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Abstract

Ecuador has been denied one of the most versatile and useful accessibility means for a long time. Subtitling for the Deaf and the Heard of Hearing (SDH) is not part of the Ecuadorian television, a fact that has contributed to the alienation of deaf people. This dissertation tries to fill the gap between audiovisual material and the deaf and the hard of hearing. Its purpose is to ascertain the perception that the Ecuadorian deaf people have of SDH, through the subtitling of the Argentinian film “Carancho.” This project aims to assess the deaf viewers’ expectations from this subtitling mode, through a questionnaire that was handed to 48 deaf and hard of hearing participants in the city of Quito, in August, 2016.

This survey was designed as a three-part tool, intended to:

1. Gather background information that will help characterize the deaf audience,
2. Help understand the knowledge the deaf have of SDH and their interaction habits with this tool,
3. Determine whether or not the style used for the subtitling of the Argentinean film is transferable to the subtitling practice in Ecuador.

The generally good assessment of the subtitles by the participants, shows that they are considered as sufficiently acceptable by the population, however, an in-depth analysis from a professional point of view, shows that these subtitles still have aspects to be improved.

The answers and opinions collected in this study, may help subtitlers establish a basis for the elaboration of future guidelines for the Ecuadorian deaf community.
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Introduction

Inclusion is a word often heard when referring to minorities. Every person has the same opportunities and rights, among which are the right to information and entertainment. This is one of the reasons why Subtitling for the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing (SDH) exists. Nevertheless, its usage is not generalized in many parts of the world. In Ecuador, for instance, it is not a common practice. It is not used in television and can only be found in some international channels through cable TV. Moreover, it is not included in national DVDs and it is not an option for online content in national streaming services.

Since audiovisual and multimedia content is a big part of our everyday lives and it keeps growing daily, partly thanks to the internet, it is important that SDH is present as an option, so that the deaf community can benefit from this technology as well.

In the past few years, the Ecuadorian government has been taking measures to promote the inclusion of people with disabilities. In 2012, the Organic Law on Disabilities was published, which states in article 64 (my translation) that “[…] educational and general culture programs, newscasts, and electoral campaigns shall incorporate a Sign Language interpreter and/or subtitles.”

The following year, the Organic Law on Communication was published in the Third Supplement of the Official Register No. 022. In article 37, it emphasises the right of access to communication of disabled people, where it establishes (my translation) that “[…] social communication media, public and private institutions of the social communication system and society shall gradually develop the following measures, among others: translation with subtitles, Sign Language and Braille.”

Currently, every national channel implements a Sign Language interpreter in at least one newscast per day, and there are intralingual subtitles (simple transcription of the oral language) in televised nationwide announcements. Nevertheless, SDH is still not widely accessible. SDH in Spanish is only available on the internet in some international streaming services for certain movies, as downloadable SubRip (.srt) documents, or as a feature in a few imported DVDs. This is not sufficient for the deaf and the hard of hearing to be able to access even half of televised content.

For this reason, the aim of this dissertation is to ascertain the perception that the Ecuadorian deaf people have of SDH, through the subtitling of the Argentinian film “Carancho,” to establish their opinions and preferences regarding this subtitling mode.

---

1 The original text in Spanish reads: “Además los programas educativos y de cultura general, noticieros y campañas electorales deberán incorporar un intérprete de lengua de señas y/o subtítulos.”

2 The original text in Spanish reads: “[…] los medios de comunicación social, las instituciones públicas y privadas del sistema de comunicación social y la sociedad desarrollarán progresivamente, entre otras, las siguientes medidas: traducción con subtítulos, lengua de señas y sistema braille.”
This study may, therefore, help subtitlers establish a basis for the elaboration of future guidelines for the Ecuadorian deaf population.

This project aims to assess the deaf viewers’ needs from this subtitling mode, their knowledge of SDH, and their opinion regarding the Argentinian style of subtitling by means of a questionnaire handed to 48 deaf participants from Quito. No underage participant took part of this study.

For this dissertation, I analysed the conventions used specifically within the subtitling of the film “Carancho,” and not general conventions used for other Argentinean audiovisual materials, such as television programs. This project focused only on SDH in Latin America since it is where the study takes place. Finally, this does not intend to be a prescriptive guide to subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing, rather it is an academic contribution to aid the deaf community in the examination of opinions that will be helpful to the future creation and implementation of SDH in Ecuador.

This dissertation will be divided into three chapters. The first chapter will focus on the theoretical background on which this study is based. Here, I will present the most relevant definitions and information regarding SDH in the Latin American region, including laws and historical background, mainly from Argentina and Ecuador; and information about the deaf community in the country and specifically in Quito. The second chapter will cover the methodology used for this project. It will explain the research design, description and selection of the sample participants and data collection methods, i.e. a questionnaire. Finally, the last chapter will include the analysis and discussion of the data collected.
Chapter 1  Theoretical background

To understand the core topic of this dissertation, it is important to outline and explain its most significant aspects. In this chapter, I will provide a brief overview of deafness and SDH within the Ecuadorian and Latin American context. However, before we delve into this subject, it is imperative to define the terms that will be used throughout this dissertation.

1.1. Who are the deaf and the hard of hearing?

When talking about people who have experienced hearing loss at any degree, a variety of terms is often used. The term “hearing impaired,” for example, is currently used less to describe people with hearing loss, as it is deemed to be offensive and an inaccurate description of the condition.

On the other hand, the phrase “hard of hearing” is used to describe people who have some degree of deafness, which can be mild, moderate or severe; which means that they do have some functional hearing. Finally, there is a difference between the terms “deaf” and “Deaf.” Although both may encompass people with any degree of hearing loss, the word “Deaf” is often used to refer to people who identify themselves as being part of the Deaf community, a linguistic and cultural minority. Since the word “Deaf” relies more on a definition from a social perspective which takes into account factors such as self-perception and identity, it will not be used in this dissertation.

For this project, I will use the term “hard of hearing” to refer to people who suffer from mild to severe hearing loss only when it is in opposition to the word “deaf” which will be used for people with profound hearing loss and anacusis in this context. Otherwise, the term “deaf” will be used for most part of this dissertation to refer to people with any degree of hearing loss (mild-to-profound). Likewise, I will use the term “deaf community” when referring to deaf people who identify themselves as deaf, so that there is no confusion between the terms “deaf” and “Deaf.”

1.1.1. Deaf people in Ecuador

According to the National Census in 2010 (n.d), there were 207,541 people with hearing loss in Ecuador. Currently, the National Council on Disability Equality, CONADIS (Consejo Nacional para la Igualdad de Discapacidades in Spanish) (n.d), states that there are 52,780 deaf people registered in their database, which means only 25% of the deaf people in Ecuador is officially registered as deaf. In Quito, the number of deaf people registered is 8,657.

CONADIS allows people with disabilities to register voluntarily and get a card. The applicant has to fulfil a series of requirements and conditions to be able to be registered. Only people with permanent disabilities are eligible. Acquiring a card grants the disabled person benefits such as tax exemptions, and discounts in several public and private services, among others.
In the entry for Ecuador on the deaf atlas (Oviedo et al., 2014) it is stated that there are 12 schools nationwide for the deaf and hard of hearing. Additionally, there is one national federation, FENASEC; and more than 23 regional and local associations.

The National Federation of Deaf People of Ecuador, FENASEC (Federación Nacional de Sordos del Ecuador), was established in 1986 (WFD and SNAD, 2008) as the national representative of the deaf population before the World Federation of the Deaf, WFD.

Moreover, there are foundations dedicated to provide information, assistance and support to the deaf and hard of hearing and their families, and to raise awareness of this state of being. One of these foundations is Fundación Vivir la Sordera (Living Deafness Foundation). It was created in 2004 to cater to the needs of the deaf community. They create educational material, develop health programs for the detection of deafness, organise exchange programs, among other activities in favour of the deaf. This foundation agreed to work with me in this project and has been the link to the deaf community.

Even though the establishment of these foundations and federations is quite recent, schools for deaf people have existed since the 1940s, when the first school for children with special needs was opened, according to Miguel Santillán (1994). Although these schools did not cater to deaf children specifically, they still provided a safe and nurturing environment for deaf children, where they could learn to communicate in Sign Language. It is graduates from these schools who started organizing themselves formally in favour of the deaf (Santillán, 2014).

Nowadays, apart from the 12 schools specifically for the deaf and hard of hearing around the country, there are almost 100 special education institutions as stated by the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education (n.d) in its web page. These schools, although not expressly catering to deaf children, accept them either in special classes or together with other children.

Additionally, the Ministry has stated that around 1000 children attend these 12 schools. Nevertheless, according to Oviedo et al. (2014) who used information from CONADIS, which is no longer available online, there were a total of 5688 deaf children in Ecuador in 2014. This means that most deaf children are enrolled in schools for hearing children, special education schools or not enrolled at all. What is more, up until recently, these schools had been using mainly an oral teaching approach; it is only in the last 6 years that a bilingual (Ecuadorian Sign Language or LSEc – written Spanish) and bicultural approach has started to be implemented in schools for the deaf. (Oviedo et al., 2014).

1.1.2. Laws in favour of the deaf

These last two decades have been pivotal for deaf people in Ecuador. The government has been working towards creating a more inclusive society and that is reflected on the different measures that have been put in place to safeguard disabled people, including the deaf.
In 2007, Ecuador signed the UN’s Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and its Optional Protocol, and ratified both the following year. Also in 2008, the new Constitution of Ecuador incorporated and developed its laws regarding the rights of priority persons and groups. These can be found under Chapter three of Title II:

Article 35. Elderly persons, girls, children and adolescents, pregnant women, persons with disabilities, persons in prison and those who suffer from disastrous or highly complex diseases shall receive priority and specialized care in the public and private sectors. The same priority care shall be received by persons in situations of risk, victims of domestic and sexual violence, child mistreatment, natural or manmade disasters. The State shall provide special protection to persons who are doubly vulnerable (my emphasis, translation from Georgetown University Political Database of the Americas, 2011).

