weekend possession when there's no train, no passenger trains running.

One of the possessions is near Carlisle in the English Lake District. It's 58 kilometres in length and contains 14 different work sites the largest being Long Ashes where they're replacing the track. It's Saturday morning. Preparation throughout the night went well. They now start cutting up the old track removing the sleepers and digging down over a meter to remove over 1,000 tons of old ballast. At another site workers are refurbishing a tunnel passing under the track. They are also replacing the foot bridge. The bridge was built at a factory before being transported by road to the site. This bridge is an integral part of the village and if the locals are going to get their papers on Sunday and their trains on Monday morning, the bridge has to fit first time.

Table 5.2: Travel programme: *Globe Trekker: Venice City Guide*

A: I know the whole gondola thing is a real cliché but it's part of a long-standing tradition in Venice and well, it's the most romantic city in the world, so the gondola thing just has to be done. And this is a gondola station. Ciao.

B: Hello.

A: Are you free?

B: Yes.

A: Can I take the gondola, yes?

B: Of course.

A: How much? How much is the gondola?

B: How much? It depends on the tour you choose. We have different prices and programs.

A: What is...?

B: Normal ride costs about 80 euros.

A: 80 euros. Well listen, you only live once, right? Thank you, grazie.

B: You are welcome.

A: Is this is your gondola?

B: This is mine.

A: Yeah? It's beautiful.

B: My gondola, yeah, you like it?

A: You interior decorated it?

B: Yeah, my mother prepared that. Yes, everything was prepared and created by my mother.

A: It's just...it's beautiful, she did a wonderful job.

B: Oh yeah? Thank you very much.

A: What's your name?

B: John the Baptist, but they call me Johnba.

A: Johnba, my name is Justine.

B: Welcome to Venice and in my gondola, Justine.

A: Grazie, John.

B: Okay, you ready?

A: I'm ready.

B: Let's go.

A: Gondolas have been used in Venice for over 400 years. Their narrow shape and single oar make them ideal for navigating the small canals. They were the preferred mode of transport for aristocrats and the gondolier, the perfect chauffeur.

A documentary is a genre which has its own conventions. In terms of discourse, it tends to be formal. At the textual level, its rhetorical purpose is mainly to inform, and it is formal in discourse and written to be spoken. As Table 5.1 shows, the documentary mainly talks about engineering and the construction of the railway, and words like “sleeper” and “ballast” are not usually found in everyday conversation. Its discourse is formal in the sense that the documentary is characterised by monologue, which involves communicative distance as discussed in Chapter 3 and tends to have more characteristics of written language, such as advance planning, complex sentences, and fluency (no pauses, hesitations, or repetitions) as discussed in Chapter 2.

Of course, a travel programme also has its own conventions. In terms of discourse, it tends toward informality. At the textual level, its rhetorical purpose is to inform in an entertaining way. As Table 5.2 shows, the travel programme introduces a traveller’s journey to Venice and its gondola. Its discourse is informal and characterised by spontaneous conversation, which involves communicative closeness and tends to have more characteristic of spoken language, such as interaction between the speaker and the listener, less-structured simple sentences, and non-fluency (false starts and repetitions). Consequently, as the results of the present study show, these conventional features of documentaries and travel programmes may be of assistance to the subtitlers in making decisions to add or omit connectives in the translating process and help the audience comprehend the subtitles when most of the connectives were omitted.

5.2.3.2 Extralinguistic factors

In addition to linguistic and semantic factors, non-linguistic factors play an important role in subtitling. As the results of the audience reception study show, even if connectives in the source texts were mostly deleted in the target texts, which in turn led to a lower level of cohesion in the target texts, the respondents seemed to have no problems comprehending the subtitles they read. From the perspective of extralinguistic factors, image and sound may make up what is lost or remained untranslated in subtitles. In a broader sense, image in subtitling may include captions (e.g. title of a programme) and signs (e.g. a road sign) on screen as well as body language (e.g. gestures and posture) and facial expressions. For example, a smile on the face may suggest approval of something. In addition, a monument like Eiffel Tower reminds people of where things happened. Consequently, there is some truth to the notion that a picture is worth a thousand words in subtitling.

Furthermore, sound conveys a lot of information that cannot be conveyed by words. The scope of sound may include music (e.g. slow and fast), background noises (e.g. car horn), voice (e.g. loud and weak), vocal effects (e.g. giggling, coughing, and throat clearing), intonation, and voiceless hesitation and pauses. All the sound and noises are revealing and make up the semiotic context in subtitling. For example, by varying the intonation, speakers can convey different moods and attitudes of surprise and nervousness, which creates emotion and meaning where the image alone cannot and helps the audience interpret the meaning of the speakers' word.

Moreover, in terms of technical aspects in subtitling, one of the possible reasons for the results of the audience reception study may be that punctuation marks such as colons and commas in the subtitles are sometimes used as a conjunctive device. For example, a connective may be omitted and replaced with a comma between sentences. The following examples are taken from the materials of the cohesion analysis:

Original: ...so it is pretty powerful stuff *and* it is pretty dangerous stuff.

Subtitles: 電力強大,非常危險 (Back translation: it is pretty powerful, pretty dangerous stuff)

The connective *and* between sentences in the original was replaced with a comma in the subtitles, but coherence was maintained from the perspective of the Chinese subtitles, because this is an effect of subtitling conventions per se allowing a more telegraphic style. Also, Chinese is more tolerant than English of parallel phrases joined by a comma.

Another possible explanation for the successful comprehension of subtitles without connectives is the format of the subtitles including use of a shorter upper line and longer lower line in two-liners to facilitate reading and insertion of line breaks according to sense blocks. The example below illustrates how line breaks serve as a cohesive device like a connective:

Original: It's the birthplace of the waltz *and* the resting place of Beethoven.

Subtitles: (Back translation)

是華爾滋的誕生地 (is the birthplace of the waltz)

貝多芬的安息處 (the resting place of Beethoven)

The original was separated into two lines to become headline-like subtitles, and the connective *and* was replaced by the line break between sentences. However, coherence was preserved between individual subtitles. In conclusion, subtitling is characterised by semiotic complexity in which different sign systems interact with each other to create a coherent story (Díaz Cintas and Remael 2007: 45). Consequently, even if subtitles are reduced linguistically due to temporal and spatial constraints, what is lost may be compensated by the rich semiotic elements in subtitling.

5.2.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, the coherence and comprehension of subtitles may rely on the context consisting of communicative transaction, pragmatic action, and semiotic interaction. Moreover, it may be argued that the semiotic interaction is the most important dimension of the three in subtitling, because it has richer semiotic elements (e.g. image and sound) than other translating activities. In addition, the semiotic factors that constrain the subtitlers in the translating process in the beginning help the audience with their comprehension of subtitles in the end. According to the results of the reception study that the respondents seemed to be able make sense themselves, it may be concluded that the rich contextual elements may make up what is lost in the subtitles, which in the present study refers to the omission of connectives.

This study set out to examine whether and how the omission of connectives affects cohesion and coherence of subtitles of different genres. In addition, it aims to evaluate the hypothesis that the reduction of connectives in subtitling may be justified, because the audience may fill in a missing link by themselves when there is reduction without affecting coherence. It may be concluded that the omission of connectives may lower the cohesion level of the subtitles, but coherence of subtitles will be maintained by the interaction of various contextual elements as well as the interaction of these elements with the audience.

Moreover, it may be concluded that reduction in subtitling is something of a necessary evil. One of the reasons for this is that viewers cannot read as quickly as they can listen, so they need sufficient time to read what is written on screen. In addition, the viewers need to watch the action on screen and listen to the soundtrack, so they need enough time to read, watch, and listen at the same time. Consequently, the subtitler needs to eliminate details and irrelevant information for readability at a glance. In other words,

under time constraints, reduction may in turn help the viewers focus on important information and the interaction of image, sound and subtitles. Therefore, it may be further concluded that subtitling is in essence a type of gist translation in which what is lost may be complemented by semiotic interaction of image and sound.

The present study has made several findings by conducting the analysis of textual cohesion and the study of coherence in the mind of the audience, and their implications will be further discussed in the final chapter of this thesis, which will be concluded with the limitations and recommendations of this study.

Chapter 6. Conclusions

The present study has investigated whether and to what extent reduction in subtitling, particularly the reduction of connectives, affect coherence and comprehension of subtitles of different genres. The findings of this study suggest that cohesion in text may not be necessary for coherence of subtitles due to rich contextual elements in subtitling as discussed in Chapter 5. The implications and limitations of the present study will be discussed in the following sections. Recommendations for future research and practice are given at the end of the chapter.

6.1 Implications for Theory

The findings of this study have a number of theoretical implications for subtitling. To begin with, this study has thrown new light on reduction in subtitling and its effect on audience comprehension. The findings show that the addition and omission of connectives have very little effect on the audience's perception on the coherence of subtitles. This suggests that comprehension in subtitling takes place from the macro structure of the text, which includes extra-textual elements such as picture and sound and signals relayed by conventions of text, genre and discourse, rather than from the micro level of the word and sentence.

Moreover, this study has investigated the relationship between cohesion and coherence. Although cohesion and coherence are integral aspects of a text, the present study has found that coherence seems to be more important than cohesion for the comprehension of subtitles. An implication of this is that the conventional wisdom that connectives such as *and*, *but*, *so* can make it easier for the reader to process and make sense of what they read is not applicable to subtitling. That is, higher level of textual cohesion does not equate to easier whole-text comprehension in subtitling. Instead, coherence in subtitling may be achieved when cohesion at the level of connectives is absent if the audience can draw inferences and make sense of what they read based on their knowledge of the language and conventions of social communication. As a result, the study of the relationship between cohesion and coherence encourages the researcher to look beyond purely linguistic issues and helps shed light on the role of the audience as an active participant in the subtitling process.

Finally, this study has tried to explain how coherence is achieved in subtitling by

adopting a contextual approach. First, register plays an important role in the communicative dimension of context, because subtitling may entail a shift of register variables: field, tenor and mode may be shifted due to some omissions. Second, in the pragmatic dimension of context, coherence may be achieved by following the cooperative principle and the Gricean maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner on the part of the speaker and the hearer. Third, the semiotic dimension of context may account for coherence in subtitling with its textual and generic conventions and extralinguistic factors. It is hoped that this contextual framework will provide an impetus for further research in subtitling.

6.2 Implications/Recommendations for Practice and Training

The findings of the present study also have several implications for professional subtitlers and training/assessment of subtitling. First, the conventions of text, genre, and discourse may provide guidelines to the professional subtitlers on what and how to translate. As a result, the subtitlers should be able to perform source text analysis in order to have a clear understanding of a text beyond the word and sentence level. In addition, as the results of the present study show, it is important for the subtitlers to conform to the expectations of the audience and determine the relevance of the information contained in the message based on their knowledge of the domain and needs for information, and viewing purposes.

Second, the findings of this study have important implications for the teaching and assessment of subtitling. Trainee subtitlers are usually taught the need for reduction in subtitling, but what is more important is that they need to learn what makes good-quality reduction. As the results of this study show, subtitling is a special type of translating that is not only constrained by time and space but also facilitated by rich contextual factors. Hence, it requires additional skills other than general translating skills (e.g. text analysis, subject expertise, language transfer, and quality control) that the other modes of translating require.

In terms of linguistics skills, Díaz Cintas (2001) identifies three dimensions: informative, semantic and communicative, while James et al. (1996) propose portrayal, language quality, grammar, punctuation and spelling. Kruger (2008) distinguishes between translation and/or editing skills, division of subtitles, grammar, spelling and punctuation. The table below provides a comparison of these skills (Kruger 2008: 85):

Table 6.1: Linguistic skills of subtitling

Díaz Cintas (2001)	James et al. (1996)	Kruger (2008)
<p>Informative dimension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of transfer of information • Omission of information and priority awarded to utterances as well as impact of omissions <p>Semantic dimension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct transfer of meaning and nuances <p>Communicative dimension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful intersemiotic (image and sound) transfer • Idiomatic flair <p>Breaks between subtitles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of coherence between individual subtitles 	<p>Portrayal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of register and style <p>Language quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of literal translation • Use of idiomatic expressions in TL <p>Grammar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of coherence, logical and syntactical units in each subtitle • Correct grammatical usage • Simplicity of syntax <p>Spelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of spelling mistakes indicating a lack of careful proofreading <p>Punctuation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct use of punctuation to give clues to syntactic structure of subtitles • Helpful punctuation without being obtrusive 	<p>Translating/Editing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of equivalence between subtitle and dialogue <p>Division of subtitles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line-to-line and subtitle-to-subtitle (coherence units) <p>Linguistic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct spelling, grammatical usage and research <p>Punctuation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy of punctuation (including dialogue dashes) • Obstruction factor of punctuation

Moreover, the subtitler needs to negotiate between number of characters, durations of subtitles, line divisions, synchronisation of what is said with when it is said, and various semiotic signs that impact on what is subtitled and how it is subtitled (ibid : 86) (see Table 6.2).

