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Introduction: context

- Respeaking with SR for producing live inTRAlingual subtitles introduced in 2001 in Europe, now preferred technique in most contexts

- New challenge: multicultural society, multilingual audiovisual products
  → need for inTERlingual live subtitles
  → training? Competences?
  → ILSA Erasmus+ Project

www.ilsaproject.eu
Introduction: ILSA

ILSA = Interlingual Live Subtitling for Access
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Introduction: ILSA

- Aim: to develop the new professional profile of the ILSer → different steps and thus IOs:
  - assessment of current intralingual and interlingual live subtitling practice and training (IO1);
  - identification of the subtitling, interpreting and respeaking skills required for the job (IO2);
  - profile definition and competences of the professional ILSer (IO3);
  - mapping the ILSA course (IO4)
  - development, assessment and validation of the course and its materials (IO5, IO6);
  - creation of a protocol to transfer the results of the project to society (IO7) for the implementation of ILS on TV, in the classroom and in social/political settings.
IO1: Methodology

• Comprehensive online questionnaire conducted in the spring of 2018 and sent to three target groups:
  1. Higher Education Institutions (HEI),
  2. Practitioners (intralingual and interlingual live subtitlers, LS and ILS),
  3. Broadcasters & Service providers
• Dissemination by all partners to more than 80 potential respondents
IO1: Results

Response rate:

1. HEI: 5 valid answers
2. Practitioners: 126 valid answers
3. Broadcasters & Service providers: 22 valid answers

Type of questions:

demographics, training type, competences, workflows, etc. But some questions identical for all 3 target groups, e.g.:

➔ Prerequisites: importance of formal training and/or practical experience in subtitling, CI, SI and translation for successful intralingual and interlingual LS?
IO1: Results

InTRA: practitioners, significant difference

InTER: practitioners, NO significant difference

NB: 3 trainers, 3 SP&B
IO1: Conclusions

• Both InTRA LS and InTER LS require different skills, i.e. subtitling, simultaneous interpreting (SI), consecutive interpreting (CI) and translation.

• However, for InTER, these different skills are considered equally important, whereas this is not the case for InTRA where these skills are ranked in descending order.

• InTER: focus on subtitling, SI, CI and translation → need to remove the frontier between translation and interpreting in training at HEI.
IO2: Methodology

• Experiment to answer the following questions:
  • Is ILS feasible?
  • Who is better suited?
  • What are the main challenges?

• Design:
  • Study: PhD Hayley Dawson, University of Roehampton
  • 50 participants: subtitlers, interpreters, subtitlers+interpreters, intralingual respeakers, bilinguals
  • 4-week online course plus ILS test
  • Two speeches (EN-ES) → 2 tests
  • Analysis with NTR model: accuracy rate
IO2: results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Good performers</th>
<th>Poor performers</th>
<th>Interpreters</th>
<th>Subtitlers</th>
<th>Poor interpreters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy rate</strong></td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>97.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4/10)</td>
<td>(6.5/10)</td>
<td>(2.5/10)</td>
<td>(5/10)</td>
<td>(3.5/10)</td>
<td>(2/10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Average accuracy rates

Observations

- Very good average AR for all (almost a pass, i.e. 98), considering the difficulty involved in ILS (points to ILS as feasible)
- Good performers managed a good AR and poor performers were properly poor: some of their tests were unintelligible.
- Interestingly, the key difference is between good and bad performers, not necessarily (or only) between interpreters and subtitlers
- Not all interpreters are good performers, not all subtitlers are poor performers
## IO2: results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of error</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Good performers</th>
<th>Poor performers</th>
<th>Interpreters</th>
<th>Subtitlers</th>
<th>Poor interpreters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T errors</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R errors</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Average number of translation and recognition errors

- T vs R: very, very evenly distributed across groups, which shows that T and R are equally important and challenging issues, and must be treated (and trained) as such.
IO2: Conclusions

• ILS seems feasible (97.6%)
• Interpreters perform better than subtitlers
  BUT Interpreter ≠ good performer; subtitler ≠ poor performer
• Translation and Respeaking are equally important and challenging
• Bad performers struggle to keep up and as a result omit too many full sentences, mistranslate the source text and dictate less clearly
• Subtitlers seem to struggle trying to keep up with the text, as a result they have more omissions, more mistranslations and more recognition errors.
Conclusions IO1 + IO2

Requirements for an ILS course

• **Subtitling**
  • knowledge of SDH
  • Segmentation
  • Reformulation
  • edition
• **Simultaneous interpreting**
  • short-term memory
  • Speed
  • multitasking
  • live translation
• **Respeaking**
  • software-related
  • dictation and enunciation (to reduce R errors)
  • unlearning of skills, such as speaking in a pleasant voice
• **Translation**
  • awareness of translation errors, especially omissions
Thank you for your attention!

Questions?

isabelle.robert@uantwerpen.be