This introductory article defines all of the priority groups, and states that people with disabilities, (a category which encompasses the deaf) should receive priority treatment in all environments. Then, section six of the same chapter is dedicated entirely to people with disabilities. It specifies the ways in which disabled people should be integrated to society’s day to day life:

Article 47. The State shall guarantee disability prevention policies and, along with society and the family, it shall ensure equal opportunities for persons with disabilities and their social integration.

Persons with disabilities are recognized the following rights:

[...] 11. Access to alternative communication mechanisms, media and forms, among which sign language for deaf persons, oralism and the Braille system. (translation from Georgetown University Political Database of the Americas, 2011)

This article ensures social integration of people with disabilities and talks about the access to media; however, SDH is not mentioned as an alternative.

Nevertheless, article 48 affirms that “the State shall adopt for the benefit of persons with disabilities measures that ensure social inclusion, by means of coordinated state and private plans and programs that promote their political, social, educational, and economic participation.” This social inclusion also comprises their right to information and access to media, a topic that is more specifically defined in the Organic Law on Disabilities and the Organic Law on Communication, which were passed on 25 September, 2012 and 25 June, 2013 respectively; and whose articles were mentioned in the introduction.

The articles in these organic laws do include subtitling as one of the means to make televised content accessible to deaf people along with Sign Language interpreting; as a result, only Sign Language has been adopted. Currently, every channel has a Sign Language interpreter for at least one of their daily 60-minute newscast, but the image is often too small to be of use. Regarding the subtitles, by the time this dissertation was written, intralingual subtitles, without any sound descriptions for the deaf, were only implemented in national broadcasts, which usually last less than 10 minutes. These subtitles are pre-prepared and open as they are already embedded in the video presented.
1.2. Explaining SDH

As we already know, the parameters involved in the creation of subtitles varies depending on what type of subtitle we are producing. Gottlieb (1997), Ivarsson (1992), Díaz-Cintas (2007) among others, have presented their own classification of subtitles depending on technical or linguistic parameters. According to these authors, subtitles can be intra or interlinguistic depending on whether they are in the same language as the audiovisual product or in a different language. They can be live or made prior to the broadcasting, they can be printed on the product or they can be independent; they can be aimed at children or adults; or they can be open (non-optional) or closed (optional or hidden).

SDH may fall into any or all of those categories, however, what makes it a particular mode of subtitling is that it is aimed at people with hearing loss. This type of subtitling includes, apart from dialogues, music, descriptions of sounds or clarifications on who or what produces a certain sound, i.e. they reflect in writing the soundtrack of the product.

Although many times the terms “intralinguistic subtitling” and “SDH” are used interchangeably, they are not the same. It is true that SDH is often in the same language as the audiovisual product, but this is not always the case, as there is also interlinguistic SDH. When using the words inter or intralinguistic, we are referring to subtitles in relation to the original language of the film, and not the audience for which they are intended. In this dissertation, the term “intralinguistic subtitling” is used for subtitles in the same language as the audiovisual product without any of the special features that the subtitling for the deaf has and which will be presented in the next section.

Even though we mentioned that this difference lies in the audience that will use the subtitles, it is important to clarify that the addressees of SDH do not constitute a homogenous group. When we talk about deaf and hard of hearing, there are many features that shape each individual and may affect how each person receives the subtitles. As Neves (2008) points out, “depending on the onset, the type and the degree of deafness, people with hearing impairment will relate to sound in different ways and will therefore relate to subtitling in accordance with those very same characteristics.”

In this study, variables such as age, education level, presence of deaf parents, degree and onset of deafness, use of hearing aids, among others, were considered due to their potential to influence the reception of subtitles.

1.2.1. Characteristics and conventions

As mentioned before, there are several parameters that make SDH a distinct form of subtitling. Díaz-Cintas (2010) defines subtitling for the deaf as a written text that shows: what is said, which includes dialogues and lyrics; who says it; how it is said, i.e. suprasegmental features; what can be heard, which consists of sound effects, ambiance noise and instrumental music; and what can be seen, which may be letters, signs, captions, etc. in other languages.
Besides these features, there are other parameters that need to be respected to produce quality subtitles. Just as interlingual subtitling for hearers, the subtitler for the deaf and hard of hearing must take into consideration all the technical and linguistic features that come hand in hand with subtitling. These include length of the subtitles, number of rows, position, colour, size and font of the text, duration of the subtitles, synchrony with the image, style of the dialogues, syntax, inter alia.

With all of these features and possible combinations, it is logical to seek norms that will help regulate subtitles for the deaf. As Neves (2008:134) points out, this “technical standardisation is highly regulated by international agreements and ISO standards which determine parameters that are to be rigorously met.” In Spain, for instance, the standard UNE 153010:2012 Subtitling for deaf and hard of hearing people which was published in 2012, is aimed at establishing quality criteria for SDH and regularise this practice.

Nonetheless, the presence of national standards does not mean that every subtitling company or broadcaster will follow them. Usually, there are guidelines, norms or codes of good practices that vary even from client to client based on their own traditions and studies. For example, while one client may prefer to identify the characters with colours, another client may ask to do it through name tags and a third, through the positioning of the subtitles. This means that there is no absolute rule or standard to follow since the addressees of SDH are diverse.

It is important to clarify that not having a definite set of rules does not imply that the existing guidelines are irrelevant; on the contrary, they can be used as quality assurance tools for the subtitles we create. However, as Neves (2008:134) points out, these guidelines only work if “they are based on serious empirical research involving all the stakeholders in their making: suppliers, professionals and receivers (the d/Deaf and the hard of hearing, in this case).”

1.2.2. SDH in Latin America

SDH did not reach Latin America until 1999 according to the page Ecured (n.d), when Caption Media s.r.l. was created as the first Closed Caption company for Latin America and Argentina. The following year, Argentina broadcasted their first program with Closed Captions. In 2008, according to the Global Survey Report WFD (2008) Argentina subtitled two daily newscasts and a current affairs program from Monday to Friday.

In said report, the countries that offered subtitling for the deaf besides Argentina, are Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Peru. Colombia, in recent years has become an important figure in the subtitling environment, producing subtitles for the deaf and the hard of hearing for local consumption and for international clients (INSOR, 2010).

1.2.3. SDH in Ecuador

Unlike some of the countries in South America, Ecuador does not count with SDH in national television. Only during the past year has intralingual subtitling been incorporated in short national broadcasts as open subtitles, but these lack all the sound cues that are characteristic of SDH.
Currently, Sign Language is used in newscasts in order to comply with the Organic Law on Communication (Asamblea Nacional, 2013) as one of the measures to take for the inclusion of the deaf and the hard of hearing, but none of the broadcasters have implemented subtitles, open or otherwise.

In an investigation conducted on accessibility means for the deaf and the hard of hearing in digital television in Ecuador, Tapia (2013) interviewed the person in charge of the technical department of several Ecuadorian channels to inquiry about their plans on making television more accessible. She pointed out that most of the channels were testing out their digital signal at the time, and that after that trial period they would have determined the future of SDH.

One channel expressed their interest in this accessibility mode and asked for some subtitling guidelines to standardize the practice and make it easier to implement. Some of the channels expressed that they would try out teletext during this trial period, but this has yet to be seen in national television, probably because this technology is being left behind in favour of new technologies.

One of the reasons for the delay in the adoption of SDH is that it was never a priority in the country, so the necessary technology was never acquired. Furthermore, because until this decade it was not an obligation for broadcasters and media providers to implement accessibility measures, they did not invest in researching this technology.

This is also reflected in the film industry in Ecuador. None of the locally produced films have Spanish SDH, and if they have subtitles they are usually in other languages like Kichwa and English. Additionally, none of the movie theatres have programmed screenings of movies with SDH.

Nevertheless, there have been spaces to raise awareness of this situation and to promote the implementation of SDH. In 2012, the first Deaf Film Festival (Festival Cine Sordo) took place in Quito and Guayaquil (Montenegro, 2012). A number of international films related to deafness were shown, all with SDH, and post-film discussions were organized. Similarly, short courses on SDH, non-verbal communication and deaf filmmaking were offered to students of relevant careers and the general public. Talks about deaf culture, sign language and deafness-related issues were also organized.

Another attempt at raising awareness of inclusion measures in cinema was the screening of the Ecuadorian movie “Saudade” with SDH in October 2015 (SR radio, 2015). In the wake of this initiative, January 2016 was the “month of inclusion” in FlacsoCine. Throughout the month they scheduled screening of movies about disabilities. Here they included the movie Saudade with SDH, as well as the Venezuelan movie “El laberinto de lo posible” with SDH and audiodescription (AD) for the blind (CNcine, 2015).
Chapter 2  Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explain how the methodology of the study was handled. First, a delimitation of the research design, together with the manner in which the participants were chosen will be determined. Then, a brief summary of the questionnaire, including an explanation of the questions and the reasons behind their elaboration will be presented. Finally, a basic overview of the selected excerpt of the movie and the reasons behind this choice will be given. This, along with a description of the subtitles and their technical characteristics will sum up the academic rationale behind the selection of this methodology.

2.1. Research design

This study is synchronic, since it measures the views of deaf people from Quito, Ecuador, in August, 2016. It is developed around the current context of SDH in the country. Likewise, it is mainly a descriptive study, aimed to determine the current needs and perceptions of the deaf community in Quito regarding SDH.

This research is designed to gather quantitative data through a survey, which will help establish the level of knowledge the deaf and the hard of hearing have of SDH. This is an important aspect because SDH, as an accessibility mode, is not widespread in the country and can be used only through certain means such as DVDs or online videos, which are not available in Spanish or are known to everyone.

Determining how familiarized the deaf and the hard of hearing are with SDH, will help understand their views on the subtitles shown in this study.