Table 6.2: Technical skills of subtitling

Díaz Cintas (2001)& James et al. (1996)	Kruger (2008)
<p>Time coding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient reading time (not too little or too much) <p>Synchronisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synchronisation of appearance and disappearance of subtitles with what is happening both on the screen and soundtrack <p>Breaks between subtitles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient duration between 2 subtitles • Successful treatment of cuts <p>Formatting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insertion of line breaks according to sense blocks • Use of a shorter upper line and longer lower line in 2-liners to facilitate reading 	<p>Cueing: duration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum vs. maximum length of one-line and two-line subtitles (too short/long) • Is sufficient time allowed to read the subtitle and to take in the image, or too much or too little time? <p>Cueing: rhythm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relation to visual rhythm of film, sound rhythm (including whether subtitles are on or off too early or late) • Respecting of boundaries (shot, scene, music) <p>Division of subtitles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line-to-line • Subtitle-to-subtitle

The skills listed in the two tables can be re-classified according to the three contextual dimensions discussed in this study. For example, the preservation of register is the essence of the communicative dimension, priority-based retention and omission of information is in accordance with relevance in the pragmatic dimension, and correct use of punctuation is one of the extralinguistic factors mentioned in the semiotic dimension of context. Also, the technical skills of subtitling can be re-classified into the semiotic context. Table 6.3 shows the reclassification of the subtitling skills (both linguistic and technical skills) proposed by Díaz Cintas (2001), James et al. (1996), and Kruger (2008), based on the three contextual dimensions.

Table 6.3: Reclassification of subtitling skills

Communicative Transaction	Pragmatic Action	Semiotic Interaction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of register and style • Use of idiomatic expressions in TL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of equivalence between subtitle and dialogue • Completeness of transfer of information • Correct transfer of meaning and nuances • Omission of information based on priority of utterances • Simplicity of syntax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful intersemiotic (image and sound) transfer • Correct use of punctuation to give clues to syntactic structure of subtitles • Synchronisation of appearance and disappearance of subtitles with what is happening both on the screen and soundtrack • Sufficient time for reading the subtitle and taking in the image • Relation to visual and sound rhythm of film • Use of a shorter upper line and longer lower line in 2-liners to facilitate reading

Moreover, the findings of the present study suggest that all the skills in the three dimensions may contribute to good-quality reduction and coherence of subtitles. However, the technical aspect of subtitling is important to the coherence of subtitles when there is reduction, but it is often ignored in the classroom of subtitling because of lack of technological support. However, with the advancement of technology, now there are several subtitling programmes developed for the purpose of subtitler training. Among them, “Subtitle Workshop”, free software for the creation of subtitles, is recommended, and it provides most of the functions of professional systems.

In summary, this study provides an integrated approach combining all contextual factors, linguistic skills, and technical skills to the teaching and assessment of subtitling so as to encourage students to consider all textual, contextual, and semiotic aspects of subtitling as well as enable a more objective way of assessing subtitles.

6.3 Evaluation of Methods

From a methodological point of view, this study contributes to the study of cohesion in text and coherence in mind in by conducting a two-phase study (i.e. the cohesion analysis and the audience reception study) to enhance our understanding of coherence and discourse of subtitling. However, a number of methodological limitations need to be noted regarding the present study. Firstly, in terms of methodology, the results of the cohesion analysis may be affected by cohesive devices that were not investigated by this study. Apart from connectives, cohesion in text may be achieved by other forms of

cohesive devices such as reference, repetition, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion as proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), but the cohesion analysis of this study only examined how the addition and omission of connectives affected the cohesion of subtitles, and its results may not provide a whole picture of how cohesion in text was achieved in subtitles. Moreover, the results of the cohesion analysis may be affected by the difference between the linguistic structures of Chinese and English in that Chinese uses fewer connectives than English. Therefore, in order to compensate for these inevitable defects, it is suggested that all the cohesive devices that may contribute to cohesion in text should be examined all together and look into the difference between Chinese and English beyond their linguistic structures in future studies.

Secondly, there are some limitations on the methodology of the audience reception study. The use of negatively-worded items in the Likert scale questionnaire was intended to encourage the respondents to think about every item carefully, but it did not turn out as expected. It seemed that negatively worded items the Chinese questionnaire may not be understood by the respondents if they did not notice the nuance of the wording, because the negative words (e.g. “沒有” [mei-you]) in the Chinese questionnaire may not be as clear and obvious as those (e.g. “not”) in the English questionnaire. Consequently, it is advised that when it comes to designing a Chinese questionnaire, the use of negatively-worded items should be avoided or at least highlighted.

Furthermore, a comprehension test may be needed to test whether the respondents truly understood what they watched. However, one of the concerns was that the test may turn out to be a test on the memory ability of the respondents instead of the readability of the subtitles if the test asks some details mentioned in the programmes, such as what event takes place in which year by whom at which place under what kind of circumstances. Moreover, the audience reception study was mainly designed to investigate the audience’s overall perception on the coherence of subtitles but not detailed comprehension of the subtitles. As a result, it may be worthwhile investigating how detailed comprehension interacts with global comprehension in future studies to shed extra light on how comprehension is achieved in subtitling.

Finally, in terms of sampling, the respondents of the audience reception study were all university and postgraduate students. They were selected because they were translation

majors, who might pay more attention to the quality of subtitles than those non-translation majors, and it was easier to obtain a large sample size at a school with audiovisual equipment. However, they may understand some if not most of the narration or dialogue in the film, which may affect how they perceived the coherence of subtitles in the questionnaire survey. In addition, they may not be able to represent all of the audience who watch the Discovery Channel. Moreover, the respondents may prefer certain subject matter, so the results may not reflect the quality of the subtitles, but their own preference. Furthermore, expertise, educational background, reading speed, personal interests, and English proficiency may also lead to different results. For example, professional subtitlers and translation trainees may hold different views on the quality of subtitles. Thus, it is recommended that future research should encompass professional subtitlers and the audience who regularly watch the programmes that the research tries to study.

6.4 Recommendations for Future Research

The present study was designed to investigate reduction of subtitling from the perspective of context, and several issues were identified during the discussion of the results of the present study. Firstly, as the present study suggests, a corpus-based study and more larger-scale audience reception studies on other genres (e.g. drama, movies, and sitcoms) are needed to further investigate whether and how reduction in subtitling may affect overall comprehension of the audience. Moreover, in addition to connectives investigated in the present study, the role of cohesive devices such as reference, repetition, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion in subtitling may be worth investigating too.

Secondly, cohesion in text seems less important in subtitling than in other types of translating. In addition, the construction of coherence in subtitling is closely related to contextual factors. Consequently, it may be worthwhile to investigate the role of cohesion and coherence in other types of translating, and particularly in terms of English-Chinese translating.

Thirdly, it was found that the reduction is inevitable and seemingly justified in subtitling. The tendency to omit and condense the source language is also found in interpreting activities such as consecutive and simultaneous interpreting as they are constrained by time. Thus, it may be worth investigating whether any of the methods and approaches used in this study might shed light on strategies and audience understanding in interpreting.

Fourthly, little is known about the subtitle reading behaviour of the audience. It may be assumed that the audience could not read the subtitles like they read sentences in a book, because the subtitles are transient and cannot be re-read. Therefore, studies on the eye movement of the audience to examine the effect of absence/presence of connectives in subtitle reading may provide new insight into the study of subtitling.

Lastly, in studying the complex process of translating, as suggested by Hatim and Mason (1990: 1), "we are in effect seeking insights which take us beyond translation itself towards the whole relationship between language activity and the social context in which it takes place". Hence, it may be worthwhile to further explore the notion of context proposed by them and its application in translating and interpreting in order to provide a more comprehensive theoretical framework for the teaching, assessment, and study of translating and interpreting as well as subtitling.

References

- Anderson, J. R. (2000). *Cognitive Psychology and Its Implications* (5th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.
- Assis Rosa, A. (2001). Features of Oral and Written Communication in Subtitling. In Y. Gambier & H. Gottlieb (Eds.), *(Multi)Media Translation: Concepts, Practice, and Research* (pp. 213-221). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2006). Contextualization in translator- and interpreter-mediated events.
- Bastin, G. L. (2009). Adaptation. Translated by Gregson, M. In: Saldanha, G. & Baker, M. (Eds.) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 3-6. Available via Google Scholar.
- Beaman, K. (1984). Coordination and Subordination Revisited: Syntactic Complexity in Spoken and Written Narrative Discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse* (pp. 45-80). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Beaugrande, R.-A. d., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Blakemore, D. (2001). Discourse and Relevance Theory. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 100-118). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies* (pp. 17-35). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic approaches to translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Bravo, J.-M. (2004). Conventional Subtitling, Screen Texts and Film Titles. In J. M. Bravo (Ed.), *A New Spectrum of Translation Studies* (pp. 209-230). Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1988). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 73-92). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chan, Y.-L. (2005). *The relationship between connectives and reading processes: Evidence from eye movements*. Unpublished MA thesis, National Central

University, Chungli.

- Chaume, F. (2004). Discourse Markers in Audiovisual Translating. *Meta*, 49(4), 843-855.
- Chen, D.-A. (1997). *English and Chinese Translation—A Comparative Study*. Taipei: Bookman.
- Chen, J. W. (2006). *Explicitation through the Use of Connectives in Translated Chinese: A Corpus-Based Study*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester, Manchester.
- Cohen, G., Kiss, G., & Le Voi, M. (1993). *Memory: Current Issues* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and Literature: The Interplay of Form and Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G. (2001). *The Discourse of Advertising* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Dancette, J. (1997). Mapping Meaning and Comprehension in Translation: Theoretical and Experimental Issues. In J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain & M. K. McBeath (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 77-103). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Linde, Z. (1995). 'Read My Lips': Subtitling Principles, Practices, and Problems. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 3(1), 9-20.
- Degand, L., Lefèvre, N., & Bestgen, Y. (1999). The impact of connectives and anaphoric expressions on expository discourse comprehension. *Document Design*, 1, 39-51.
- Díaz Cintas, J. (2001). *La traducción audiovisual: el subtitulado*. Salamanca: Almar.
- Díaz Cintas, J., & Remael, A. (2007). *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (1993). Semantic Change in Translation: A Cognitive Perspective. In Y. Gambier & J. Tammola (Eds.), *Translation and Knowledge*. Turku: University of Turku-Centre for Translation and Interpreting.
- Enkvist, N. E. (1989). From Text to Interpretability: A Contribution to the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text Linguistics. In W. Heydrich, F. Neubauer, J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer (Eds.), *Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse* (pp. 369-382). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Enkvist, N. E. (1990). Seven Problems in the Study of Coherence and Interpretability. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives* (pp. 11-28). Alexandria, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Fischer, K. (2006). Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: introduction to the volume (pp. 1-20). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Fraser, B. (2006). Towards a theory of discourse markers. In K. Fischer (Ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (pp. 189-204). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Gambier, Y. (1994). Audio-visual Communication: Typological Detour. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2* (pp. 275-283). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gambier, Y. (2003). Introduction: Screen Transadaptation: Perception and Reception. *The Translator: Screen Translation*, 9(2), 171-189.
- Georgakopoulou, P. (2003). *Reduction levels in subtitling: DVD subtitling: a compromise of trends*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Surrey, Guildford.
- Goldman, S. R., & Murray, J. D. (1992). Knowledge of Connectors as Cohesion Devices in Text: A Comparative Study of Native-English and English-as-a-Second-Language Speakers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(4), 504-519.
- Gottlieb, H. (1992). Subtitling - A New University Discipline. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience* (pp. 161-170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (1994). Subtitling: People Translating People. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2* (pp. 261-274). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (1997). Quality Revisited: The Rendering of English Idioms in Danish Television Subtitles vs. Printed Translations. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Text Typology and Translation* (pp. 309-338). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (1998). Subtitling. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 244-248). London: Routledge.
- Gottlieb, H. (2004). *Screen Translation: Seven studies in subtitling, dubbing and voice-over* (4th ed.). Copenhagen: Centre for Translation Studies, University of Copenhagen.

- Grace-Martin, K. (2008). Can Likert Scale Data ever be Continuous? Retrieved 10 July, 2001, from <http://www.analysisfactor.com/statchat/can-likert-scale-data-ever-be-continuous/>
- Green, G. M. (1989). *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts* (pp. 41-58). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Guardini, P. (1998). Decision-Making in Subtitling. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 6(1), 91-112.
- Gumperz, J. J., Kaltman, H., & O'Connor, M. C. (1984). Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse: Ethnic Style and the Transition to Literacy. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse* (pp. 3-19). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Gutt, E.-A. (1992). *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation*. Dallas/New York: Summer Institute of Linguistics and United Bible Societies.
- Gutt, E.-A. (1998). Pragmatic Aspects of Translation: Some Relevance-Theory Observations. In L. Hickey (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Translation* (pp. 41-53). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London, Edward Arnold. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: the Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Hansen, M.-B. M. (1998). *The functions of discourse particles: A study with special reference to spoken standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication Across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.

- Hatim, B. (1998). Text Politeness: A Semiotic Regime for a More Interactive Pragmatics. In L. Hickey (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Translation* (pp. 72-102). Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Heltai, P. (2005). Explicitation, Redundancy, Ellipsis and Translation. In K. Károly & Á. Fóris (Eds.), *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honour of Kinga Klaudy* (pp. 45-74). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). *Thinking Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- House, J. (2004). Explicitness in Discourse Across Languages. In J. House, W. Koller & K. Schubert (Eds.), *Neue Perspektiven in der Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschwissenschaft* (pp. 185-208). Bochum: AKS.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation* (pp. 232-239). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- James, H., Roffe, I., & Thorne, D. (1996). Assessment and Skills in Screen Translation. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3: New Horizons* (pp. 177-186). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jucker, A. H., & Ziv, Y. (1998). Discourse Markers: Introduction. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory* (pp. 1-12). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kilborn, R. (1993). Speak my language: Current attitudes to television subtitling and dubbing. *Media, Culture and Society*, 15, 641-660.
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85(5), 163-394.
- Klaudy, K. (1998). Explicitation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 80-84). London: Routledge.
- Koch, P., & Österreicher, U. (1990). *Gesprochene Sprache in der Romania*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kovačič, I. (1991). Subtitling and contemporary linguistic theories. In M. Jovanovic (Ed.), *Latraduction, profession créative-Translation, a creative profession* (pp.