2.2. Sample selection

For this survey, it was necessary to select a group of people who will be able to represent a diverse group of deaf people in Ecuador so as to be able to better determine their needs. At first, it was planned to use a sample of 100 deaf or hard of hearing people; however, it was reduced by half. The reason was time and resource constraints, and the fact that the survey was to be conducted in the month of August, which is a time when universities are not teaching courses and people choose to travel for vacation.

The selection criteria for the participants was as follows:

- To have knowledge of written Spanish,
- To be over 18 years old, and
- To have some degree of hearing loss.

All the participants resided in Quito and were of legal age at the moment of the survey.

The participants were approached by phone and e-mail with the help of the foundation Vivir la Sordera. This foundation provided the information on people related to them through the foundation itself, friends or family and students of theirs. On the phone, the participants were briefly informed of the
project and the aims of this study, giving them the opportunity to agree or refuse to partake. Before answering the questionnaire a more detailed explanation of this project and their involvement was given. All of the participants signed an informed consent form (APPENDIX 2), and answered the questionnaire voluntarily. However, because of linguistic preferences among participants and to create a better communicative environment, an Ecuadorian Sign Language interpreter was hired to help with any clarification or answer their queries regarding the questionnaire.

2.3. Data collection

To gather the information for this study, a short questionnaire was created for the deaf and hard of hearing participants. In order to adapt to each of the participants schedules, three screenings were programmed where they would see the clip and answer the questionnaire. These screenings had a total attendance of 31 participants in groups of 8, 10 and 13 people. For the remaining 17 participants, I visited their homes (14 participants) or sent the questionnaire and the video via e-mail (3 participants). The survey was not created and distributed online because it might have excluded a big part of the deaf population who are not users of the internet, forums or similar technology and this survey was aimed to be answered by people of different ages, lifestyles and backgrounds. This survey was conducted throughout August, 2016. The data was processed and managed in Microsoft Excel 2013.

The questionnaire was devised to mainly measure the deaf and hard of hearing people’s reception of the subtitles found in the clip presented. For this purpose, a total of twenty-two close-ended questions were drafted, and they were divided into three sections: Section A: personal data; Section B: SDH and audiovisual consumer habits; and Section C: perception on the subtitles found in the movie “Carancho.” The first part of this questionnaire was based on a similar survey conducted by Morettini (2012) for Italian SDH due to its similar purpose. Although below is a brief explanation of how each part of the survey was composed, each of the questions will be reviewed in detail chapter 3.

Section A covered personal and background information of the participants. The purpose was to determine their characteristics and how their individual context may influence their perception of the subtitles presented. Questions in this section were aimed to collect information regarding their deafness and knowledge of written Spanish. This section included multiple choice and dichotomous questions.

Section B mainly included contingency questions, i.e. questions whose answers depended on responding affirmatively to question 11. Although most of the questions in this section were multiple choice admitting only one answer, question 12 admitted multiple answers. This part of the questionnaire sought to determine if the participants were familiarized with SDH and, if so, to what degree. Establishing this factor will help understand why some of the participants may be more critical of the subtitles than others.

Section C was entirely dedicated to the rating of the subtitles. It consisted of eight matrix questions in a Likert scale, which asked the participants to rate their degree of satisfaction regarding different aspects
of the subtitles. Questions 19, 20 and 21 offered an example to illustrate the parameter to evaluate. This section was first read and explained to the participants before they were showed the clip, so that they were aware of what to focus on.

The questionnaire was drafted in Spanish and was presented to a group of three deaf people at first, to test the clarity and appropriateness of the survey. The complete questionnaire in Spanish and its translation can be found as APPENDIX 3.

2.4. Film/subtitle selection

The choice of the film and the subtitles was a difficult one. For this project, I wanted to work with subtitles made in Ecuador and analyse their quality and conventions used, however, none of the national productions had Spanish SDH.

Furthermore, when I decided to look for a Latin American production with Spanish SDH, the search was just as difficult and nearly as unsuccessful as the first one. Due to the fact that in Quito piracy is very popular, and is the easiest way of acquiring audiovisual material, there is only a handful of stores that sell original content. I considered buying a film online from an international retailer like Amazon, but decided against it as having it shipped from abroad could take from 2 to 5 weeks. For this reason, the process of selecting the film and the subtitles took longer than expected.

I wanted to focus on subtitles tailored for the Latin American region, since our reality is different from the one in Europe or in North America. As stated before, only a fraction of deaf children go to school and have the opportunity to learn Spanish. Moreover, written Spanish is oftentimes taught to deaf children in the same way it would be taught to hearing children, without considering this is on many occasions their second language, so it may be harder to understand the syntax behind the language. This might mean that the reading speed or the syntax used will be different from the guidelines found in other countries.

For this project, I was looking for a Colombian, Peruvian or Argentinian movie, since they are the countries that are the most advanced in SDH in the region according to the Global Survey Report WFD Regional Secretariat for South America (WFD and SNAD, 2008). In the end, I found the Argentinian movie “Carancho” (Pablo Trapero, 2010) with Spanish SDH.

2.4.1. Carancho

The Argentinian movie directed by Pablo Trapero and released in 2010 focuses on two main characters: Sosa, a lawyer who lost his license and now looks for clients to represent and take advantage of their insurance company; and Lujan, a doctor who has to drug herself to be able to endure her long working hours. Their paths cross in the midst of a traffic accident, when she was trying to save the life of the man he wanted to make his client.
For this study, I selected an 8 minute scene from minutes 2:29 to 10:26 of the film. This excerpt was specifically chosen for several reasons. First, it portrayed the introduction of the main characters, which helped the audience follow the scene more easily. Second, the scene included a variety of diegetic and non-diegetic sounds that can be appreciated in figures 2.1 and 2.2. Also, different sources of voice and speakers off camera were present in the clip as can be seen in figures 2.3 and 2.4. Lastly, this extract of the movie incorporated fast and slow-paced dialogues. All of these features were to be taken into account for the rating of the subtitles in section C of the questionnaire. This subtitled clip was presented to the participants upon explanation of said section.

![Figure 2.1 Example of diegetic sound](image1)

![Figure 2.2 Example of non-diegetic sound](image2)
2.4.2. Characteristics of the subtitles found in the DVD “Carancho”

The Spanish SDH was included in the DVD under the screen “configuración” or “settings” as shown in Figure 2.5. In order to analyse the subtitles, they were ripped from the DVD with the use of the free software SubExtractor version 1.0.3.1 and saved as a SubRip text file (.srt). The subtitles corresponding to the chosen clip can be found in APPENDIX 5.
The clip included 124 subtitles, but neither the subtitler nor the subtitling company were credited anywhere in the film. The subtitles were analysed with the free software Subtitle Edit version 3.4.1.

Table 2.1 shows the characteristics of the subtitles found in the DVD versus the “standard” subtitling parameters\(^3\) for DVD explained by Díaz-Cintas (2007). On the other hand, Table 2.2 shows the SDH features, which were used in the DVD. The frame rate for the video and the subtitles was 25 fps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Subtitles in Carancho</th>
<th>Standard subtitling practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum reading speed(^4)</td>
<td>23 cps</td>
<td>17 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration of subtitles</td>
<td>1 second (2 exceptions)</td>
<td>1 second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum duration of subtitles</td>
<td>4:24 seconds</td>
<td>6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum gap between subtitles</td>
<td>1 frame</td>
<td>2 frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum row length</td>
<td>39 characters per line</td>
<td>39 characters per line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.1** Characteristics of the subtitles in the DVD vs standard practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Subtitles in Carancho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound effects</td>
<td>In capital letters enclosed by square brackets ([ ]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>The word <em>música</em> or “music” in capital letters enclosed by square brackets ([ ]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic features</td>
<td>In capital letters enclosed by square brackets ([ ]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>Source of the off-screen voice in capital letters followed by a semi colon (:). When the voice comes from sources like a radio, the text is slanted or in italics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dashes</td>
<td>Dashes in both lines when two different speakers are represented in the same subtitle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>Bottom-center of the screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>White for all the subtitles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.2** SDH features included in the DVD

---

\(^3\) The word “standard” in this context refers to the guidelines provided by Díaz-Cintas (2007); however, it is important to mention that there is no real standard in subtitling as these parameters may vary from country to country or even from one subtitling company to another. The use of these guidelines are for reference only.

\(^4\) Although the guidelines proposed by Díaz-Cintas (2007) measure the reading speed in words per minute (wpm), Subtitle Edit used characters per second (cps). For this reason, the equivalence table presented in Díaz-Cintas (2007) was used to set a standard in cps, with 180 wpm as equivalent to 17 cps. Nevertheless, Martí Ferriol (2012) states that, “different subtitling programs calculate different reading speed values (both in cps and wpm) for the same set of subtitles.” This is why 17 cps in WinCaps may not be equivalent to 17 cps in Subtitle Edit and why these numbers are used only as a general reference.
Regarding the reading speed, most of the subtitles were below 18 cps. However, the reading speed of fourteen subtitles ranged between 19 and 23 cps, which could be considered too fast, especially for SDH, considering that Spanish is sometimes learned as a second language by the deaf.

Additionally, as shown in Table 2.1, the minimum gap of two frames between subtitles is not present in the subtitles in the DVD. Although most of the subtitles left more than two frames between subtitles, there were seven instances where only one frame was left between the subtitles and twenty instances where three frames were left between the subtitles. This leads to think that the subtitler did the spotting without considering this parameter or was even unaware of it.

Regarding the orthotypography of the subtitles, it will be explained and analysed in full detail in the next chapter. These conventions will follow the ones explained by Díaz-Cintas (2003:157-192; 2007:102-142).
Chapter 3 Analysis and discussion

This chapter presents an analysis of the subtitles from the movie “Carancho” from a technical and linguistic point of view, and a full overview of the results of the survey. I will explain the answers given by the deaf and the hard of hearing and associate them with the issues posed in the Introduction. The results of the survey will be presented in three sections that correspond to the ones in the survey. For this purpose, the answers will be presented in a series of figures that will help illustrate the results. Additionally, the correlations between the answers to two or more questions will be illustrated in figures to allow for a better understanding of the results. A complete table with the answers to each of the questions can be found in APPENDIX 4.