- 407-417). Belgrade: Prevodilac.
- Kovačič, I. (1992). *Jezikoslovni pogled na podnaslovno prevajanje televizijskih oddaj/A Linguistic Approach to Subtitling Television Programmes*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana.
- Kovačič, I. (1993). Tri funkcijska jedra sodobnega anglosaskega jezikoslovja. In S. Inka (Ed.), *Jezik tako in drugače* (pp. 282-293). Zbornik. Ljubljana: Drustvo za uporabno jezikoslovje Slovenije.
- Kovačič, I. (1994). Relevance as a factor in subtitling reductions. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2* (pp. 245-251). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kovačič, I. (1998). Six Subtitlers-Six Subtitling Texts. In L. Bowker, M. Cronin, D. Kenny & J. Pearson (Eds.), *University in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies* (pp. 75-82). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kovačič, I. (2002). Thinking-aloud Protocol--Interview--Text Analysis. In S. Tirkkonen-Condit & R. Jaaskelainen (Eds.), *Tapping and Mapping the Processes of Translation and Interpreting: Outlooks on Empirical Research* (pp. 97-109). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kroll, B. (1977). Combining ideas in written and spoken English: A look at subordination and coordination. Discourse across time and space. In E. Keenan & T. Bennett (Eds.), *Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics* (Vol. 5, pp. 69-108). Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California.
- Kruger, H. (2001). The Creation of Interlingual Subtitles: Semiotics, Equivalence and Condensation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 9(3), 177-196.
- Kruger, J.-L. (2008). Subtitler training as part of a general training programme in the language professions. In J. Díaz Cintas (Ed.), *The Didactics of Audiovisual Translation* (pp. 71-87). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lautamatti, L. (1990). Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives* (pp. 31-40). Alexandria, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1981). *Style in fiction : a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1989). A Review of Relevance. *Journal of Linguistics*, 25, 455-472.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

- McNamara, D. S., Kintsch, E., Butler, S. N., & Kintsch, W. (1996). Are good texts always better? Interactions of text coherence, background knowledge, and levels of understanding in learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction, 14*, 1-43.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Millis, K. K., Graesser, A. C., & Haberlandt, K. (1993). The impact of connectives on the memory of expository text. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 7*, 317-339.
- Millis, K. K., & Just, M. A. (1994). The influence of connectives on sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language, 33*, 128-147.
- Murray, J. D. (1995). Logical Connectives and Local Coherence. In R. F. Lorch & E. J. O'Brien (Eds.), *Sources of Coherence in Reading* (pp. 107-125). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Murray, J. D. (1997). Connectives and narrative text: the role of continuity. *Memory and Cognition, 25*(2), 227-236.
- Nida, E. A. (2001). *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- O'Connell, E. (2007). Screen Translation. In P. Kuhlwezak & K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 120-133). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Øverås, L. (1998). In Search of the Third Code: An Investigation of Norms in Literary Translation. *Meta, 43*(4), 571-588.
- Pander Maat, H., & Sanders, T. (2006). Connectives in Text. In K. Brown, A. H. Anderson, L. Bauer, M. Berns, G. Hirst & J. Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 33-41). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Peng, K.-C. (2006). *The development of coherence and quality of performance in conference interpreter training*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds, Leeds.
- Perego, E. (2003). Evidence of Explicitation in Subtitling: Towards a Categorisation. *Across Languages and Cultures, 4*(1), 63-88.
- Pommier, C. (1988). *Doublage et postsynchronisation*. Paris: Editions Dujarric.
- Puurtinen, T. (2003). Genre-specific Features of Translationese? Linguistic Differences between Translated and Non-translated Finnish Children's Literature *Literary and Linguistic Computing, 18*(4), 389-406.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar*

- of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Reiss, K. (1971). *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik: Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*. München: Hueber.
- Reiss, K. (1977). Texttypen, Übersetzungstypen und die Beurteilung von Übersetzungen. *Lebende Sprachen* 22(3): 97-100.
- Reiss, K. (1989). Text types, translation types and translation assessment. In A. Chesterman (Ed.), *Readings in Translation* (pp. 105-115). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations* (E. F. Rhodes, Trans.). New York/Manchester: American Bible Society/St. Jerome.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rost, M. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Listening*. London: Longman.
- Sanders, T., & Pander Maat, H. (2006). Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approaches. In K. Brown, A. H. Anderson, L. Bauer, M. Berns, G. Hirst & J. Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 591-595). London: Elsevier.
- Sanders, T. J. M., & Noordman, L. G. M. (2000). The Role of Coherence Relations and Their Linguistic Markers in Text Processing. *Discourse Processes*, 29(1), 37-60.
- Sanford, A. J. (2006). Coherence: Psycholinguistic Approach. In K. Brown, A. H. Anderson, L. Bauer, M. Berns, G. Hirst & J. Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 585-591). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse markers. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Setton, R. (1999). *Simultaneous Interpretation: A cognitive-pragmatic analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shiro, M. (1994). Inferences in discourse comprehension. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (pp. 167-178). London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. M. (1988). Naturalness in Language. *English Language Research Journal*, 2, 11-20.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.).

Oxford: Blackwell.

- Spooren, W., & Sanders, T. (2006). The acquisition order of coherence relations: On cognitive complexity in discourse. *Spooren, W. & T. Sanders (2005) submitted for publication*, 1-41.
- Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Thorne, S. (1997). *Mastering Advanced English Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1992). A Theoretical Account of Translation-Without Translation Theory? *Target*, 4(2), 237-245.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2005). The Monitor Model Revisited: Evidence from Process Research. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 50(2), 405-414.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Velde, R. G. v. d. (1989). Man, Verbal Text, Inferencing, and Coherence. In W. Heydrich, F. Neubauer, J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer (Eds.), *Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse* (pp. 174-214). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier.
- Vivanco, V. (2005). The absence of connectives and the maintenance of coherence in publicity texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(8), 1233-1249.
- Warren, M. (1993). Inexplicitness: A Feature of Naturalness in Conversation. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 37-53). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wu, J.-T., & Liu, I.-m. (1986). The Effects of Information Load and Backward Linking Element on Sentence Comprehension and Verification. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 27(2), 93-103.

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample materials for the cohesion analysis

1. Documentary: *Building the Biggest: The West Coast Line* (6 minutes)

(The symbol “//” in the TT means the breaking of subtitles into two lines on the screen.)

ST	TT
The West Coast Line is 2,672 kilometres long and dates back 150 years.	西海岸鐵路長 2672 公里 造於 150 年前
The UK's main commuter line winds its way between London and Glasgow in Scotland calling in at some of Britain's largest industrial centres.	這條英國主幹線//從倫敦到蘇蘭格拉斯哥 連接英國最大的幾處工業中心
It is now being replaced piece by piece like a giant jigsaw at a cost of over eight billion pounds.	現在這條鐵路如拼圖般逐段更新 耗資超過 80 億鎊
And incredibly the biggest civil engineering project ever carried out in Europe takes place at weekends.	不可思議的是//這個歐洲最大的土木工程 竟然只在週末施工
To realize the enormity of the program you really do have to realize how much is going on at anyone time.	要瞭解這計畫的龐大 得先知道//同時有多少工程在進行
Building the Biggest	極限建築
The West Coast Mainline is the only direct means of rail transport between London and Glasgow.	西岸主幹線是倫敦至格拉斯哥//唯一直接鐵路運輸線
The 150 year old track is desperately in need of replacement.	這條高齡 150 歲的鐵路亟需更新
With over 20 million people commuting Monday to Friday, the only way to get the job done is to close the line on a Friday night, bring in a massive work force, rip out the old, put in the new, and then hand the track back to the operators on Sunday evening.	由於週一到週五//通勤人次超過 2 千萬 唯一的施工方式 是在週五晚上關閉鐵路 動員大批人力 為這條鐵路線汰舊換新 然後在週日傍晚讓鐵路恢復運作
Over 60 million man hours have already been worked on the project.	這項工程至今已花費//超過 6 千萬工時
It's a very complex job.	這個工作非常複雜
Our problem was how to keep all the maintenance activities and all the normal railway activities going at the same time as laying over the top of that, that eight billion pound program where they go to the upgrade of that.	問題在於如何//一邊進行維修 同時保持//鐵路正常運作 在進行 80 億鎊的//更新工程時 鐵路也能夠繼續運作
On every weekend, we have to be prepared before we go into that weekend, knowing exactly what we need, and what trains have to move onto the depots at what time, and we are managing that activity.	每週末動工前都要先做好準備 要知道工程所需 以及要在何時讓哪個列車進站 我們要瞭解那些運作
Up and down the country over 10,000 workers get ready for the weekend shift.	全國上下有 1 萬名工人//準備在週末值班
It's almost midnight on Friday.	現在是週五,時近午夜
Trains are making their final journeys before the line closes down.	等最後一班列車進站//鐵路就要關閉
At six o'clock Sunday evening the line that runs between London and Glasgow has to be handed back to the operators.	到了週日傍晚 6 點 倫敦至格拉斯哥幹線//就得恢復運作
On Friday night if there are 20 trains that are supposed to leave the depot half an hour apart, we will track those and if any of those get behind, and we have to	例如週五晚有 20 班列車//每班間隔半小時 我們會進行追蹤//如果有列車落後

step in and adjust what we're doing in the field or adjust what's happening in the yard, then we will do that.	我們就必須開始工地的進度 或調度班車好進行施工
It becomes a very complex picture, not only to deliver our possessions but to drive the trains to inspect the train before it leaves the work site, that it's loaded properly and safely to get back to the depot.	這是很複雜的局面//我們要接管鐵路 還得在列車離開工地前做檢查 確定一切安全妥當才能進站
It's all those types of people that are needed at the right time at the right place.	所有人員時時都要在崗位上待命
The pressure's on. If just one of the work sites slip behind schedule by as little as a minute hundreds of thousands of people will be stranded on stations throughout Britain.	工程壓力很大//只要一處工地進度落後 1 分鐘 就會有數十萬人困在英國各地車站
Millions of pounds worth of equipment and thousands of men are ready to descend onto the tracks.	價值數百萬英鎊的裝備 以及數千人力 準備開始更新鐵路
They wait for the green light.	只等一聲令下就要開工
If you would like to get your men to lock Charlie, echo, one, one, four and Charlie, echo, two, five, six to engine.	你們要鎖定 CE114//和 CE256 了嗎?
Okay and once that's done I'll give you permission to lay the section.	好了之後你就能鋪那段鐵軌
At the end of the service on the Friday night, Saturday morning, we take complete possession of the line so the engineers can do whatever they have to do out to upgrade the West Coast Mainline.	在週五晚鐵路關閉之後 週六早上,我們接管整條鐵路 讓工程師能夠//更新西岸主幹線
Once the last train's out of the section I'll clear the area earlier we can block the, to all traffic and then hand the line over to the engineers so that they can get on with their work.	一等最後班車離開這路段 我們就盡快管制交通,淨空此區 把這段鐵路交給工程師施工
We place detonators on the track which are small explosive shots so should the driver run over them he knows to stop because he's entering a prohibited zone.	我們在鐵路上安置//爆炸力很弱的雷管 若有火車司機駛過//就知道要停下來 因為他闖入了禁區
Above your head you've got the 25KV and before we can go on and do most work we have to make sure not only is that turned off but make sure it's isolated and local earth supplied.	上方是 2 萬 5 千伏特電壓 施工前要確定電源都關閉 也要確定電線都絕緣和接地
At 25,000 volts, touch these and you're history.	電壓 2 萬 5 千伏特,碰到就死定了
It's 10,000 times more than what you'd get in a domestic power supply so it is pretty powerful stuff and it's pretty dangerous stuff.	這比家庭用電強 1 萬倍 電力強大,非常危險
With safety of paramount importance one last precaution is taken before work begins.	安全第一//開工前還有最後的預防措施
They place a man on the track to look out for any rogue locomotives.	他們派一個人守在鐵軌上 以免有火車頭誤闖工地
Hello, Carlisle...	喂,卡來爾站嗎?
Just confirm my daily sector all my protection is now in place.	向你確認我的路段//都做好安全措施
If you're taking off.	你要的話就可以開始了
The signalman in charge of the track, Carl Abraitis.	負責這路段的信號員是//卡爾艾伯特斯
Thank you.	謝謝
Well, I'll start me possession actually gone to the O-425 and that's that.	現在由我接手//進行 O-425 程序
Arranging me work...etcetera.	安排施工事宜等等

Millions of pounds worth of machinery comes to life.	價值數百萬鎊的機具開始運轉
In just 38 hours the line has to be handed back to the operators.	38 小時後//這條鐵路就必須恢復運作
Will they finish their work on time?	他們能及時完工嗎?
Britain's hundreds of thousands of commuters hold their breath. (BREAK 1)	英國數十萬通勤人口都屏息以待 (BREAK 1)

2. Travel Programme: *Globe Trekker: Vienna City Guide* (9 minutes)
(The symbol “-“ in the ST means exchanges between two persons.)

ST	TT
Globe Trekker	勇闖天涯
It's known as the city of music.	這裡有音樂之都的美譽
It's the birthplace of the waltz, and the resting place of Beethoven.	是華爾滋的誕生地 貝多芬的安息處
It's famous for its cakes, coffee houses, and of course, culture.	這裡的蛋糕 咖啡廳 以及文化聞名於世
This is Vienna.	這裡是維也納
Vienna is the capital of the Republic of Austria.	維也納是奧地利的首都
It lies at the very heart of central Europe, and it's home to two million people, one quarter of the country's population.	地處中歐的心臟地帶 全市有 200 萬人口//佔奧地利總人口的 1/4
The historical center of Vienna is completely enclosed inside the Ringstrasse.	維也納的歷史中心//由環城大道所圍繞
The Stephansdom Cathedral at its focal point, and the mighty Hofburg Palace to the west of the city.	聖史蒂芬大教堂位於中央 宏偉的霍夫堡皇宮則位於西邊
Vienna City Guide	維也納市區
Less than a hundred years ago Vienna was the capital of one of the most powerful states in Europe,	不到 100 年前//維也納是歐洲強國的首都
holding its own alongside London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.	與倫敦,柏林及聖彼得堡齊名
It was ruled for over six centuries by one family, the Habsburgs, whose power is celebrated all over the city.	哈布斯堡家族曾統治奧地利近 6 世紀 其權力象徵廣見於維也納各處
(Day 1) One of the nicest and easiest ways to see the city is on the bicycle.	(第 1 天)//遊覽維也納的最佳方式是騎自行車
Incredibly, in Vienna there are 500 miles of cycle lanes just in the city.	不可思議的是//維也納有 500 哩長的自行車專用道
Since the 13th century, the remains of the imperial Habsburgs have been stored in the crypt of the magnificent Stephansdom Cathedral.	13 世紀起,哈布斯堡皇族的遺體 被存放在聖史蒂芬大教堂的地下室
The imperial Habsburgs, they were like an eccentric bunch.	他們是一群很奇怪的人
Like, normal people when you die you get buried, but what they used to do is cut parts of their body up and embalm them.	一般人在死後入土為安 但這些皇族的屍體會被肢解//防腐保存
And this is what these are, these jars are full of, like, brains, they're full of eyes, intestines, and the bowels, and they're down here in the crypt of the church.	這些就是他們的遺體 這些罐子裝著腦袋,眼睛,腸子和內臟

	存放在教堂的地下室
What it is, they scattered the rest of the body parts around the city, so, like, the Habsburg's worshippers could go to different parts of the city, because if they all came here it would get really crowded.	遺體其他部分存放在維也納各處 要祭拜哈布斯堡皇族的人//可到不同的地方 因為如果大家全來這裡//那會太擁擠
So, if you're, like, a bowel worshipper, obviously you come here.	因此要祭拜內臟就來這裡
If you're into the hearts, you go about five minutes that way, and the rest of it, like the heads and the arms, ten minutes that way by the multi-story car park.	要祭拜心臟就往那邊走 5 分鐘 其他部分,像頭部和手臂//就往那邊走 10 分鐘 在那棟立體停車場旁邊
There are dozens of churches to visit all over the city in a variety of styles, from Romanesque, to Gothic, to Baroque.	維也納有數十座各式各樣的教堂 包括羅馬,哥德和巴洛克式建築
Vienna, right, they've got like palaces here like most cities have post offices.	維也納也有皇宮//就像多數城市都有郵局
Nobility from all over Europe used to build their homes here, but I'm heading right into the nerve center of the Habsburg empire and the biggest of all, the Hofburg Palace.	歐洲各地的貴族在此建造宅邸 但我要前往哈布斯堡王朝的政治中心 規模最大的霍夫堡皇宮
The Habsburg motto was, "It falls to Austria to command the whole universe."	哈布斯堡皇族的座右銘是/"奧地利將統治全宇宙"
The imposing Hofburg Palace reflects the aspirations of 20 generations of emperors	富麗堂皇的霍夫堡//反映出 20 代皇帝的雄心
who ruled over 50 million subjects speaking 40 different languages from this enormous fortress.	他們從這座巨大堡壘//統治講 40 種語言的 5 千萬臣民
Oh, my God. Look at that thing.	天啊,你看那個
This crown was built in the beginning of the 1600s, and it's just encrusted with, like, expensive jewels and gold, and the amazing thing about it is, it's not even, like, the main crown.	這個皇冠是 1600 年代初製作的 鑲有珍貴的寶石和黃金 驚人的是,這還不是主要的皇冠
It's not the coronation crown, that's in Nuremberg.	這不是加冕皇冠,那頂存放在紐倫堡
This is, like, your everyday crown that you wear in the household when you're hoovering up.	這是平常在家裡//做家事時配戴的皇冠
When the Habsburg family fled into exile, they took most of their jewels with them and left this lot behind.	哈布斯堡皇族流亡時帶走多數珠寶//並留下這些東西
I mean, there's an amethyst the size of a potato.	這裡有馬鈴薯大小的紫水晶
So, imagine what the collection must have been like before they split it up.	所以他們原先的收藏一定很可觀
And this is the prize of the Habsburg collection.	這是哈布斯堡皇族最寶貴的珍藏
It's 2,860 carats worth of emerald.	2860 克拉的翡翠
It's the biggest one in the world and it took two years to cut, and when they were finished they turned into that, which is a saltcellar.	這是世上最大的翡翠//費時 2 年切割 最後將它做成鹽罐
As well as the expensive worldly goods, they've also gotten a monopoly on the spiritual ones.	除了昂貴的世俗用品 他們也收藏獨一無二的宗教聖物
That in there, apparently, is the tooth of John the Baptist.	裡面顯然是施洗約翰的牙齒
That in there's a little, like, a little chipping from Christ's manger, and up there is a piece of the tablecloth from the Last Supper.	下面是耶穌馬槽的小碎片 上面是"最後的晚餐"的桌布碎片
See that there?	看到那個嗎?
That is the actual spear, apparently, that pierced Christ while he was on the cross, and that is actually part of the cross.	那是耶穌釘在十字架時//刺穿祂身體的矛 而那是十字架的一部份

But I read somewhere, right, if all the pieces of wood that claim to be the cross of Christ were put together, they'd actually make 40 different crosses.	但我曾在某處讀到 若將所有宣稱是//耶穌十字架的木片拼湊起來 可以做成 40 個十字架
So, who knows?	所以天曉得?
The Hofburg also houses secret treasures underground.	霍夫堡的地下室也有祕密寶藏
When Vienna was surrounded by a city wall the only way to expand was by digging down.	由於維也納四周圍繞著城牆//唯一的擴張方式是往下挖
Barbara showed me around the cellars beneath the palace.	芭芭拉帶我參觀皇宮的地下室
-All around the cities. -How deep was it then?	遍佈全市//有多深?
Maximum of five stories.	最多有 5 層樓
-What you're saying, there's like an underground city? -It was a city underneath a city.	所以這就像一座地下城市?//城市下的城市
-Wow, there's, like, statues, huh? -Well, these aren't actually statues. These are the positives.	這些是雕像嗎?//不是,這些只是雕像的樣本
All right, all right. So the artists would make these first, take them to the emperor, and if he liked it then they'd make the big statue.	藝術家先製作樣本拿給皇帝看 如果他喜歡就做成大雕像
Make the real monument out of metal, ceramic...	用金屬或陶製成真正的雕像
-This is...whose this? -That's Mozart.	這是誰?//莫札特
-That's Mozart? Is it? -Amadeus Mozart.	是嗎?//阿瑪迪斯莫札特
Wow. So the artist would go "Look, this is what...this is the bust of you which I made."	藝術家會問:// "看,這是我為您製作的半身像"
"Do you want a big one done?"	"您要做大雕像嗎?"
-Yeah, there's a big one with legs, and a huge monument in the imperial gardens. -Oh, I see.	對,皇家花園裡有一座有腿的大雕像//我懂了
I like it, but I want it with legs and hands. Cor!	我很喜歡,但我要加上腿和手
So what...what are they all doing down here, then? It's just storage?	地下室的用途是什麼?//存放東西嗎?
It's storage. Whatever the city of Vienna, or in the old days the imperial family, didn't need, they put down here in their wide cellars.	對,維也納市或過去哈布斯堡皇族//不需要的東西 全存放在這個寬廣的地下室
Barbara, I think I've done all my sightseeing in here.	芭芭拉,我想我看夠了
The empire finally crumbled at the end of World War I, and overnight Vienna was reduced to being just a provincial capital city.	哈布斯堡王朝//在第一次大戰結束時瓦解 維也納在一夕間被貶為地方首都
The Habsburgs' last display of power was to build the final wing of their palace, the monumental Neueburg.	哈布斯堡王朝最後展示威權的代表 是興建皇宮最後的側翼//宏偉的"新王宮"
But it was made famous, not because of the Habsburg family, but by the world's most notorious fascist, Adolph Hitler.	但這裡不是因哈布斯堡皇族而出名 而是因舉世最惡名昭彰的//法西斯份子,希特勒
Hitler was actually born in Austria, and at the age of 17 he moved to Vienna to become an artist, but he got rejected twice at the art school, because his work was inadequate.	希特勒出生於奧地利 17 歲搬到維也納,立志成為藝術家 但他因作品不合格//兩度遭到藝術學校拒絕
But to a letter to a friend, he said, "Maybe it was fate."	他在寫給朋友的信上說:// "也許這是命運"
Maybe I'm reserved for some bigger purpose in my life.	"我的人生有更重要的使命"
He swept the streets. He lived in a homeless hostel.	他去掃馬路,住在流浪者之家

After six years of poverty and artistic failure, he gave it all up and moved to Germany to make his name there.	經過 6 年當不成藝術家的窮困生活 他最後放棄一切搬到德國 並在那裡揚名立萬
The next time Hitler came back to Vienna was in 1938, but this time it was at the head of the German army.	希特勒在 1938 年重返維也納 但此時他的身份已是德軍領袖
He came to this balcony and announced to a crowd of over 250,000 that Austria is now part of the Third Reich.	他站在這個陽台上對 25 萬多人宣布 奧地利如今是第三帝國的一部份
Austria was the first country to fall under Hitler's spell, but after the war they were quick to retract their enthusiasm, and claimed to be the first victim of the Nazi regime. (BREAK 1)	奧地利是第一個臣服於希特勒的國家 但他們在戰後//立即收回對希特勒的效忠 並宣稱自己是納粹政權的首位受害者 (BREAK 1)

Appendix B: List of four types of connectives

The list below is based on the classification of conjunction by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004).

1. Additive	and also, furthermore, above all, in addition, besides, apart from, as well, plus, not only...but also, moreover, what's more, more importantly, more to the point, in particular, particularly, especially, nor, neither...nor, or, or else, alternatively, either...or, otherwise, except, that is, in other words, for instance, for example, in addition to, like, such as, say, likewise, similarly, in a different way, in comparison, by comparison, if (...or not), whether (...or not)
2. Adversative	but, instead, in contrast, by contrast, on the contrary, conversely, on the other hand, yet, still, however, whereas, though, although, anyway, even though, even so, even if, nevertheless, nonetheless, notwithstanding, regardless of, after all, despite, in spite of, while, in fact, as a matter of fact, actually, in reality, (or) rather, instead, on the contrary, at least, more accurately, more precisely, in any case
3. Causal	for, because, since, as, due to, for this reason, on account of this, the reasons is, as a result, in consequence, consequently, hence, therefore, thus, so, then, unless, that is why, for this purpose, with this in mind, in order to, so as to, if (...then), then, under the circumstances, as long as, otherwise, in case (of), in this respect/regard, regarding, in terms of, in other respects
4. Temporal	before (that), previously, earlier, formerly, originally, initially, already, once, just then, at the same time, meanwhile, simultaneously, as, while, when, (and) then, next, after, afterwards, since, subsequently, for the first time, in the first place, to begin with, at first, first of all, secondly, thirdly, as soon as, until, at once, soon, next time, next day, that morning, at that time, until then, now, at this moment/point, from now on, after a time/while, finally, at last, lastly, last of all, eventually, in the end, in future

Appendix C: Results of the cohesion analysis

1. The amount of additive connectives in STs and TTs

ST	Doc	Travel
(and) also	22	20
apart from	0	1
as well	3	9
(not only...) but (also)	8	2
but also	2	4
either...or	3	1
especially	1	10
except [except for]	1	2
for example	3	1
in addition (to)	1	0
in particular	1	0
like (=such as)	0	9
moreover	1	0
nor	2	1
or	15	12
plus	0	1
say (=such as)	1	2
still (=besides)	24	17
such as	4	2
if (...or not)	8	6
whether (...or not)	1	0
Total	101	100

TT	Doc	Travel
也[還,並,更,以及,而且,加上,仍,依然] (and also, but also, still)	143	108
不是...就是(either...or)	1	0
尤其[特別是] (especially)	3	9
除...外 (except)	1	1
比方[如,例如,像,像是] (for example)	6	12
另外[此外,除了...之外] (in addition, in addition to)	1	3
或 (or)	13	7
也不 (nor)	3	4
也就是[那就是,即,亦即] (that is)	11	4
是否 [能否] (whether, if)	20	2
Total	202	150