3.1. Analysis of the subtitles

This section will describe the technical and orthotypographic features of the subtitles, with the purpose of determining their quality from a professional point of view. Subsequently, this analysis will be used for comparison with the perception of quality gathered from the users’ point of view (i.e. from the deaf and the hard of hearing participants).

3.1.1. Technical assessment

First, as stated in the previous chapter, the reading speed set for the subtitles remains constantly below 18cps for the most part, but the high speed of some of the subtitles may cause the viewer to miss important information in the film. Since only a few of the subtitles are faster than what is considered suitable for subtitling, this change in speed could be credited to an impossibility to reduce the information presented in the subtitle and not with an unfamiliarity with reading speed standards.

Nevertheless, if we look at the minimum duration of the subtitles on screen, all of the subtitles respect the one-second (25 frames) rule except for two, which remain on-screen for 24 and 23 frames. Although it is true that some companies might set this even at 21 frames (Díaz-Cintas, 2007); in this case, given that these are the only two instances in a set of 124 subtitles, it points to a lack of attention in the spotting, or lack of revision of the finished product.

On the other hand, there seems to be no set standard for the minimum gap between subtitles. Díaz-Cintas (2007:92) explains that “a slight, clear pause has to exist between two consecutive subtitles if the viewer is to register that a change of reading material has taken place on screen.” He suggests to include a pause of two or three frames; however, in this case, gaps of 1 to 3 frames could be seen between consecutive subtitles. This does not indicate a clear pattern, which is why I believe this parameter was not taken into consideration when cueing.

Regarding the maximum number of lines and characters per line, as shown in Table 2.1, both respected the standard practice in all cases.
Considering the specific characteristics of SDH, the Argentinean style is similar to the British one, with some minor exceptions. Most of the labels intended for the use of the deaf and the hard of hearing are represented in capital letters, between square brackets as shown in Figure 3.1. However, some of these labels are sometimes unnecessary, as the sound is clear through the images shown. An example of this can be seen again in Figure 3.1, where the label translated reads “[SIREN OF AMBULANCE],” when the image in the screen shows clearly an ambulance with its lights on answering an emergency call.

One important feature in this film is the music it incorporates to set the tone and mood of the situations. Regretfully, the labels for the music in the film do not include any relevant or helpful information, like the artist of the song, the mood it conveys, the genre or even if it is instrumental or not. The music in this film is limited to be referred to when it starts playing (with the label “[MUSIC]”) and when it ends (with the label “[MUSIC ENDS]”) as shown in Figure 3.2. This type of label is too general and thus, not only does it not add to the enjoyment of the film, but it is also denying equal opportunities to the deaf and hard of hearing by giving them incomplete information.
Paralinguistic features are marked like the previous labels, as shown in Figure 3.3. Unfortunately, there were no instances in the clip where paralinguistic features were shown, so it was not possible to determine if this is how they are represented every time.

![Figure 3.3 Label for paralinguistic features](image)

It is also clear from Figure 3.3 that the colour of all the subtitles is white with black border and that their position is bottom-centred. This means that the characters are not identified through either colour or position of the subtitles.

To identify the characters when they are off-screen or it is not clear who is talking, labels are used. Nevertheless, these labels differ from the previous ones. To identify a character, the name or identification is written in capital letters immediately followed by a semi colon (;). This kind of label is used for any source of voice and is placed before the dialogue as shown in Figure 3.4.

![Figure 3.4 Character label](image)

Figure 3.4 also shows one of the uses of italics in this clip, which is to write the dialogue of an off-screen character. A second use can be seen in Figure 3.5, where it is used for voices that come from a machine.
Finally, dashes are used when the dialogue of two people is represented in the same subtitle. The dash is used in both lines, contradicting the suggestions by Díaz-Cintas (2003), and it is written right before the word with no spaces between the two characters. An example of this can also be found in Figure 3.4.

3.1.2. Linguistic assessment

To evaluate the linguistic features involved when writing subtitles, it is important to understand that they are not to be treated as a regular text. Each subtitle is to be considered an individual unit, since the dialogue is fragmented and the viewer has virtually no access to the previous or following subtitle (Díaz-Cintas, 2007). Due to this inherent characteristic of subtitles, they cannot be analysed solely by traditional grammatical rules, but other aspects need to be considered as well, such as the genre of the text, the circumstances surrounding that subtitle, the audience, etc.

Regarding punctuation, a few irregularities are present in these subtitles when dealing with vocatives. As it is clear from the examples shown in Table 3.1, it seems that the subtitler was not aware of the punctuation rules concerning vocatives, and therefore punctuated the dialogues according to pauses in the speech. It could be argued that the reason to ignore some commas before and/or after a vocative, was to not overload a subtitle and making it hard to read, as it would be the case in subtitle 16. Nonetheless, this justification cannot be applied to subtitles 5 or 25. We do see in subtitles 87 and 104 that it has correct punctuation; however, the lack of consistency in punctuation shows that the subtitler was not sure or aware of this grammatical rule.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PICO; Vamos Luján.</td>
<td>PICO; Let’s go Lujan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RADIO; Atento Sosa, atento Sosa.</td>
<td>RADIO; Heads-up Sosa, heads-up Sosa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bajá la tabla. Pico.</td>
<td>Unload the stretcher Pico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Gustavo, ¿estás bien?</td>
<td>Gustavo, are you ok?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.1 Inconsistent punctuation with vocatives**

On the other hand, there were no problems regarding punctuation marks like full stops (.) and question marks (?). Ellipsis were used to show doubts, as can be seen in Table 3.2, subtitle 31, and ideas that continue on the next subtitle, but only if there is a pause in the speech (as is subtitles 113 and 114). In his case, ellipsis is only used at the end of the subtitle and not at the beginning of the following subtitle. If no pause exists in the utterance, no punctuation is used, and the next subtitle starts with lower case, as shown in subtitles 123 and 124.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>¿Sabes cómo se llama?</td>
<td>Do you know his name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Eh... Creo que Gustavo.</td>
<td>Uh... I think it’s Gustavo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Primero te da dos gambas</td>
<td>First he gives you two hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>por el dato...</td>
<td>for the info…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>y si el caso es bueno, después te da 300 más.</td>
<td>and if the case is good,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>he’ll later give you 300 more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>¿Qué es lo mejor que les puede pasar?</td>
<td>What’s the best thing that can happen to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Que caiga un carancho</td>
<td>That a vulture comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>con ganas de romperle bien el ojete a las aseguradoras.</td>
<td>eager to stick it up the asses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of insurance companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2 Use of ellipsis points**

Concerning the orthography of the subtitles, there are no mistakes except for one, where the accent or tilde is missing from the word. Subtitle 25 is written “¿Qué paso?” with the intended meaning of “What happened?” The mistake is in the second word: pasó, where the accent is missing from the letter “o.” This changes the meaning of the word completely as the unaccented word could mean “a step”, first person of the verb “to walk by” in the present tense, “pace”, etc., when the intent is to use the third person of the verb to happen in past tense. Because of the context of the phrase, the correct meaning could be deduced, but this orthographical mistake is unacceptable, as subtitles must have impeccable orthography before presenting them to the public.

In this particular clip, the use of accents is especially important, as they are often used to mark the dialect of the characters. In Rioplatense Spanish, it is very common the voséo, which is the use of “vos” instead of the pronoun “tú.” The use of this pronoun also changes the conjugation (and the accent) of
the verbs. In the present tense of this dialect, usually the last syllable is accented, and it can be represented with the graphic accent as can be seen in subtitle 39 in Table 3.3. In imperative, the word is formed from the conjugation of the verb for the second person plural, without the final –d. An example is shown in subtitle 43. In this case, the word “dejale” has lost the accent that would appear on the first “e” in neutral Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-No. ¿Cuántos años tenés, Gustavo?</td>
<td>-No. How old are you, Gustavo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>¿Me ayudás con la tabla? Dejale la cabeza acá. Ponete al lado mío.</td>
<td>Can you help me with the stretcher? Leave his head here. Come next to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.3** Rioplatense Spanish in subtitling

Despite this use of the accents, some of the subtitles do not follow this pattern. Table 3.4 shows two occasions where the word is conjugated as it would be in neutral Spanish, even though it is not conjugated that way by the character. This could be a deliberate decision, to try not to burden the receiver with too many dialectical cues. Nevertheless, this is present only in a handful of subtitles and at random times, which might mean that it was inattention from the subtitler. In my opinion, the inconsistent use of these dialectic marks make the subtitles lose coherence and call unnecessary attention to the subtitles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>¿Sabes si estaba borracho?</td>
<td>Do you know if he was drunk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gustavo, ¿me escuchas?</td>
<td>Gustavo, can you hear me?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.4** Incoherent use of dialect

Another technique to depict the dialect is the syntax and lexis used. Table 3.5 shows how it was done in subtitles 109 and 116. The structure of subtitle 109, even though it is a verbatim transcription of the original, might be a little confusing if someone is not familiarised with that way of talking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Y, bastante es como 8, 10 años.</td>
<td>So, a long time is like 8, 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Los garcan un poco, ¿viste? Pero cobran.</td>
<td>They nobble them a bit, you know? But they get money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.5** Rioplatense syntax.