2. The amount of adversative connectives in STs and TTs

ST	Doc	Travel
actually	18	36
all the same	0	1
although	10	4
anyway	2	7
at least	6	4
at the same time (=yet)	0	1
but	132	153
but still	1	1
but yet	0	1
despite	2	3
even	27	24
even if	1	2
however	1	4
in fact	1	11
in reality	1	0
instead (of)	4	2
on the other hand	1	0
regardless of	1	0
still (=yet)	1	1
though	1	4
when (=but)	0	1
whereas	1	0
whether...or not (=regardless of)	1	3
while (=though)	2	1
yet	5	1
yet despite	1	0
yet while	1	0
Total	221	265

TT	Doc	Travel
其實[事實上,實際上] (actually)	6	15
雖...但 [儘管...卻,固然] (although...[but])	17	8
總之 [反正] (anyway)	1	5
至少 (at least)	5	4
但...(卻) [但是,可是,然而, 而,卻,倒是] (but, yet)	169	143
即使[即便,就連,甚至] (even, even if)	22	14
不過 (however)	2	10
反而 (instead)	2	0
話說回來 (on the other hand)	0	1
不管[不論] (regardless of, whether)	2	3
Total	226	203

3. The amount of causal connectives in STs and TTs

ST	Doc	Travel
as (=because)	1	2
as a result [as a result of]	1	1
because	26	61
due to	0	1
for	1	0
if (...then)	57	67
in case (of)	3	0
otherwise	1	2
since (=because)	1	0
so	48	72
then (=in that case)	4	9
therefore	1	0
unless	3	2
when (=because)	0	1
Total	147	218

TT	Doc	Travel
結果 (as a result)	4	2
只要...就 (as long as, if...then)	9	4
因 [因為,由於] (because)	37	51
如果...(那) [萬一,若,...的話,要是] (if...[then])	32	32
所以 [因此,因而,於是] (so)	37	58
那[那麼] (then)	0	3
否則 (otherwise)	0	1
除非 (unless)	1	2
Total	120	153

4. The amount of temporal connectives in STs and TTs

ST	Doc	Travel
after	27	11
(and) then	21	54
as (=when)	24	8
as soon as	3	0
at anyone time (同一時間)	1	0
at any time/moment	4	0
at first	2	2
at last	0	4
at that time	3	0
at the same time	4	0
at the time	5	1
before	46	31
by then	0	1
eventually	4	1
finally	5	5
first	9	12
first of all	2	0
for the first time	4	1
in future	0	1
initially	1	0
in the end	0	1
in the first place	1	0
meanwhile	1	1
next	1	0
now	39	64
once	13	1
originally	3	3
previously	1	0

TT	Doc	Travel
...後 [之後,後來] (after)	67	30
然後 [再,一會兒] (and then)	23	39
當[當...時,...時,等,隨著] (as, when)	43	36
一旦[一...] (as soon as, once)	7	3
盡快 (as soon as possible)	2	1
隨時 [時時] (at any time)	7	1
同時 (at the same time)	10	1
...前 [之前,先前,以前,以往,往昔,過去] (before, formerly, previously)	36	21
到時 [屆時] (by then)	1	1
最後 [終於,終究,總算] (finally, eventually)	9	15
首先 [先,率先] (first)	19	20
首次 [首度] (for the first time)	6	1
將來 [未來] (in future)	2	1
當初 [起初,起先,原本,原先,最初,最早,一開始] (in the first place, originally)	8	6
接下來,接著 (next)	6	5
目前[如今,此時,這時,現在,現為,至今,迄今,當今] (now)	42	41
自...(以來) [從...,自從...,繼...] (since)	6	11
不久後 [不久之後] (soon after)	4	1
當時 [那時] (then)	23	3
第三 thirdly	0	1
直到 (...才) (until)	7	5
Total	328	243

simultaneously	2	0
since	5	16
so far	2	1
soon after	2	0
then (=at that time)	1	2
these days	0	2
thirdly	0	1
to begin with	1	0
today(=now)	7	5
(not...) until	11	7
when	43	46
while	6	3
Total	304	285

5. The amount of *and* in STs and TTs

ST	Doc	Travel
<i>and</i>	261	505

TT		Doc	Travel
additive	也,還,更,並,且,而且,及,以及,另,加上,或,既,又,與,和 (and)	42	38
adversative	而,而非,但,卻,不過 (but)	10	11
causal	由於,因為,因此,因而,於是,所以,結果,讓 (because, so, so that)	6	7
temporal	再,然後,後來,之後 (and then)	4	6
Total		62	62

Appendix D: English questionnaire

Audience Reception on Subtitles of English TV Programmes

Dear Students,

I am a PhD student at Newcastle University, UK. I am currently conducting a survey on audience reception on subtitles of English TV programmes, particularly informative programmes from Discovery Channel and Discovery “Travel and Living” Channel. Thus, I need to collect first-hand data from you. This questionnaire will take about 60 minutes to complete. Please be assured that the information you provide will be kept in strict confidentiality and will only be used for research purposes. If you are interested in the results of this survey, please leave your contact details on this page so I can send you a copy once the study is completed. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Huan-Li Kao

e-mail: HUAN-LI.KAO@NCL.AC.UK

If you would like to know the results of this questionnaire, please leave your name and e-mail.

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

I. General Information (Please tick or write where appropriate.)

1. You are a: freshman sophomore junior senior
first-year graduate student second-year graduate student
2. Your major is: _____
3. Have you ever taken or are you taking a course on subtitle translation?
Yes. No.
4. Have you done professional subtitle translation before?
Yes. (Please go to Q5.) No. (Please go to Q6.)
5. How many hours (or years) and what kind of work have you done?

6. What kind of subtitled English TV programmes do you watch? (tick more than one if applicable)
movies (e.g. HBO, Cinemax, etc.)
documentaries (e.g. Discovery Channel, National Geographic Channel, etc.)
travel programmes (e.g. Travel and Living Channel)
wildlife programmes (e.g. Animal Planet Channel)
sit-coms, soap opera, mini-series (e.g. "Friends", "CSI")
I never watch subtitled English TV programmes.
others (please specify): _____
7. How many hours on average do you watch subtitled foreign films and TV programmes per week?
0 hour less than 1 hour 1-2 hours
3-4 hours 5-6 hours 7-8 hours
more than 8 hours (please specify): _____
8. How would you rate your English listening comprehension ability in general?
very good good so-so poor very poor
9. How would you rate the importance of subtitles to your comprehension of English TV programmes?
very important important so-so not important
not at all important
9a. Please specify the reason for choosing this answer:

10. How would you rate the subtitling quality of English TV programmes in general?
very good good so-so poor very poor
11. Have you ever watched programmes of Discovery Channel?
Yes. (Please go to Q12.) No. (Please go to Q15.)
12. Why do you watch those programmes? (tick more than one if applicable)
obtain new knowledge
language learning

pleasure

others (please specify): _____

13. Do you pay attention to the quality of subtitles when watching those programmes?
Yes. (Please go to Q14.) No. (Please go to Q15.)
14. How would you rate the subtitling quality of Discovery Channel programmes?
very good good so-so poor very poor
15. Have you ever watched programmes of Discovery “Travel and Living” Channel?
Yes. (Please go to Q16.) No. (Please go to Q19.)
16. Why do you watch those programmes? (tick more than one if applicable)
obtain new knowledge language learning
pleasure others (please specify): _____
17. Do you pay attention to the quality of subtitles when watching those programmes?
Yes. (Please go to Q18.) No. (Please go to Q19.)
18. How would you rate the subtitling quality of “Travel and Living” programmes?
very good good so-so poor very poor
19. How do you think of the important of the following criteria when you watch subtitled foreign TV programmes? (Please tick in the box for each criterion.)

	Very important	Important	So-so	Not important	Not at all important
a. Clarity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Concision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Fluency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Faithfulness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Coherence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Completeness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Readability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Diction & Register	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Speed of Subtitles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19a. Other important criteria (please specify): _____

II. Your view on the first clip (Please tick or write where appropriate.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	So-so	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The subtitles are concise.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The subtitles are difficult to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The subtitles are too succinct to convey the meaning completely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I can understand the subtitles immediately without much thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The subtitles do not omit any essential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The subtitles cannot reflect the style of the clip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The subtitles are too fast to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The subtitles are too long to be understood at a glance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The connection between the subtitles is not obvious.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The subtitles are fluent and smooth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The overall quality of the subtitles is good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Do you know anything about the clip and Vienna before watching the clip? If yes, does it help you understand the content of the clip?

14. Do you think there is any information loss or any kind of omission? If yes, please specify.

15. Do you think the subtitles are fluent and coherent? If no, please specify the problems you noticed.

16. If you think there is any other problem with the subtitles, please specify.

III. Your view on the second clip (Please tick or write where appropriate.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	So-so	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The subtitles are concise.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The subtitles are difficult to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The subtitles are too succinct to convey the meaning completely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I can understand the subtitles immediately without much thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The subtitles do not omit any essential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The subtitles cannot reflect the style of the clip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The subtitles are too fast to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The subtitles are too long to be understood at a glance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The connection between the subtitles is not obvious.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The subtitles are fluent and smooth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The overall quality of the subtitles is good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Do you know anything about the clip and Portugal before watching the clip? If yes, does it help you understand the content of the clip? _____

14. Do you think there is any information loss or any kind of omission? If yes, please specify. _____

15. Do you think the subtitles are fluent and coherent? If no, please specify the problems you noticed.

16. If you think there is any other problem with the subtitles, please specify.

17. Do you like this clip or the previous clip in terms of overall quality of the subtitles? Why? _____

IV. Your view on the third clip (Please tick or write where appropriate.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	So-so	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The subtitles are concise.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The subtitles are difficult to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The subtitles are too succinct to convey the meaning completely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I can understand the subtitles immediately without much thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The subtitles do not omit any essential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The subtitles cannot reflect the style of the clip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The subtitles are too fast to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The subtitles are too long to be understood at a glance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The connection between the subtitles is not obvious.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The subtitles are fluent and smooth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The overall quality of the subtitles is good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Do you know anything about the clip and Julius Caesar before watching the clip? If yes, does it help you understand the content of the clip?

14. Do you think there is any information loss or any kind of omission? If yes, please specify.

15. Do you think the subtitles are fluent and coherent? If no, please specify the problems you noticed.

16. If you think there is any other problem with the subtitles, please specify.

V. Your view on the fourth clip (Please tick or write where appropriate.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	So-so	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The subtitles are concise.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The subtitles are difficult to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The subtitles are too succinct to convey the meaning completely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I can understand the subtitles immediately without much thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The subtitles do not omit any essential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The subtitles do not omit any finer shades of meaning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The subtitles cannot reflect the style of the clip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The subtitles are too fast to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The subtitles are too long to be understood at a glance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The connection between the subtitles is not obvious.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The subtitles are fluent and smooth.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The overall quality of the subtitles is good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Do you know anything about the clip and a stadium before watching the clip? If yes, does it help you understand the content of the clip? _____

14. Do you think there is any information loss or any kind of omission? If yes, please specify. _____

15. Do you think the subtitles are fluent and coherent? If no, please specify the problems you noticed. _____

16. If you think there is any other problem with the subtitles, please specify.

17. Do you like this clip or the previous clip in terms of overall quality of the subtitles? Why? _____

18. Among the four clips, which one do you think is the best in terms of overall quality? Why? _____

Appendix E: Chinese questionnaire

電視字幕翻譯品質

問卷調查

大家好：

我是英國新堡大學翻譯研究所博士生，目前正在進行一項關於電視字幕翻譯品質的研究調查，尤其以研究傳達資訊的知性節目為主（「Discovery 頻道」和「Discovery 旅遊生活頻道」節目），因此需要各位同學提供寶貴的意見。這份問卷約需花費 50-60 分鐘完成（其中 30 分鐘觀看影片），而且各位提供的資料將完全保密，僅供研究之用。若各位想知道問卷分析結果，請在本頁下方留下聯絡方式，我會在問卷分析完成後將結果寄給各位。非常感謝各位的協助，祝學業順利！

高煥麗

e-mail: HUAN-LI.KAO@NCL.AC.UK

若想知道分析結果，請留下聯絡方式：

姓名：_____

電子郵件：_____

I. 基本資料 (請打勾或填寫答案)

1. 年級: 大學一年級 大學二年級 大學三年級 大學四年級
研究生一年級 研究生二年級
2. 就讀科系: _____
3. 你是否上過影片翻譯的課程?
是 否
4. 你是否做過影片翻譯的工作? (包括任何有關電影, 電視, 錄影帶的字幕翻譯)
是(請繼續回答下一題) 否(請跳至第 6 題作答)
5. 你做過幾小時或幾年的影片翻譯工作?是何種影片翻譯工作?