Finally, an aspect that depends on linguistic and technical properties is the line breaks in subtitles. In this extract, most of the subtitles followed a logical separation of a sentence. It was clear that the line breaks were not random and were actually well thought of, as can be seen in subtitles 66 and 69 in Table

---

5 The use of the term “neutral Spanish” in this context, refers to the Spanish often used for translations or dubbing material intended to be used by Hispanic America. It is important to emphasize that in reality, there is no such thing as a “neutral” or “standard” Spanish because of the plethora of dialects that exist all over the world.
3.6. Likewise, there were two cases, subtitles 43 and 121, where the line breaks were slightly awkward, but this can be attributed to lack of space to fit in the whole information in the same line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sí lo conocés al tipo que nos ayudó recién.</td>
<td>If you know the guy that helped us just now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sí, todo bien. Nos acompaña hasta el policlínico.</td>
<td>Yes, that’s fine. He’ll come with us to the polyclinic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>¿Me ayudás con la tabla? Dejale la cabeza acá. Ponete al lado mío.</td>
<td>Can you help me with the stretcher? Leave his head here. Come next to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Imaginate un tipo de éstos. Tirado abajo de un bondi a las 4 de la mañana</td>
<td>Imagine one of these guys. Lying under a bus at 4 in the morning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Line breaks

3.1.3. Conclusions

To begin with, the person or company responsible for subtitling this film is not credited anywhere in the DVD, thus, making it hard to determine if the subtitles were professionally made. The fact that we do not know who was responsible for the subtitles, makes it impossible to determine if they used a style guide or not, and which one.

In some aspects it was clear that the subtitler knew what they were doing and had possibly used some style guide or had some professional knowledge of the practice. Nonetheless, certain practices and inconsistencies suggest that there were no clear standards applied, they were created semi-professionally or that the subtitler did not have sufficient time to verify the quality of the subtitles.

Overall, these subtitles respected most of the techniques and specifications used in SDH practices. They were definitely created with the users in mind, so they fulfill their purpose. However, they are not perfect and they need to be improved. They could be considered an adequate product for the deaf if the problems mentioned above are solved.

3.2. Analysis of surveys

For this study, 48 deaf and hard of hearing people from the city of Quito were surveyed. They answered 22 questions related to their hearing loss, knowledge of SDH and their opinions on the subtitling of the film Carancho. This questionnaire was designed to determine the perception that the deaf and the hard of hearing have of SDH by:

- Describing the deaf viewers’ characteristics and needs,
- Assessing their knowledge of SDH,
- Recording their opinion regarding the Argentinian style of subtitling for the deaf, and
- Establishing their preferences for this subtitling mode.
The first section covers personal and background information about the deaf. This helps determine the characteristics of deaf people in Quito. In the next section, these answers will be correlated to the users of SDH, in order to establish the characteristics and needs of the audience that will receive the subtitles.

3.2.1. About the participants

The questionnaire was answered by 25 male and 23 female participants. Out of the people surveyed, half were aged between 18 and 35 years old, which constitutes a rather young group. People over 66 years old were the less numerous, represented by only 6 participants.

![Figure 3.6 Age of the participants](image)

Regarding education, Figure 3.7 shows that all of the participants had received formal education; however, only two had managed to pursue postgraduate studies. This shows the difficulties the deaf face regarding full inclusion in the country. This figure also shows that 44% of the people interviewed have attended university, but this might not be a true indicator of the reality of the deaf, since part of the interviewed were recruited through a university’s list of people with hearing loss. Moreover, if we look at Figure 3.8, we can see that the level of education is highly dependent on age: more young people have undergraduate studies than older people.

On the other hand, more than two thirds of the interviewed have not attended schools for the deaf. This is consistent with the statistics by CONADIS previously discussed, about the schooling of deaf children. This answer can also be related to question 5 concerning deaf parents. The answers reflect how the majority of deaf children are born to hearing parents (63%). The lack of knowledge, misconceptions and prejudices towards deafness by hearing parents, might push them to send their children to regular schools.
The data gathered in this study also shows that the majority of the participants (81%) had a CONADIS card, which means they are fully aware of their deafness and decided to register in the Council.

![Figure 3.7 Participants’ education level](image)

**Figure 3.7** Participants’ education level

The data regarding hearing loss can be summarised in Figure 3.9. We can see that most of those surveyed knew their degree of hearing loss, and the majority suffered from moderate to severe hearing loss. If we compare these answers to the ones for question 10, we can see in Figure 3.10 that people with mild-to-moderate hearing loss, used hearing aids, while the majority of the people with severe hearing loss had had a cochlear implant surgery. None of the people surveyed used FM systems.

![Figure 3.8 Education level of the participants by age](image)

**Figure 3.8** Education level of the participants by age
Finally, Questions 8 and 9 can be analysed together, since the age of onset of deafness directly affects a person’s acquisition of oral language. For children who have lost their hearing before the age of three (or before learning to talk), the term pre-lingual is used. If a child loses their hearing after learning spoken language, we talk about post-lingual deafness. Figure 3.11 shows the correlation between onset of hearing loss and the preferred communication method of the deaf person.
If we take the participants that belong to the three leftmost ages and add them up, we have that 16 of the surveyed people had pre-lingual hearing loss. Everyone in that group, communicated with LSEc, either alone, or with written or oral Spanish. Using data from question 7, we can see that eleven of the pre-lingual deaf, have severe-to-profound deafness.

Additionally, if we add up the ones that lost their hearing between the ages of 3 and 19, we find that 17 lost their hearing throughout their school years. The majority of them, have opted for an oral communication method. From these people, 8 suffer from severe-to-profound deafness.

Similarly, adding the number of surveyed who lost their hearing between the ages of 20 and 65, results in a total of ten people. This group also favours oral communication and most of them (8) suffer from mild-to-moderate hearing loss.

Finally, five people reported having lost their hearing after they were 66 years old. Regarding their communication method, most selected “other” and consistently wrote that they communicated with oral language and lip-reading. Three people from this group, did not know their level of deafness.

3.2.2. Knowledge of SDH

The answers to question 11 show that the knowledge of SDH was divided nearly in equal parts. Twenty-six participants declared knowing about SDH before taking this survey, while 22 did not know or were not sure. This number is high for a country that does not use it in any setting. This answer may be explained if we consider that people might use SDH in another language, they might be confusing it with intelingual subtitling or that the rise of streaming sites like Netflix, allow them to be exposed to more and more varied audiovisual content.
If we compare this information with the answers obtained from question 10, we can see that out of the 16 people who do not use hearing aids, only 6 knew about SDH; of the 18 people that used hearing aids, half had heard about SDH before, and from the 14 people with cochlear implants, eleven knew about SDH. This number might point to the group that needs SDH the most and because of that they actively look for this kind of subtitling.

Figure 3.12 shows the answers to question 12 of the participants familiar with SDH. We can see clearly that the three places where they find SDH more often is in DVDs, Internet and paid television. As stated before, piracy in the country is extremely widespread, so acquiring DVDs of any movie or show is not a hard task. Since the content is not original and it is often downloaded from the Internet, they might come with fansubs made for them.

![MEDIA USED WITH SDH](image)

**Figure 3.12** Media used with SDH

It is interesting to see that some respondents selected cinema, even though there are no screenings in the country’s movie theatres. This might suggest that some of the surveyed confused SDH with traditional subtitling.

Another interesting figure, is the one of national television. No participant selected this option since it does not exist in the country yet. Moreover, as all of the foreign programs that are broadcasted on national television, must be dubbed, not even interlingual subtitles are seen on national channels.

The next two questions can be analysed together. Figure 3.13 illustrates the frequency and timespan in which they have been using this accessibility solution.
Figure 3.13 Frequency and timespan of use of SDH

Of the 26 people who know about SDH, 15 people have been using it for more than 7 years. They mostly use it between 2 or 3 times per week, or even more often. There are, however, two exceptions; those who use it between 2 and 3 times a month.

Furthermore, out of these 26 people, eleven have been using SDH between 1 and 6 years, and they mostly use it 2 to 3 times per month or less often. There are also two exceptions, who use it more than 2 to 3 times per week. We can see that those who are more familiarized with this technology, are more likely to use it with more frequency.

3.2.3. Rating the subtitles

The answers given by the participants have been gathered in Figure 3.14. They have also been separated between the responses given by those who were familiar with SDH and those who were not. The averages of these answers can be seen in Table 3.7.

Figure 3.14 Assessment of subtitles
Figure 3.14 shows the rating for each of the parameters to evaluate. They are represented by how many people chose a specific value in the Likert scale. From that figure we can notice that there is a general tendency to evaluate positively all the subtitles. Most of the answers lean towards the satisfied side of the scale, with one exception: description of music. This parameter is the lowest rated of the group.

As we mentioned earlier, the labels used for music were too general, and not informative enough. These answers reflect that the deaf and hard of hearing need more information regarding the sounds that are described.

On the other hand we have the parameter of position, which has the highest rating of all. This indicates that the deaf and the hard of hearing are probably accustomed to seeing traditional subtitles in that place, so they associate this positioning with “standard” or “good” subtitling practice.

Another feature that stands out as good is the clarity of the language used. In spite of the different dialect (which included a distinctive vocabulary, expressions, orthography and syntax), the viewers found them easy to understand and follow.

The feature of “character ID,” however, received mixed reviews. It seems like they had no strong opinion against it, but they did not find it likeable enough.

Table 3.7 gives us more insight on who rated the subtitles a certain way. It is interesting to see that the people who were not familiar with SDH were more critical of the subtitling practices. The consistently assigned lower scores than their deaf and hard of hearing peer who have used SDH before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with SDH</th>
<th>Time on screen</th>
<th>Synchrony</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Character ID</th>
<th>Clarity of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,31</td>
<td>4,32</td>
<td>4,04</td>
<td>4,62</td>
<td>4,31</td>
<td>3,58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with SDH</td>
<td>3,91</td>
<td>3,82</td>
<td>3,82</td>
<td>4,05</td>
<td>3,45</td>
<td>3,05</td>
<td>3,27</td>
<td>3,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Answers</td>
<td>4,13</td>
<td>4,09</td>
<td>3,94</td>
<td>4,35</td>
<td>3,92</td>
<td>3,33</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>3,94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 Average by parameter of the evaluation of the subtitles

By looking at the average of all the answers by parameter, we are able to establish their level of satisfaction with the subtitles. It is clear that the viewers thought that the cueing of the subtitles was adequate, since the scores for time on screen and synchrony are high. If we take all the results in this section to get an average marking for the subtitles, where 5 is “very satisfied” and 1 is “very dissatisfied”, the subtitles were rated with a “3.92.”
3.2.4. Conclusions

Since the deaf and the hard of hearing are not a homogenous group, their opinions regarding SDH are bound to be varied. Each person will need subtitles that can take into consideration their specific background and knowledge, so that they can get the most out of the subtitling.