6. 你平常觀看何種有中文字幕的英文電視節目?(可複選)
電影 (例如:HBO, Cinemax)
紀錄片(例如:Discovery 頻道, 國家地理頻道)
旅遊節目 (例如:旅遊生活頻道)
野生動物節目(例如:動物星球頻道)
電視影集 (例如:「六人行」, 「CSI 犯罪現場」)
我從不看有中文字幕的英文電視節目
其他(請說明): _____
7. 你每週平均觀看幾小時有字幕的英文電視節目?
0 小時 不到 1 小時 1-2 小時
3-4 小時 5-6 小時 7-8 小時
8 小時以上(請說明): _____
8. 你覺得自己的英文聽力如何?
很好 好 普通 差 很差
9. 當你觀看英文電視節目時, 中文字幕對你瞭解節目內容有多重要?
非常重要 重要 普通 不重要 完全不重要

9a. 請說明選擇此答案的原因: _____

10. 你認為一般而言英文電視節目的字幕翻譯品質如何?
很好 好 普通 差 很差
11. 你看過 Discovery 頻道的節目嗎?(該頻道以播放紀錄片為主)
是(請繼續回答下一題) 否(請跳至第 15 題作答)
12. 你為何觀看該頻道節目?(可複選)
獲取新知 學習語言 娛樂
其他(請說明): _____

13. 你會注意該頻道節目的字幕翻譯品質嗎?
會(請繼續回答下一題) 不會(請跳至第 15 題作答)
14. 你認為 Discovery 頻道節目的字幕翻譯品質如何?
很好 好 普通 差 很差
15. 你看過旅遊生活頻道的節目嗎?(該頻道以播放旅遊美食節目為主)
是(請繼續回答下一題) 否(請跳至第 19 題作答)
16. 你為何觀看該頻道節目?(可複選)
獲取新知 學習語言 娛樂
其他(請說明): _____
17. 你會注意該頻道節目的字幕翻譯品質嗎?
會(請繼續回答下一題) 不會(請跳至第 19 題作答)
18. 你認為旅遊生活頻道節目的字幕翻譯品質如何?
很好 好 普通 差 很差
19. 在下列電視字幕翻譯標準中,你認為各項標準的重要程度為何?(請勾選)

	非常重要	重要	普通	不重要	完全不重要
a. 文意清楚 Clarity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 辭意正確 Accuracy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 用字精簡 Concision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 文字流暢 Fluency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 忠於原文 Faithfulness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 邏輯連貫 Coherence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 原意完整 Completeness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. 容易閱讀 Readability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. 用詞恰當 Diction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. 字幕速度適中 Speed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19a. 除了上列項目之外,若你認為還有其他標準也很重要,請說明:

II. 對第一段影片的看法 (請打勾或填寫答案)

請在第 1-12 題中勾選適當的答案	非常同意	同意	普通	不同意	非常不同意
1. 我認為字幕很簡潔。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 我認為字幕很難看得懂。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 我認為字幕太精簡, 沒有完整傳達英文原意。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 我可以馬上理解字幕的意思, 而不需花太多時間思考。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何重要的訊息(information)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何細微的英文語意(meaning)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 我認為字幕的措辭沒有貼切反映英文節目的型態和風格。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 我認為字幕速度太快, 來不及看。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 我認為字幕太冗長, 使我無法立刻瞭解字幕的意思。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 我認為句子之間的連結(connection)不是很明顯。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. 我認為整體而言字幕十分流暢, 沒有不連貫的感覺。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. 我認為整體而言字幕的品質很好。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. 在看這段影片前, 你對「維也納」有任何瞭解嗎? 如果有的話, 這對你瞭解這段影片的內容有幫助嗎?

14. 你認為這些字幕有遺漏任何訊息嗎? 如果有的話, 請說明:

15. 你認為這些字幕是否流暢連貫? 如果不是的話, 請說明你注意到哪些問題:

16. 你認為這些字幕是否有任何其他需要改進的地方? 如果有的話, 請說明:

III. 對第二段影片的看法 (請打勾或填寫答案)

請在第 1-12 題中勾選適當的答案	非常同意	同意	普通	不同意	非常不同意
1. 我認為字幕很簡潔。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 我認為字幕很難看得懂。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 我認為字幕太精簡, 沒有完整傳達英文原意。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 我可以馬上理解字幕的意思, 而不需花太多時間思考。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何重要的訊息(information)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何細微的英文語意(meaning)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 我認為字幕的措辭沒有貼切反映英文節目的型態和風格。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 我認為字幕速度太快, 來不及看。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 我認為字幕太冗長, 使我無法立刻瞭解字幕的意思。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 我認為句子之間的連結(connection)不是很明顯。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. 我認為整體而言字幕十分流暢, 沒有不連貫的感覺。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. 我認為整體而言字幕的品質很好。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. 在看這段影片前, 你對「葡萄牙」有任何瞭解嗎? 如果有的話, 這對你瞭解這段影片的內容有幫助嗎?

14. 你認為這些字幕有遺漏任何訊息嗎? 如果有的話, 請說明:

15. 你認為這些字幕是否流暢連貫? 如果不是的話, 請說明你注意到哪些問題:

16. 你認為這些字幕是否有任何其他需要改進的地方? 如果有的話, 請說明:

17. 就整體字幕品質而言, 你認為這段影片與前一段「維也納」影片何者比較好? 為什麼?

IV. 對第三段影片的看法 (請打勾或填寫答案)

請在第 1-12 題中勾選適當的答案	非常同意	同意	普通	不同意	非常不同意
1. 我認為字幕很簡潔。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 我認為字幕很難看得懂。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 我認為字幕太精簡, 沒有完整傳達英文原意。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 我可以馬上理解字幕的意思, 而不需花太多時間思考。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何重要的訊息(information)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何細微的英文語意(meaning)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 我認為字幕的措辭沒有貼切反映英文節目的型態和風格。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 我認為字幕速度太快, 來不及看。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 我認為字幕太冗長, 使我無法立刻瞭解字幕的意思。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 我認為句子之間的連結(connection)不是很明顯。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. 我認為整體而言字幕十分流暢, 沒有不連貫的感覺。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. 我認為整體而言字幕的品質很好。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. 在看這段影片前, 你對「凱撒大帝」有任何瞭解嗎? 如果有的話, 這對你瞭解這段影片的內容有幫助嗎?

14. 你認為這些字幕有遺漏任何訊息嗎? 如果有的話, 請說明:

15. 你認為這些字幕是否流暢連貫? 如果不是的話, 請說明你注意到哪些問題:

16. 你認為這些字幕是否有任何其他需要改進的地方? 如果有的話, 請說明:

V. 對第四段影片的看法 (請打勾或填寫答案)

請在第 1-12 題中勾選適當的答案	非常同意	同意	普通	不同意	非常不同意
1. 我認為字幕很簡潔。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 我認為字幕很難看得懂。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 我認為字幕太精簡, 沒有完整傳達英文原意。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 我可以馬上理解字幕的意思, 而不需花太多時間思考。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何重要的訊息(information)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. 我認為字幕沒有遺漏任何細微的英文語意(meaning)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 我認為字幕的措辭沒有貼切反映英文節目的型態和風	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. 我認為字幕速度太快, 來不及看。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 我認為字幕太冗長, 使我無法立刻瞭解字幕的意思。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. 我認為句子之間的連結(connection)不是很明顯。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. 我認為整體而言字幕十分流暢, 沒有不連貫的感覺。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. 我認為整體而言字幕的品質很好。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. 在看這段影片前, 你對「運動場」有任何瞭解嗎? 如果有的話, 這對於你瞭解這段影片的內容有幫助嗎? _____

14. 你認為這些字幕有遺漏任何訊息嗎? 如果有的話, 請說明:

15. 你認為這些字幕是否流暢連貫? 如果不是的話, 請說明你注意到哪些問題:

16. 你認為這些字幕是否有任何其他需要改進的地方? 如果有的話, 請說明:

17. 就整體字幕品質而言, 你認為這段影片與前一段「凱撒大帝」影片何者比較好? 為什麼? _____

18. 就這四段影片而言, 你認為哪段影片的整體字幕品質比較好? 為什麼?

Appendix F: General information about the respondents

1. Education

	Frequency	Percent
Sophomore	68	43.0
Junior	45	28.5
Senior	23	14.6
1-year graduate	22	13.9
Total	158	100.0

2. Major

	Frequency	Percent
Translation	157	99.4
Other	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

3. Subtitling course

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	52	32.9
No	106	67.1
Total	158	100.0

4. Work experience

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	5.7
No	149	94.3
Total	158	100.0

5. How many hours/years

	Frequency	Percent
1 hr	1	0.6
2 hrs	2	1.3
3 hrs	1	0.6
1 yr+	1	0.6
2 years	1	0.6
Very short time	1	0.6
Non-response	2	1.3
Not applicable	149	94.3
Total	158	100.0

6.1 Movie

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	145	91.8
No	12	7.6
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.2 Documentary

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	39	24.7
No	118	74.7
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.3 Travelling

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	51.3
No	76	48.1
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.4 Wildlife

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	73	46.2
No	84	53.2
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.5 TV dramas

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	109	69.0
No	48	30.4
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.6 Never watch

	Frequency	Percent
No	157	99.4
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

6.7 Other

	Frequency	Percent
Religion channel	1	0.6
MTV	3	1.9
Non-response	154	97.5
Total	158	100.0

7. Viewing hours

	Frequency	Percent
0 hour	1	0.6
Less than 1 hour	36	22.8
1-2 hours	49	31.0
3-4 hours	31	19.6
5-6 hours	23	14.6
7-8 hours	13	8.2
More than 8 hours	4	2.5
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

8. Comprehension ability

	Frequency	Percent
Good	16	10.1
So-so	94	59.5
Poor	41	25.9
Very poor	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

9. Importance of subtitles

	Frequency	Percent
Very important	26	16.5
Important	96	60.8
So-so	35	22.2
Not important	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

9a. Reason

	Frequency	Percent
1. No subtitles needed to understand	5	3.2
2. No subtitles needed to improve listening	3	1.9
3. Subtitles needed to fully understand	83	52.5
4. Subtitles needed to understand vocabulary, terms, slangs, idioms	22	13.9
5. Subtitles needed to understand accents	3	1.9
6. Subtitles needed to follow fast speech	6	3.8
7. Subtitles needed to study translation	6	3.8
8. Non-response	30	19.0
Total	158	100.0

10. Overall quality

	Frequency	Percent
Very good	4	2.5
Good	78	49.4
So-so	73	46.2
Poor	1	0.6
Hard to say	1	0.6
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

11. Viewing Discovery Channel

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	151	95.6
No	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

12.1 Knowledge

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	123	77.8
No	28	17.7
Not applicable	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

12.2 Language

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	61	38.6
No	90	57.0
Not applicable	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

12.3 Pleasure

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	48.1
No	75	47.5
Not applicable	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

12.4 Other

	Frequency	Percent
By chance	2	1.3
Watch with family	1	0.6
Knowledge about animals	1	0.6
Interest	1	0.6
Non-response	146	92.4
Not applicable	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

13. Attention to quality

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	105	66.5
No	46	29.1
Not applicable	7	4.4
Total	158	100.0

14. Quality of Discovery Channel

	Frequency	Percent
Very good	22	13.9
Good	73	46.2
So-so	10	6.3
Not applicable	53	33.5
Total	158	100.0

15. Viewing T&L Channel

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	110	69.6
No	47	29.7
Missing value	1	0.6
Total	158	100.0

16.1 Knowledge

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	77	48.7
No	33	20.9
Missing value	2	1.3
Not applicable	46	29.1
Total	158	100.0

16.2 Language

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	50	31.6
No	60	38.0
Missing value	2	1.3
Not applicable	47	29.1
Total	158	100.0

16.3 Pleasure

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	88	55.7
No	22	13.9
Missing value	2	1.3
Not applicable	46	29.1
Total	158	100.0

16.4 Other

	Frequency	Percent
Culture	1	0.6
Roommate	1	0.6
Non-response	110	69.7
Not applicable	46	29.1
Total	158	100.0

17. Attention to quality

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	74	46.8
No	37	23.4
Missing value	2	1.3
Not applicable	45	28.5
Total	158	100.0

18. Quality of T&L Channel

	Frequency	Percent
Very good	15	9.5
Good	47	29.7
So-so	12	7.6
Missing value	2	1.3
Not applicable	82	51.9
Total	158	100.0

19. Criteria (Likert scale)

	Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
a. Clarity	158	4.53	0.55	0.30
b. Accuracy	157	4.40	0.59	0.34
c. Concision	158	3.88	0.77	0.59
d. Fluency	158	4.35	0.58	0.33
e. Faithfulness	157	3.97	0.76	0.58
f. Coherence	158	4.45	0.58	0.34
g. Completeness	157	4.13	0.69	0.48
h. Readability	157	4.48	0.61	0.37
i. Diction & register	158	4.33	0.60	0.36
j. Speed of subtitles	158	4.25	0.74	0.54

19a. Other criteria

	Frequency	Percent
Colloquial	2	1.3
Length and font	3	1.9
Culture	3	1.9
Non-response	150	94.9
Total	158	100.0