It is important to remember that the more exposed a deaf person is to this type of subtitling, the easier it will become to understand and accept the conventions used, and the more comfortable they will feel with a product.

People who had not experienced SDH before, did not know what to expect and had no standard to compare it to, so it is possible that they expected much more of this clip.

It is clear that the specifications used for this subtitling were not the best, from a professional point of view. Nevertheless, the score provided by the participants, who are in fact the target audience for this mode of subtitling, shows that they were good enough in their eyes.
Conclusions and further research

Deaf people have been overlooked for a long time. It has been only in recent years that they have gained visibility in Ecuador, and we must take advantage of that momentum. Although laws have been drafted to safeguard their rights, they are not respected, and their interests are not being taken into consideration.

The diversity of the deaf and hard of hearing audience poses a challenge to any subtitler, but knowing their characteristics, background, needs, limitations and strengths, the subtitler will be able to create a product tailored specifically to cover the necessities of the deaf and the hard of hearing. Section A of the questionnaire was devised to understand the recipients of the end product. By getting to know how they receive information, we are defining the setting to be used when subtitling.

It is important to create a set of rules that will help subtitlers stay focused on good practices. Nevertheless, these practices have to be defined together with the deaf audiences so that they are indeed useful for the deaf. A set of rules or guidelines for subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing will constitute a quality standard in the field, one that can be copied, replicated and disseminated.

The conventions and characteristics reviewed in this study were the most notorious and basic in the field, but also the most important to define. Thanks to the participants’ review of the product and their information on audiovisual consumer habits and SDH consumer habits, it will now be easier to set baselines for future implementation of subtitles. By researching their current habits and opinions, we are establishing a standard based on their needs and preferences.

Nevertheless, the features presented here are just one set of possibilities. It would be helpful if more empirical research was made on the subject. I recommend that other studies are conducted, which include different approaches and subtitling traditions, to determine which one is preferred by the users.

The mostly positive reviews of the example subtitles already show that there is a norm that could be used as a basis for the creation of future subtitles. Nonetheless, as shown by the professional assessment of the subtitles, there is still room for improvement, another aspect also reflected in the scoring of the subtitles.

Sadly, due to time and resource constraints, this study could not be conducted at a larger scale. It would be interesting to replicate this study including teenagers and kids, as well as people from other geographic regions. Additionally, the questionnaire included only close-ended questions to facilitate the counting process; however, it might be useful to include, in future studies, open ended questions where the participants are able to share their thoughts on the practice and suggest ways to improve upon the subtitles.

Even though this study was possible thanks to the participation of deaf and hard of hearing people, this is not enough to take SDH into practice. To be able to generate a truly functional and useful product, it
is necessary to have deaf and hard of hearing people actively involved during the whole process of creation and implementation of the subtitles.

SDH is a practice that will help deaf people reclaim their right to information, communication, entertainment and inclusion, but it has to be implemented with the voices of the deaf people in mind.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Laws and regulations in Spanish

CONSTITUCIÓN DE LA REPÚBLICA DEL ECUADOR

Capítulo tercero

Derechos de las personas y grupos de atención prioritaria

Art. 35.- Las personas adultas mayores, niñas, niños y adolescentes, mujeres embarazadas, personas con discapacidad, personas privadas de libertad y quienes adolezcan de enfermedades catastróficas o de alta complejidad, recibirán atención prioritaria y especializada en los ámbitos público y privado. La misma atención prioritaria recibirán las personas en situación de riesgo, las víctimas de violencia doméstica y sexual, maltrato infantil, desastres naturales o antropogénicos. El Estado prestará especial protección a las personas en condición de doble vulnerabilidad.

Sección sexta

Personas con discapacidad

Art. 47.- El Estado garantizará políticas de prevención de las discapacidades y, de manera conjunta con la sociedad y la familia, procurará la equiparación de oportunidades para las personas con discapacidad y su integración social.

11. El acceso a mecanismos, medios y formas alternativas de comunicación, entre ellos el lenguaje de señas para personas sordas, el oralismo y el sistema braille.

LEY ORGÁNICA DE DISCAPACIDADES

Parágrafo 2°

De la accesibilidad a la comunicación

Artículo 63.- Accesibilidad de la comunicación.- El Estado promocionará el uso de la lengua de señas ecuatoriana, el sistema Braille, las ayudas técnicas y tecnológicas, así como los mecanismos, medios y formatos aumentativos y alternativos de comunicación; garantizando la inclusión y participación de las personas con discapacidad en la vida en común. Artículo 64.- Comunicación audiovisual.- La autoridad nacional encargada de las telecomunicaciones dictará las normas y regulará la implementación de herramientas humanas, técnicas y tecnológicas necesarias en los medios de comunicación audiovisual.
para que las personas con discapacidad auditiva ejerzan su derecho de acceso a la información. Dentro de las normas se establecerá la obligación de incorporar a un intérprete de lenguaje de señas ecuatoriana y/o la opción de subtitulado en los contenidos de programas educativos, noticias, campañas electorales y cultura general. Además, se establecerá la obligación a los medios de comunicación audiovisual y de radio para la emisión de un programa semanal en que las personas con discapacidad puedan interactuar.

LEY ORGÁNICA DE COMUNICACIÓN

SECCIÓN II

Derechos de igualdad e interculturalidad

Art. 37.- Derecho al acceso de las personas con discapacidad. - Se promueve el derecho al acceso y ejercicio de los derechos a la comunicación de las personas con discapacidad. Para ello, los medios de comunicación social, las instituciones públicas y privadas del sistema de comunicación social y la sociedad desarrollarán progresivamente, entre otras, las siguientes medidas: traducción con subtítulos, lenguaje de señas y sistema braille. El Estado adoptará políticas públicas que permitan la investigación para mejorar el acceso preferencial de las personas con discapacidad a las tecnologías de información y comunicación.
CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO PARA PARTICIPACIÓN

Estimad@ participante:

La presente investigación es llevada a cabo por la estudiante Andrea Carolina Arellano Meza del Colegio Universitario de Londres.

**Tema de la disertación:** “Análisis de la percepción que tienen las personas sordas sobre la subtitulación para sordos e hipoacúsicos (SpS) basado en un ejemplo de la película argentina Carancho”.

**Objetivo:** Determinar la utilidad y aplicabilidad del estilo usado en la subtitulación de la película Carancho para la comunidad sorda de Quito. La opinión de los participantes podrá ayudar a definir futuras normas para la creación de subtítulos para sordos en el Ecuador.

**Procedimientos:** Se elegirá a participantes que tengan algún grado de sordera (leve-profunda) y entiendan español escrito para la resolución de una encuesta y proyección de un clip de la película.

**Beneficios:** La participación en esta encuesta permitirá al encuestado expresar su interés, opinión y necesidades con respecto a la subtitulación para sordos, además de conocer más sobre este tipo de subtitulado. De igual manera, el participante tiene derecho a recibir más información sobre cómo acceder a los subtítulos para sordos a través de diferentes medios.

La investigadora entregará a los participantes los resultados al finalizar la investigación.

**Costos:** El participante no debe incurrir en ningún costo.

**Confidencialidad:** Cada encuesta es anónima y confidencial, por lo tanto será codificada de manera que no se pueda asociar la información obtenida con el participante. De ninguna manera se identificará a los participantes en las presentaciones o publicaciones que deriven de este estudio.

**Comunicación con el investigador:** Para cualquier duda o consulta, usted puede contactarse con:

Andrea Arellano: 0999071792
Derechos del participante: El/la participante puede retirarse de la investigación en cualquier momento sin tener que dar ningún tipo de explicación y sin que ello signifique ningún perjuicio para él/ella.

Después de haber leído esto, si usted desea participar en la investigación, sírvase llenar con sus datos y firmar el FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO que encontrará a continuación.

Atentamente,

Andrea Arellano

CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO PARA PARTICIPACIÓN EN PROTOCOLOS DE INVESTIGACIÓN

Lugar y fecha:________________________

Por medio de la presente, yo ______________________________ accedo a participar en la investigación: “Percepción de los subtítulos para sordos e hipoacúsicos (SpS) por parte de la comunidad sorda de Quito”, desarrollada por la estudiante Andrea Carolina Arellano Meza para la obtención del título de Maestría en Traducción Audiovisual en el Colegio Universitario de Londres.

El objetivo es: Determinar la utilidad y aplicabilidad de los parámetros usados en la subtitulación de la película Carancho para la comunidad sorda de Quito.

Se me ha explicado que mi participación consistirá en responder a un cuestionario.

Declaro que se me ha informado sobre (ver anexo):

Objetivo del estudio, criterios de selección, características y metodología del estudio, confidencialidad y anonimato de los datos obtenidos.
La investigadora responsable se ha comprometido en brindarme información oportuna y aclarar cualquier duda que le planteé acerca de los procedimientos que se llevarán a cabo, beneficios o cualquier asunto relacionado con la investigación.

Entiendo que conservo el derecho a no participar del estudio y/o retirarme en cualquier momento en que lo considere conveniente, sin que ello me afecte en nada.

La investigadora responsable me ha dado seguridades de que no me identificará en las presentaciones o publicaciones que deriven de este estudio y de que los datos relacionados serán manejados en forma confidencial.

______________________________                           _______________________________
Nombre y firma del/la participante                           Andrea Arellano
Investigadora responsable
INFORMED CONSENT FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Dear participant,

This research is conducted by the student Andrea Carolina Arellano Meza from University College London.

Dissertation Topic: “Analysis of the perception that the Ecuadorian deaf and hard of hearing have of the subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH) through an example from the Argentinian film Carancho.

Purpose: To determine the usefulness and suitability of the subtitling style used in the film Carancho for the deaf community in Quito. The participants’ opinions will help define future guidelines for the creation of subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing in Ecuador.

Procedure: To identify participants who have some degree of hearing loss (mild-profound) and know written Spanish, for them to complete a questionnaire and watch a clip with SDH.

Benefits: The respondent will be able to express their interest, opinions and needs regarding SDH, as well as learn more about this type of subtitling. Moreover, the participant has the right to receive more information on how to access SDH through different means.

The researcher will give the participants the results of the study when the research is completed.

Costs: This will not have any cost for the participant.

Confidentiality: Each survey is anonymous and confidential; thus, it will be coded so that the information gathered cannot be associated to any participant in particular. The participants will not be identified in any of the presentations or publications derived from this study without previous consent.

Contacting the researcher: In case of any doubts or questions you can contact:
Andrea Arellano: 0999071792

Rights of the participant: The participant may leave the survey at any time without justification and it will not affect the participant in any way.

After reading this, if you wish to take part in this research, please fill in your name and signature in the INFORMED CONSENT FORM that you will find in the next page.
Sincerely,
Andrea Arellano

---

INFORMED CONSENT FOR THE PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH PROTOCOLS

Place and Date: ________________________________

I, __________________________________________________________________________, hereby agree to take part in the study: “Perception of the subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH) by the deaf community of Quito,” developed by the student Andrea Carolina Arellano Meza submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MSc in Specialised Translation (Audiovisual) of University College London.

The purpose is: to determine the usefulness and suitability of the subtitling style used in the film Carancho for the deaf community in Quito.

It has been explained to me that my participation consists of answering a questionnaire.

I confirm that I have been informed about (see attachment):

The purpose of the study, selection criteria, methodology and characteristics of the study, confidentiality and anonymity of the data gathered.

The researcher in charge has guaranteed to provide timely information and clarify any doubt that I have about the procedures taking place, benefits or any other issue related with the investigation.

I understand that I have the right to refrain from participating and/or withdraw from this study whenever I choose to, without this affecting me in any way.

The researcher in charge has assured me that I will not be identified in any presentations or publications derived from this study and that all related information will be handled with confidentiality.

_________________________________    ________________________________
Name and signature of the participant    Andrea Arellano
Researchers in charge
Appendix 3: Questionnaire

3.1 Spanish

Encuesta sobre la subtitulación para sordos e hipoacúsicos (SpS)

La subtitulación accesible o subtitulación para personas sordas e hipoacúsicas (SpS) es un tipo de subtitulado que, además de los diálogos de los participantes, incluye información relevante para las personas sordas, como efectos sonoros, voces o música que no aparecen en pantalla, identificación de personajes, entre otros.

Esta encuesta tiene como objetivo establecer su nivel de conocimiento sobre la SpS y determinar la utilidad de los subtítulos encontrados en el DVD de la película argentina “Carancho” para la comunidad sorda de la ciudad de Quito.

Sus valiosas respuestas son completamente anónimas y confidenciales y podrán ayudar a determinar futuras normas para la implementación de este modo de subtitulado en el país.

Instrucciones:

Leer cada pregunta detenidamente y marcar solamente la respuesta que más se acerca a su realidad, a menos que se indique lo contrario. En caso de seleccionar “otro”, favor escribir la respuesta en el espacio disponible. Responder todas las preguntas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Datos del encuestado:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Edad:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 18-25 años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 26-35 años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 36-45 años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 46-65 años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 66 años en adelante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Género:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Masculino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Femenino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Prefiero no decir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nivel de estudios:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Ninguno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Nivel básico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Nivel bachillerato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Estudios universitarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Estudios de posgrado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ¿Ha estudiado en instituciones educativas para personas sordas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ¿Tiene padres sordos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Sí, ambos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Sí, uno de ellos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ¿Tiene carné del CONADIS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ¿Cuál es su grado de sordera?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Leve (20 – 40 dB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Moderada (40 – 70 dB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Severa (70 – 90 dB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Profunda (90 – 120 dB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ No está seguro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. ¿A qué edad comenzó su pérdida de la audición?
   ___ Al nacer
   ___ 0-18 meses
   ___ 18 meses a 2 años
   ___ 3-5 años
   ___ 6-19 años
   ___ 20-35 años
   ___ 36-65 años
   ___ 66 años en adelante

9. ¿Cómo se comunica?
   ___ Lengua de señas ecuatoriana
   ___ Lengua oral
   ___ Lengua de señas y lengua oral
   ___ Lectura de labios
   ___ Lengua de señas y español escrito
   ___ Otro: ________________________

10. ¿Usa algún tipo de ayuda auditiva?
    ___ No
    ___ Sí, audífono
    ___ Sí, implante coclear
    ___ Sí, frecuencia modulada (FM)

B. SpS y hábitos de consumo audiovisual

11. Antes de esta encuesta, ¿sabía qué es la subtitulación para sordos? Si la respuesta es no o no está seguro, pase a la sección C.
    ___ Sí
    ___ No
    ___ No está seguro

12. ¿En dónde ha utilizado la subtitulación para sordos? (Puede marcar más de una opción)
    ___ Televisión pagada (cable o satélite)
    ___ Televisión nacional
    ___ Videos en internet
    ___ Museos
    ___ DVD/Blu-Ray
    ___ Cine
    ___ Aula

13. ¿Con cuánta frecuencia usa la subtitulación para sordos?
    ___ Todos los días
    ___ 2-3 veces a la semana
    ___ 2-3 veces al mes
    ___ 1 vez al mes
    ___ Menos de 1 vez al mes

14. ¿Por cuánto tiempo ha usado la subtitulación para sordos?
    ___ Menos de un año
    ___ 1-3 años
    ___ 4-6 años
    ___ 7-10 años
    ___ Más de 10 años
C. **Percepción sobre los subtítulos de la película “Carancho”**

A continuación encontrará una serie de parámetros con respecto a la calidad de los subtítulos presentados en el clip de la película Carancho. Indique su nivel de satisfacción con cada uno de ellos. Por favor, marque con un círculo la opción elegida:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivel de Satisfacción</th>
<th>Muy insatisfecho</th>
<th>Muy satisfecho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Tiempo que los subtítulos aparecen en pantalla</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sincronía de los subtítulos con la imagen</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Color de los subtítulos</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Posición de los subtítulos</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Descripción de los sonidos Ej.: [SIRENA DE AMBULANCIA]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Descripción de la música Ej.: [MÚSICA]</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Identificación de los personajes cuando hablan fuera de pantalla Ej.: SOSA;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Claridad del lenguaje usado</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRACIAS por su tiempo y colaboración.**
### 3.2 Translation in English

**Survey on subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH)**

Subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH) is a type of subtitling that, in addition to dialogue, it also has relevant information for deaf people, such as sound effects, music or off-screen voices, speaker identification, among others.

This survey aims to establish your knowledge about SDH and determine the usefulness of the subtitles found in the DVD of the Argentinian movie “Carancho” for the deaf community in Quito.

Your valuable answers are completely anonymous and confidential, and will help determine future guidelines for the implementation this type of subtitling in the country.

**Instructions:**

Read each question carefully and check only the answer that best describes your reality unless otherwise stated. In case of selecting “other,” please specify in the available space. Answer all the questions.

**A. Participant information:**

1. **Age:**
   - [ ] 18–25 years old
   - [ ] 26–35 years old
   - [ ] 36–45 years old
   - [ ] 46–65 years old
   - [ ] 66 years old or older

2. **Gender:**
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] I prefer not to say

3. **Education level:**
   - [ ] None
   - [ ] Primary school
   - [ ] Secondary school
   - [ ] Undergraduate studies
   - [ ] Postgraduate studies

4. **Have you studied in schools for the deaf and hard of hearing?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. **Do you have deaf parents?**
   - [ ] Yes, both
   - [ ] Yes, one of them
   - [ ] No

6. **Do you have a CONADIS card?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. **What is your level of hearing loss?**
   - [ ] Mild (20–40 dB)
   - [ ] Moderate (40–70 dB)
   - [ ] Severe (70–90 dB)
   - [ ] Profound (90–120 dB)
   - [ ] I’m not sure
8. At what age was the onset of your hearing loss?
   ___ At birth
   ___ 0-18 months
   ___ 18 months to 2 years old
   ___ 3-5 years old
   ___ 6-19 years old
   ___ 20-35 years old
   ___ 36-65 years old
   ___ 66 years old or older

9. How do you communicate
   ___ Ecuadorian Sign Language
   ___ Oral language
   ___ Sign Language and oral language
   ___ Lip-reading
   ___ Sign Language and written Spanish
   ___ Other: _______________________

10. Do you use any kind of hearing aid?
    ___ No
    ___ Yes, hearing aid
    ___ Yes, cochlear implant
    ___ Yes, frequency modulation systems

11. Where have you used the subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing? (You may pick more than one option)
    ___ Paid TV (cable or satellite)
    ___ Open TV
    ___ Videos on the internet
    ___ Museums
    ___ DVD/Blu-Ray
    ___ Cinema
    ___ Classroom

12. How often do you use the subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing?
    ___ Everyday
    ___ 2-3 times per week
    ___ 2-3 times per month
    ___ Once per month
    ___ Less than once per month

13. For how long have you been using the subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing?
    ___ Less than a year
    ___ 1-3 years
    ___ 4-6 years
    ___ 7-10 years
    ___ More than 10 years
C. **Perception on the subtitles for the movie “Carancho”**

Below you will find a series of parameters regarding the quality of the subtitles presented in a clip of the film *Carancho*. Please mark with a circle your level of satisfaction with each one of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Time that the subtitles remain on screen</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Synchrony of the subtitles and the image</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Colour of the subtitles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Position of the subtitles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Description of the sounds</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g.: [AMBULANCE SIREN]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Description of the music</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g.: [MUSIC]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Character identification when speaking off screen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g.: SOSA;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Clarity of the language used</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*THANK YOU for your time and collaboration.*
### Appendix 4: Complete answers to the survey