Appendix G: Sample materials for the audience reception study

1. Travel programme 1: *Globe Trekker: Vienna City Guide* [max & min]

1.1 Original script (ST) and subtitles (TT)

Original Script (ST)	Original Subtitles (TT)
Globe Trekker	勇闖天涯
It's known as the city of music.	這裡有音樂之都的美譽
It's the birthplace of the waltz, and the resting place of Beethoven.	是華爾滋的誕生地 貝多芬的安息處
It's famous for its cakes, coffee houses, and of course, culture.	這裡的蛋糕 咖啡廳 以及文化聞名於世
This is Vienna.	這裡是維也納
Vienna is the capital of the Republic of Austria.	維也納是奧地利的首都
It lies at the very heart of central Europe and it's home to two million people, one quarter of the country's population.	地處中歐的心臟地帶 全市有 200 萬人口//佔奧地利總人口的 1/4
The historical centre of Vienna is completely enclosed inside the Ringstrasse.	維也納的歷史中心//由環城大道所圍繞
The Stephansdom Cathedral at its focal point, and the mighty Hofburg Palace to the west of the city.	聖史蒂芬大教堂位於中央 宏偉的霍夫堡皇宮則位於西邊
Vienna City Guide	維也納市區
Less than a hundred years ago Vienna was the capital of one of the most powerful states in Europe, holding its own alongside London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.	不到 100 年前//維也納是歐洲強國的首都 與倫敦,柏林及聖彼得堡齊名
It was ruled for over six centuries by one family, the Habsburgs, whose power is celebrated all over the city.	哈布斯堡家族曾統治奧地利近 6 世紀 其權力象徵廣見於維也納各處
(Day 1) One of the nicest and easiest ways to see the city is on the bicycle.	(第 1 天)//遊覽維也納的最佳方式是騎自行車
Incredibly, in Vienna there are 500 miles of cycle lanes just in the city.	不可思議的是//維也納有 500 哩長的自行車專用道
Since the 13th century, the remains of the imperial Habsburgs have been stored in the crypt of the magnificent Stephansdom Cathedral.	13 世紀起,哈布斯堡皇族的遺體 被存放在聖史蒂芬大教堂的地下室
The imperial Habsburgs, they were like an eccentric bunch.	他們是一群很奇怪的人
Like, normal people when you die you get buried, but what they used to do is to cut parts of their body up and embalm them.	一般人在死後入土為安 但這些皇族的屍體會被肢解//防腐保存

1.2 Travel programme 1 (max)

Manipulated Subtitles (max)	Back Translation
勇闖天涯	Globe Trekker
這裡有音樂之都的美譽	It's known as the city of music.
是華爾滋的誕生地 也是貝多芬的安息處	It's the birthplace of the waltz, and the resting place of Beethoven.
這裡的蛋糕 咖啡廳 以及文化聞名於世	It's famous for its cakes, coffee houses, and of course, culture.
這裡是維也納	This is Vienna.
維也納是奧地利的首都	Vienna is the capital of the Republic of Austria.
地處中歐的心臟地帶 而且全市有 200 萬人口//佔奧地利總人口的 1/4	It lies at the very heart of central Europe and it's home to two million people, one quarter of the country's population.
維也納的歷史中心//由環城大道所圍繞	The historical centre of Vienna is completely enclosed inside the Ringstrasse.
聖史蒂芬大教堂位於中央 而宏偉的霍夫堡皇宮則位於西邊	The Stephansdom Cathedral at its focal point, and the mighty Hofburg Palace to the west of the city.
維也納市區	Vienna City Guide
不到 100 年前//維也納是歐洲強國的首都 並與倫敦,柏林及聖彼得堡齊名	Less than a hundred years ago Vienna was the capital of one of the most powerful states in Europe, holding its own alongside London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.
哈布斯堡家族曾統治奧地利近 6 世紀 其權力象徵廣見於維也納各處	It was ruled for over six centuries by one family, the Habsburgs, whose power is celebrated all over the city.
(第 1 天)//遊覽維也納的最佳方式是騎自行車	(Day 1) One of the nicest and easiest ways to see the city is on the bicycle.
不可思議的是//維也納有 500 哩長的自行車專用道	Incredibly, in Vienna there are 500 miles of cycle lanes just in the city.
自 13 世紀起,哈布斯堡皇族的遺體 被存放在聖史蒂芬大教堂的地下室	Since the 13th century, the remains of the imperial Habsburgs have been stored in the crypt of the magnificent Stephansdom Cathedral.
他們是一群很奇怪的人	The imperial Habsburgs, they were like an eccentric bunch.
因為一般人在死後入土為安 但這些皇族的屍體會被肢解//並防腐保存	Like, normal people when you die you get buried, but what they used to do is to cut parts of their body up and embalm them.

1.3 Travel programme 1 (min)

Manipulated Subtitles (min)	Back Translation
勇闖天涯	Globe Trekker
這裡有音樂之都的美譽	It's known as the city of music.
華爾滋的誕生地 貝多芬的安息處	It's the birthplace of the waltz, and the resting place of Beethoven.
這裡的蛋糕 咖啡廳 以及文化聞名於世	It's famous for its cakes, coffee houses, and of course, culture.
這裡是維也納	This is Vienna.
維也納是奧地利的首都	Vienna is the capital of the Republic of Austria.
地處中歐的心臟地帶 全市有 200 萬人口//佔奧地利總人口的 1/4	It lies at the very heart of central Europe and it's home to two million people, one quarter of the country's population.
維也納的歷史中心//由環城大道所圍繞	The historical centre of Vienna is completely enclosed inside the Ringstrasse.
聖史蒂芬大教堂位於中央 宏偉的霍夫堡皇宮位於西邊	The Stephansdom Cathedral at its focal point, and the mighty Hofburg Palace to the west of the city.
維也納市區	Vienna City Guide
不到 100 年前//維也納是歐洲強國的首都 與倫敦,柏林及聖彼得堡齊名	Less than a hundred years ago Vienna was the capital of one of the most powerful states in Europe, holding its own alongside London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.
哈布斯堡家族曾統治奧地利近 6 世紀 其權力象徵廣見於維也納各處	It was ruled for over six centuries by one family, the Habsburgs, whose power is celebrated all over the city.
(第 1 天)//遊覽維也納的最佳方式是騎自行車	(Day 1) One of the nicest and easiest ways to see the city is on the bicycle.
不可思議的是//維也納有 500 哩長的自行車專用道	Incredibly, in Vienna there are 500 miles of cycle lanes just in the city.
13 世紀起,哈布斯堡皇族的遺體 被存放在聖史蒂芬大教堂的地下室	Since the 13th century, the remains of the imperial Habsburgs have been stored in the crypt of the magnificent Stephansdom Cathedral.
他們是一群很奇怪的人	The imperial Habsburgs, they were like an eccentric bunch.
一般人在死後入土為安 這些皇族的屍體會被肢解//防腐保存	Like, normal people when you die you get buried, but what they used to do is to cut parts of their body up and embalm them.

2. Travel programme 2: *Globe Trekker: Portugal and the Azores* [max & min]

2.1 Original script (ST) and subtitles (TT)

Original Script (ST)	Original Subtitles (TT)
Global Trekker	勇闖天涯
Most people who visit this country head south for the sun and the sand and I'm interested in that, but this place has so much more to offer.	造訪此國的人大多前往南方//享受陽光和沙灘 這我也很感興趣//但這裡還有很多其他特色
It has an incredible history.	這裡有輝煌的歷史
After all, it helped lead the discovery of the new world.	畢竟,這是發現新世界的起點
It's steeped in tradition and folklore.	此地有深遠的傳統和民俗
It's got rugged countryside.	還有粗獷的鄉間景致
There is definitely a real life here that most visitors haven't yet explored.	以及多數遊客尚未探索的真實生活
This is Portugal.	這裡是葡萄牙
Portugal once one of the great European empires is situated in the North Atlantic and shares a 500-mile long border with Spain.	葡萄牙曾是//最偉大的歐洲帝國之一 地處北大西洋 與鄰國西班牙的邊界//綿延 500 哩
The country's territories include the Azores Islands.	領土涵蓋亞速群島
My journey takes me from the rugged terrain of the Peneda Geres National Park to Porto.	我將從佩內達吉瑞斯國家公園//前往波士
Heading south, I visit Santarem. Passing through Fatima, I head for Lisbon before travelling south to the beaches of the Algarve.	然後往南造訪桑塔林 途經法提馬,前往里斯本 往南到阿爾加夫的海灘
I end my journey in the remote Azores Islands for some whale watching.	最後到遙遠的亞速群島賞鯨
Portugal and the Azores	葡萄牙與亞速群島
Peneda Geres is Portugal's only national park.	佩內達吉瑞斯//是葡萄牙唯一的國家公園
Now, what makes this particular land so special is that they're trying to preserve not only an ecosystem, but also a way of life that is on the verge of becoming extinct.	此地的特別之處是//他們不僅在保護生態系統 也在維護一種即將消失的生活方式

2.2 Travel programme 2 (max)

Manipulated Subtitles (max)	Back Translation
勇闖天涯	Global Trekker
造訪此國的人大多前往南方//以享受陽光和沙灘 這我也很感興趣//但這裡還有很多其他特色	Most people who visit this country head south for the sun and the sand and I'm interested in that, but this place has so much more to offer.
這裡有輝煌的歷史	It has an incredible history.
畢竟,這裡是發現新世界的起點	After all, it helped lead the discovery of the new world.
此地有深遠的傳統和民俗	It's steeped in tradition and folklore.
還有粗獷的鄉間景致	It's got rugged countryside.
以及多數遊客尚未探索的真實生活	There is definitely a real life here that most visitors haven't yet explored.
這裡是葡萄牙	This is Portugal.
葡萄牙曾是//最偉大的歐洲帝國之一 地處北大西洋 並與鄰國西班牙的邊界//綿延 500 哩	Portugal once one of the great European empires is situated in the North Atlantic and shares a 500-mile long border with Spain.
領土涵蓋亞速群島	The country's territories include the Azores Islands.
我將從佩內達吉瑞斯國家公園//前往波士	My journey takes me from the rugged terrain of the Peneda Geres National Park to Porto.
然後往南造訪桑塔林 途經法提馬,前往里斯本 接著往南到阿爾加夫的海灘	Heading south, I visit Santarem. Passing through Fatima, I head for Lisbon before travelling south to the beaches of the Algarve.
最後到遙遠的亞速群島賞鯨	I end my journey in the remote Azores Islands for some whale watching.
葡萄牙與亞速群島	Portugal and the Azores
佩內達吉瑞斯//是葡萄牙唯一的國家公園	Peneda Geres is Portugal's only national park.
此地的特別之處是//他們不僅在保護生態系統 也在維護一種即將消失的生活方式	Now, what makes this particular land so special is that they're trying to preserve not only an ecosystem, but also a way of life that is on the verge of becoming extinct.

2.3 Travel programme 2 (min)

Manipulated Subtitles (min)	Back Translation
勇闖天涯	Global Trekker
造訪此國的人大多前往南方//享受陽光和沙灘 這我很感興趣//這裡有很多其他特色	Most people who visit this country head south for the sun and the sand and I'm interested in that, but this place has so much more to offer.
這裡有輝煌的歷史	It has an incredible history.
這裡是發現新世界的起點	After all, it helped lead the discovery of the new world.
此地有深遠的傳統和民俗	It's steeped in tradition and folklore.
粗獷的鄉間景致	It's got rugged countryside.
多數遊客尚未探索的真實生活	There is definitely a real life here that most visitors haven't yet explored.
這裡是葡萄牙	This is Portugal.
葡萄牙曾是//最偉大的歐洲帝國之一 地處北大西洋 與鄰國西班牙的邊界//綿延 500 哩	Portugal once one of the great European empires is situated in the North Atlantic and shares a 500-mile long border with Spain.
領土涵蓋亞速群島	The country's territories include the Azores Islands.
我將從佩內達吉瑞斯國家公園//前往波士	My journey takes me from the rugged terrain of the Peneda Geres National Park to Porto.
往南造訪桑塔林 途經法提馬, 前往里斯本 往南到阿爾加夫的海灘	Heading south, I visit Santarem. Passing through Fatima, I head for Lisbon before travelling south to the beaches of the Algarve.
到遙遠的亞速群島賞鯨	I end my journey in the remote Azores Islands for some whale watching.
葡萄牙與亞速群島	Portugal and the Azores
佩內達吉瑞斯是葡萄牙唯一的國家公園	Peneda Geres is Portugal's only national park.
此地的特別之處是//他們在保護生態系統 維護一種即將消失的生活方式	Now, what makes this particular land so special is that they're trying to preserve not only an ecosystem, but also a way of life that is on the verge of becoming extinct.

3. Documentary 1: *Who Killed Julius Caesar?* [max & min]

3.1 Original script (ST) and subtitles (TT)

Original Script (ST)	Original Subtitles (TT)
Rome, superpower of its day, whose all-conquering legions subdued vast new lands, and where one man had triumphed to gain ultimate control, a man whose death could change history.	羅馬曾是超級強權 所向無敵的羅馬軍團征服廣袤疆域 此帝國曾由一人全權掌控 而他的死亡將改變歷史
Julius Caesar, genius and, perhaps, greatest general of all time, was murdered openly in the Roman senate.	凱撒大帝是天才//或許也是歷來最偉大的將領 卻在羅馬元老院被公然謀殺
For centuries, no one questioned the facts of his death.	數世紀來,無人質疑他的死因
But now, 2,000 years later, a top Italian investigator has returned to the earliest historical accounts and reopened the case.	但在 2 千年後的今日 一名義大利頂尖調查員//回顧最早的歷史記載 重新調查此案
Using 21st century forensic techniques he revisits the key locations.	他利用 21 世紀的鑑識技術//重新造訪關鍵地點
With computer-generated models, he recreates the crime scene.	並用電腦模型模擬犯罪現場
Blow by blow, he stages a simulation of the murder itself.	他一刀一刀地模擬謀殺實況
And the most startling revelation of all, the truth emerges, not from the assassins, but deep inside the mind of Julius Caesar himself.	最驚人的真相並非來自行刺者 而是來自凱撒大帝的內心深處
Rome on the Ides, the 15th of March, 44 BC. Senators await the head of state.	古羅馬西元前 44 年 3 月 15 日 元老院議員等待元首到來
Julius Caesar, dictator of Rome, conqueror of Europe.	即羅馬獨裁者和歐洲征服者//凱撒大帝
First item on the agenda, murder.	他們的第一項議程是謀殺
The nation's shrewdest and greatest general arrives at the Senate unguarded and dismissed all warnings.	羅馬最精明偉大的將軍 在沒有保鏢且無視所有警告的情況下//抵達元老院
As bystanders look on in horror he is cut down.	旁觀者驚恐地看著他遇刺
The deed is quick, bloody, and public.	此謀殺行動快速,血腥且公開
The identity of the culprits beyond doubt.	罪魁禍首的身份也無庸置疑
But did the famous conspirators, Brutus and Cassius, really mastermind Caesar's murder?	但著名的謀反者布魯特斯與卡修斯 真的是凱撒大帝謀殺案的主腦嗎?
Or were they just the pawns of an unseen hand?	或僅是幕後黑手的傀儡?

3.2 Documentary 1 (max)

Manipulated Subtitles (max)	Back Translation
羅馬曾是超級強權 所向無敵的羅馬軍團征服廣袤疆域 此帝國曾由一人全權掌控 而他的死亡將改變歷史	Rome, superpower of its day, whose all-conquering legions subdued vast new lands, and where one man had triumphed to gain ultimate control, a man whose death could change history.
凱撒大帝是天才//或許也是歷來最偉大的將領 卻在羅馬元老院被公然謀殺	Julius Caesar, genius and, perhaps, greatest general of all time, was murdered openly in the Roman senate.
數世紀來,無人質疑他的死因	For centuries, no one questioned the facts of his death.
但在 2 千年後的今日 一名義大利頂尖調查員//回顧最早的歷史記載 並重新調查此案	But now, 2,000 years later, a top Italian investigator has returned to the earliest historical accounts and reopened the case.
他利用 21 世紀的鑑識技術//重新造訪關鍵地點	Using 21st century forensic techniques he revisits the key locations.
並用電腦模型模擬犯罪現場	With computer-generated models, he recreates the crime scene.
他一刀一刀地模擬謀殺實況	Blow by blow, he stages a simulation of the murder itself.
但最驚人的真相並非來自行刺者 而是來自凱撒大帝的內心深處	And the most startling revelation of all, the truth emerges, not from the assassins, but deep inside the mind of Julius Caesar himself.
古羅馬西元前 44 年 3 月 15 日 元老院議員等待元首到來	Rome on the Ides, the 15th of March, 44 BC. Senators await the head of state.
即羅馬獨裁者和歐洲征服者//凱撒大帝	Julius Caesar, dictator of Rome, conqueror of Europe.
他們的第一項議程是謀殺	First item on the agenda, murder.
羅馬最精明偉大的將軍 在沒有保鏢且無視所有警告的情況下//抵達元老院	The nation's shrewdest and greatest general arrives at the Senate unguarded and dismissed all warnings.
旁觀者驚恐地看著他遇刺	As bystanders look on in horror he is cut down.
此謀殺行動快速,血腥且公開	The deed is quick, bloody, and public.
罪魁禍首的身份也無庸置疑	The identity of the culprits beyond doubt.
但著名的謀反者布魯特斯與卡修斯 真的是凱撒大帝謀殺案的主腦嗎?	But did the famous conspirators, Brutus and Cassius, really mastermind Caesar's murder?
或僅是幕後黑手的傀儡?	Or were they just the pawns of an unseen hand?

3.3 Documentary 1 (min)

Manipulated Subtitles (min)	Back Translation
羅馬曾是超級強權 所向無敵的羅馬軍團征服廣袤疆域 此帝國曾由一人全權掌控 他的死亡將改變歷史	Rome, superpower of its day, whose all-conquering legions subdued vast new lands, and where one man had triumphed to gain ultimate control, a man whose death could change history.
凱撒大帝是天才//或許是歷來最偉大的將領 在羅馬元老院被公然謀殺	Julius Caesar, genius and, perhaps, greatest general of all time, was murdered openly in the Roman senate.
數世紀來,無人質疑他的死因	For centuries, no one questioned the facts of his death.
2 千年後的今日 一名義大利頂尖調查員//回顧最早的歷史記載 重新調查此案	But now, 2,000 years later, a top Italian investigator has returned to the earliest historical accounts and reopened the case.
他利用 21 世紀的鑑識技術//重新造訪關鍵地點	Using 21st century forensic techniques he revisits the key locations.
用電腦模型模擬犯罪現場	With computer-generated models, he recreates the crime scene.
他一刀一刀地模擬謀殺實況	Blow by blow, he stages a simulation of the murder itself.
最驚人的真相並非來自行刺者 而是凱撒大帝的內心深處	And the most startling revelation of all, the truth emerges, not from the assassins, but deep inside the mind of Julius Caesar himself.
古羅馬西元前 44 年 3 月 15 日 元老院議員等待元首到來	Rome on the Ides, the 15th of March, 44 BC. Senators await the head of state.
羅馬獨裁者和歐洲征服者//凱撒大帝	Julius Caesar, dictator of Rome, conqueror of Europe.
他們的第一項議程是謀殺	First item on the agenda, murder.
羅馬最精明偉大的將軍 在沒有保鏢且無視所有警告的情況下//抵達元老院	The nation's shrewdest and greatest general arrives at the Senate unguarded and dismissed all warnings.
旁觀者驚恐地看著他遇刺	As bystanders look on in horror he is cut down.
謀殺行動快速,血腥且公開	The deed is quick, bloody, and public.
罪魁禍首的身份無庸置疑	The identity of the culprits beyond doubt.
著名的謀反者布魯特斯與卡修斯 是凱撒大帝謀殺案的主腦嗎?	But did the famous conspirators, Brutus and Cassius, really mastermind Caesar's murder?
或是幕後黑手的傀儡?	Or were they just the pawns of an unseen hand?

4. Documentary 2: *Building the Ultimate: Stadium* [max & min]

4.1 Original script (ST) and subtitles (TT)

Original Script (ST)	Original Subtitles (TT)
They are some of the biggest structures built by man, cathedrals of the modern age.	它們是最大的人造建築之一 也是現代的大教堂
Stadia are perhaps the few buildings that can truly live up to what the concept of an icon really can be.	運動場可能是//少數符合地標概念的建築物之一
Passion and emotion are at the heart of their very being.	熱情和激動的情緒是它們的核心
I think there is something deep within the human psyche that loves being in this vast assemblage of fellow human beings.	我認為人類內心深處//喜愛眾人齊聚一堂的感覺
Stadia only dreamed of, of today become a reality.	原本僅屬想像的運動場如今已經成真
Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, make sure they're strong enough, but also make sure that when they, when they're used, they actually work.	科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//並確保它們夠堅固 但也確保它們真的能使用
The modern stadium has become a masterpiece of engineering as we strive to build the ultimate.	現代運動場已成為工程傑作 因為我們致力於打造極致的運動場
Building The Ultimate: Stadium	超強科技工程:運動場
Every stadium is a unique building that pays homage to the live event.	每座運動場都是//向現場比賽致敬的獨特建築
The twin-towers of Wembley were an icon for generations.	溫布萊運動場的雙子塔//數代以來一直都是地標
It was the most famous stadium in the world and held a special place in the hearts of millions.	這是世界最著名的運動場 並在數百萬人心中佔據特殊地位
Yet to keep up with ever increasing demands, a new Wembley Stadium is needed.	但為了滿足不斷增加的需求 人們需要一座新的溫布萊運動場
For this film, we've been given special access to the building of Wembley's new stadium and its radical design.	為了拍攝本節目//我們特別獲准進入新運動場 一窺其先進設計
At twice the size and four times the height of the old Wembley, you could fit 50,000 trucks inside it.	新運動場比舊的大 1 倍,高 3 倍 內部可容納 5 萬輛卡車
Its roof will be over 11 acres and it will seat 90,000.	屋頂面積將超過 11 英畝//並有 9 萬個座位
It is the ultimate in stadium design.	這是極致的運動場設計

4.2 Documentary 2 (max)

Manipulated Subtitles (max)	Back Translation
它們是最大的人造建築之一 也是現代的大教堂	They are some of the biggest structures built by man, cathedrals of the modern age.
運動場可能是//少數符合地標概念的建築物之一	Stadia are perhaps the few buildings that can truly live up to what the concept of an icon really can be.
熱情和激動的情緒是它們的核心	Passion and emotion are at the heart of their very being.
我認為人類內心深處//喜愛眾人齊聚一堂的感覺	I think there is something deep within the human psyche that loves being in this vast assemblage of fellow human beings.
原本僅屬想像的運動場如今已經成真	Stadia only dreamed of, of today become a reality.
科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//並確保它們夠堅固 但也確保它們真的能使用	Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, make sure they're strong enough, but also make sure that when they're used, they actually work.
現代運動場已成為工程傑作 因為我們致力於打造極致的運動場	The modern stadium has become a masterpiece of engineering as we strive to build the ultimate.
超強科技工程:運動場	Building The Ultimate: Stadium
每座運動場都是//向現場比賽致敬的獨特建築	Every stadium is a unique building that pays homage to the live event.
溫布萊運動場的雙子塔//數代以來一直都是地標	The twin-towers of Wembley were an icon for generations.
這是世界最著名的運動場 並在數百萬人心中佔據特殊地位	It was the most famous stadium in the world and held a special place in the hearts of millions.
但為了滿足不斷增加的需求 人們需要一座新的溫布萊運動場	Yet to keep up with ever increasing demands, a new Wembley Stadium is needed.
為了拍攝本節目//我們特別獲准進入新運動場 並一窺其先進設計	For this film, we've been given special access to the building of Wembley's new stadium and its radical design.
新運動場比舊的大 1 倍,高 3 倍 內部可容納 5 萬輛卡車	At twice the size and four times the height of the old Wembley, you could fit 50,000 trucks inside it.
屋頂面積將超過 11 英畝//並有 9 萬個座位	Its roof will be over 11 acres and it will seat 90,000.
這是極致的運動場設計	It is the ultimate in stadium design.

4.3 Documentary 2 (min)

Manipulated Subtitles (min)	Back Translation
它們是最大的人造建築之一 現代的大教堂	They are some of the biggest structures built by man, cathedrals of the modern age.
運動場可能是//少數符合地標概念的建築物之一	Stadia are perhaps the few buildings that can truly live up to what the concept of an icon really can be.
熱情和激動的情緒是它們的核心	Passion and emotion are at the heart of their very being.
我認為人類內心深處//喜愛眾人齊聚一堂的感覺	I think there is something deep within the human psyche that loves being in this vast assemblage of fellow human beings.
想像中的運動場如今已經成真	Stadia only dreamed of, of today become a reality.
科技使我們得以設計和分析建築//確保它們夠堅固 確保它們真的能使用	Technology has enabled us to design things, analyze them, make sure they're strong enough, but also make sure that when they, when they're used, they actually work.
現代運動場已成為工程傑作 我們致力於打造極致的運動場	The modern stadium has become a masterpiece of engineering as we strive to build the ultimate.
超強科技工程:運動場	Building The Ultimate: Stadium
每座運動場都是//向現場比賽致敬的獨特建築	Every stadium is a unique building that pays homage to the live event.
溫布萊運動場的雙子塔//數代以來都是地標	The twin-towers of Wembley were an icon for generations.
這是世界最著名的運動場 在數百萬人心中佔據特殊地位	It was the most famous stadium in the world and held a special place in the hearts of millions.
為了滿足不斷增加的需求 人們需要一座新的溫布萊運動場	Yet to keep up with ever increasing demands, a new Wembley Stadium is needed.
為了拍攝本節目//我們特別獲准進入新運動場 一窺其先進設計	For this film, we've been given special access to the building of Wembley's new stadium and its radical design.
新運動場比舊的大1倍,高3倍 內部可容納5萬輛卡車	At twice the size and four times the height of the old Wembley, you could fit 50,000 trucks inside it.
屋頂面積將超過11英畝//有9萬個座位	Its roof will be over 11 acres and it will seat 90,000.
這是極致的運動場設計	It is the ultimate in stadium design.

Appendix H: Average scores of 8 clips for each item

No. Item	Group A (75)				Group B (83)			
	Travel1 (max)	Travel2 (min)	Doc1 (min)	Doc2 (max)	Travel1 (min)	Travel2 (max)	Doc1 (max)	Doc2 (min)
1. Concise	4.12	3.84	3.92	3.99	3.94	3.81	3.83	3.99
2. Understandable	4.04	3.87	3.96	3.96	3.86	3.95	3.80	3.88
3. Complete	4.00	3.96	3.96	4.03	3.93	3.99	4.02	3.92
4. Processing effort	4.08	3.87	4.03	3.97	3.90	3.88	3.94	4.05
5. Major info	3.93	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.04	3.98	3.90	4.04
6. Subtle meaning	3.69	3.79	3.76	3.81	3.52	3.86	3.77	4.00
7. Style	3.91	3.84	3.84	3.77	3.66	3.69	3.92	3.61
8. Speed	3.76	3.79	3.84	3.91	3.66	3.78	3.80	3.95
9. Length	3.85	3.89	3.92	4.00	3.81	3.69	3.80	4.04
10. Connection	3.69	3.67	3.73	3.83	3.55	3.65	3.73	3.80
11. Fluency	3.89	3.96	3.95	4.03	13.82	3.82	3.90	4.07
12. Overall quality	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.17	4.02	3.95	4.00	4.14
Average	3.92	3.88	3.92	3.96	3.81	3.84	3.87	3.96