#### Section A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Answers / Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66+</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer not to say</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education level</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>23 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate studies</td>
<td>21 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate studies</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Studies in schools for the deaf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deaf parents</td>
<td>Yes, both</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, one of them</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CONADIS card</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of hearing loss</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>10 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>13 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>14 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profound</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'm not sure</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Onset of hearing loss</td>
<td>At birth</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-18 months</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 months to 2 years old</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years old</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-19 years old</td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-35 years old</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-65 years old</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 years old or older</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communication method</td>
<td>Ecuadorian Sign Language</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral language</td>
<td>21 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign Language and oral language</td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lip-reading</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign Language and written Spanish</td>
<td>9 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hearing aids</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>16 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, hearing aid</td>
<td>20 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, cochlear implant</td>
<td>12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, frequency modulation systems</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Answers/Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of SDH before survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Where have you used the subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing?</td>
<td>Paid TV (cable or satellite)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National TV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videos on the internet</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVD/Blu-Ray</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How often do you use the subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing?</td>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 times per week</td>
<td>10 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 times per month</td>
<td>10 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than once per month</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For how long have you been using the subtitling for the deaf and hard</td>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>11 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of subtitles

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied

[Bar chart showing assessment of subtitles across different aspects such as Time on screen, Synchrony, Colour, Position, Description of sounds, Description of music, Character ID, and Clarity of language.]
Appendix 5: Subtitles of the clip of the movie *Carancho*

1
00:00:04,200 --> 00:00:06,080
[RADIO]

2
00:00:08,080 --> 00:00:09,640
Buen día.
[PUERTA SE CIERRA]

3
00:00:10,840 --> 00:00:13,040
[TRUENOS]

4
00:00:15,400 --> 00:00:17,360
[QUEJIDO]

5
00:00:20,360 --> 00:00:21,640
PICO; Vamos Luján.

6
00:00:24,040 --> 00:00:29,000
[PUERTA SE CIERRA]

7
00:00:29,120 --> 00:00:31,320
Luján, ¿te puedes apurar por favor?

8
00:00:32,080 --> 00:00:33,120
Ahí voy.

9
00:00:33,200 --> 00:00:35,040
[MÚSICA]

10
00:00:35,120 --> 00:00:36,960
[QUEJIDOS]

11
00:00:43,280 --> 00:00:46,280
[QUEJIDOS]

12
00:00:57,920 --> 00:00:59,760
[MÚSICA]

13
00:01:46,240 --> 00:01:48,800
Dale nena, subí.

14
00:01:53,960 --> 00:01:58,120
[SIRENA DE AMBULANCIA]
00:02:10,240 --> 00:02:11,480
[MÚSICA]

00:02:19,640 --> 00:02:21,600
RADIO; <i>Atento Sosa, atento Sosa.</i></i>

00:02:21,640 --> 00:02:24,960
<i>Choque de una camioneta con una moto, Mosconi y Villegas.</i></i>

00:02:28,440 --> 00:02:31,160
[SIRENA DE AMBULANCIA]

00:02:38,840 --> 00:02:40,440
Tranquilo. Ya llegaron.

00:02:52,400 --> 00:02:54,000
Bajá la tabla. Pico.

00:02:58,600 --> 00:02:59,760
[FINALIZA LA MÚSICA]

00:02:59,880 --> 00:03:02,720
- Por favor. Dejen pasar a los médicos.
- Buenas noches.

00:03:02,800 --> 00:03:03,920
¿Cómo le va?

00:03:04,680 --> 00:03:05,960
¿Qué paso?

00:03:08,160 --> 00:03:10,560
Parece que se paró delante de la camioneta.

00:03:11,720 --> 00:03:14,840
Se golpeó muy fuerte la cabeza, no tenía puesto el casco.
¿Sabes si estaba borracho?

Olor a alcohol no tiene.

¿Estuvo todo el tiempo consciente?
- Hasta recién hablaba. Ahora...

Gustavo, ¿me escuchas?

Sí. ¿Sí?

Bueno. Yo soy médica gordo, ¿sabes?

Te estoy poniendo un collar. Te vamos a llevar a hospital, ¿sí?

¿Te acordás de lo que pasó?

- No. ¿No? ¿No te acordás de nada?

¿Cuántos años tenés, Gustavo?

- 24. ¿24? ¿Estabas trabajando?

- Sí. ¿Sí?

- Despejen. Por favor.
- Quedate tranquilo.

00:03:50,000 --> 00:03:53,680
¿Me ayudás con la tabla? Dejale la cabeza acá. Ponete al lado mío.

00:03:53,760 --> 00:03:56,200
- Sí, ya sé. Tengo primeros auxilios.
ENFERMERO; <i>- Permiso.</i>

00:03:56,320 --> 00:03:57,240
Muy bien.

00:03:57,520 --> 00:04:01,080
Te pido si podés poner una mano acá, con la otra trabás acá, ¿sí?

00:04:01,160 --> 00:04:04,240
Cuando yo cuento. A la cuenta de tres. Lo vamos a correr.

00:04:04,320 --> 00:04:05,840
¿Vamos? 1, 2, 3.

00:04:05,920 --> 00:04:07,000
Ahi va.
[QUEJIDOS]

00:04:07,080 --> 00:04:10,480
Tranquilo. Tranquilo, gordo. Dale, 1, 2, 3. Lo bajamos.

00:04:10,680 --> 00:04:12,000
- Muy bien.
- Listo.

00:04:12,080 --> 00:04:13,360
Ahi estamos.

00:04:13,440 --> 00:04:15,760
Oficial, ¿me ayuda por favor?

00:04:15,920 --> 00:04:17,920
- ¿Vos estás bien?
- ¿Yo?
Sí. Sí, sí. Más o menos.

¿Sí? ¿Vos estabas manejando?

¿Chocaste?

Ah. No, esto es otra cosa.

¿Sí? ¿Vos estabais manejando?

¿Chocaste?

Ah. No, esto es otra cosa.

¿Estoy bien.

A ver, perdón, ¿eh? Quedate quieto.

Vamos Luján.

Andá a hacerte ver.

Por ahí te tienen que coser.

Gracias.

[SIRENA DE AMBULANCIA]

Pico...

¿Lo conocés?

¿Qué?

Si lo conocés al tipo que nos ayudó recién.

Si, ¿por?
Nos está siguiendo.

Sí, todo bien. Nos acompañará hasta el policlínico.

Nos acompañará hasta el policlínico.

Nos acompañará hasta el policlínico.

[PUERTA SE CIERRA]

¿Qué pasó?

- No lo quieren recibir.

¿Por qué?

Qué sé yo qué pasa.

Que no hay nadie. Que tienen quilombo, la misma pajería de siempre.

¿Aquí está ella arreglando todo.

- ¿Quién es a chica?

Es nueva. La hermana de un amigo.

¿Me entendés? Vos acá tenés terapia y tenés tomógrafo.

Te lo vas a tener que llevar porque no lo puedo aceptar.

Yo no me lo voy a llevar. Resolvelo, porque yo de acá no me voy.
No sé. Habla con el jefe de servicio.

81
00:05:23,400 --> 00:05:25,360
- Hola. Perdón. ¿Cómo estás?
- Hola.

82
00:05:25,440 --> 00:05:28,400
- Decime, ¿el Ruso no está hoy?
- Sí, está.

83
00:05:28,560 --> 00:05:30,320
¿Lo podés llamar un minutito?

84
00:05:32,440 --> 00:05:34,040
Voy a ver qué hago.

85
00:05:34,560 --> 00:05:36,120
¿Y yo qué hago?

86
00:05:36,800 --> 00:05:38,320
Vos, esperame.

87
00:05:40,880 --> 00:05:42,720
Gustavo, ¿estás bien?

88
00:05:43,200 --> 00:05:44,640
[QUEJIDO]

89
00:05:47,160 --> 00:05:49,360
La verdad. No lo puedo creer.

90
00:05:49,440 --> 00:05:50,760
Tranquila.

91
00:05:57,800 --> 00:05:59,240
Ruso.

92
00:06:10,560 --> 00:06:13,400
Pico. Entrego el vestuario y te veo fuera, ¿sí?

93
00:06:23,920 --> 00:06:26,040
- ¿Todo bien?
- Sí, gracias. Permiso.
¿Algún problema?

No. No. Todo bien. Gracias por ayudarme, en serio.

De nada.

¿Me decís tu nombre?

Olivera.

¿Y tu nombre?

- Luján. Luján Olivera.
- Luján Olivera.

- ¿Necesitás mi matrícula?
- No, no. Así está bien.

Toma. Por si necesitás algo.
- Bueno.

Tenela, nunca se sabe. Hasta luego.

Che, ¿hace mucho que lo conocés a Sosa vos?
Bastante.

¿Cuánto es bastante?

Y, bastante es como 8, 10 años.

¿Siempre carancheando?

¿Eh? No. El loco empezó a hacer esto cuando le sacaron a matrícula.

Empezó a trabajar para los putos estos de la fundación.

Primero te da dos gambas por el dato...

y si el caso es bueno, después te da 300 más.

Y los clientes que vos le das, ¿cobran?

Los garcan un poco, ¿viste? Pero cobran.

Imaginate que no tienen obra social ni trabajo. No tienen una mierda.

La fundación para esta gente termina haciendo como un trabajo social.
¿Un trabajo social?

- Trabajo social. Sí.
- [RISA IRÓNICA]

Imaginate un tipo de éstos. Tirado abajo de un bondí a las 4 de la mañana

con los huesos rotos...

¿Qué es lo mejor que les puede pasar? Que caiga un carancho

cgon gana de romperle bien el ojete a las aseguradoras.