

SUBTITLE ERROR TYPOLOGIES IN UNOFFICIAL MOVIE STREAMING WEBSITE BY USING FAR MODEL

Ika Kartika Amilia[1], Rizka Alvina Hasni[2]

[1]ika.kartika@stbalia.ac.id

[1] [2]STBA LIA Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: This study was intended to investigate the types of errors in the movie subtitles available on a movie online streaming, LayarKaca21 (LK21). The research method applied is a descriptive case study. The data were collected by comparing the English version of the subtitles, the LK21's version, and the Indonesian subtitles on Netflix. The movie taken as a data source was of the animation genre, entitled *How to Train Your Dragon: The Hidden World*. The data found were analyzed based on Pederson's typology of subtitle errors, FAR Model standing for Functional Equivalence, Acceptability, and Readability. The errors were classified into distinct categories: functional equivalence errors, including semantic and stylistic discrepancies; acceptability errors encompassing grammatical, spelling, and idiomatic inaccuracies; and readability errors involving segmentation and spotting, reading speed and line length, and punctuation and graphics. Throughout the analysis, 716 errors were identified, comprising 316 functional equivalence, 105 acceptability, and 295 readability errors. The investigation outcomes unveiled that most errors within LK21 predominantly fell under the functional equivalence category. Such errors inherently possess the potential to significantly hinder viewers' comprehension of the conveyed messages in the movies or series they engage with. Given the central role of subtitles in facilitating audience understanding, the presence of functional equivalence errors within LK21's subtitles raises concerns about the quality and effectiveness of the platform's subtitles.

Keywords: subtitle, functional equivalence, readability, acceptability

INTRODUCTION

Massive technical advancements and innovations have profoundly affected all facets of human life, notably communication. Diverse forms of communication have evolved to promote global communication. In today's technology-driven, multimedia society, the communication value of video with voice and text is crucial. The transformation from paper to digital has had a profound effect on the generation and transmission of information and communications, but also on the roles of users and consumers. A new, dynamic media environment has impacted communication and is built on creating, transmitting, and receiving messages among multiple participants.

Additionally, technological advancements necessitate that messages be conveyed nonverbally via audiovisual medium and audibly. Since the 1990s, when television, movies, computers, and mobile phones became a prominent component of the human social environment, audiovisual media have

been increasingly popular. Audiovisual programs that enhance knowledge and facilitate people's work are indispensable in almost every element of life. As examples of multi-modal works, audiovisual programs rely on the interaction between two codes, images and sound, and although literature and poetry evoke, audiovisual productions depict and actualize a certain reality through the director's editing of specific images. In this communicative setting, meaning is given not only through the character exchanges, but also through pictures, gestures, camera movements, music, special effects, etc. Thus, information is simultaneously delivered across audio and visual channels and conveyed through a vast array of signifying codes, articulated in accordance with certain filmic norms and conventions.

These many programs and audiovisual materials contain linguistic characteristics, and the entire process is linguistically inseparable from the translation process, particularly audiovisual translation (AVT) (Cintas & Remael, 2020). Audiovisual translation is essentially the translation of the video's spoken language. This type of translation necessitates the coordination of verbal and nonverbal elements. This is due to the fact that, when translating, a translator must consider not only the text, but also dialogue, sound effects, pictures, and the video's ambiance (Matkivska, 2014).

In general, there are three types of audiovisual translation: dubbing, voice-over, and subtitling. Subtitles refer to texts that display on-screen in the same language as the audio-visual work (intralingual subtitling) or in a different target language (i.e. interlingual subtitling). According to (Cintas & Remael (2020), subtitles are a translation practice where the results of the translation are shown at the bottom of the screen. Technically translating an SL movie or audiovisual media to a TL movie or audiovisual media, synced with the original spoken message, is the process of subtitling (Gottlieb, 2004). According to O'Connell, (2016), subtitling is "the addition of written text to the original audio soundtrack on screen" (p.169). According to Ghaemi & Benyamin (2010), subtitling is less expensive than dubbing. Kapsaskis (2008) added that subtitling is less expensive and may convey SL audiovisual products simultaneously. In addition, subtitling has traits that distinguish it from other methods of translation (Bogucki, 2009). Due to the restricted space available on the screen, one of these characteristics is the sparing use of subtitling, which should not impede viewing the screen clearly. This type of translation seeks to transmit the characters' dialogue, as well as any other items that appear in the image and audio information. All subtitled programs consist of three elements: sound, an image, and the subtitles.

However, subtitling is a cognitively taxing procedure fraught with problems and difficulties (Karamitroglou, 2000) and formal quantitative and textual qualitative obstacles (Gottlieb, 2004). Formal restrictions are represented by a maximum of two lines and thirty-five characters, while the visual context of the film represents textual constraints and obstacles. Subtitling presents numerous technical challenges, such as the average reading speed of viewers. Another limitation is the synchronization procedure, which must maintain a constant minimum gap between subtitles. Some claim that a viewer's reading speed is between 150 and 180 words per minute, however this might vary depending on the lexical density and linguistic content offered in text (de Linde & Kay, 1999).

According to Sibson (2012), a translator must take into account the restrictions of subtitles including semiotic, geographical, and temporal boundaries (due to the transition from dialogue to writing). Regarding the spatial dimension, subtitles typically consist of only two lines. If the subtitle is a single line, it is inserted at the bottom. Each line has about 35 characters, including spaces and punctuation. Depending on the client's request, a line can include between 39 and 41 characters in certain instances. The text is positioned below the image so that it does not obscure it. The bottom row occupies at least one-twelfth of the screen's height (Cintas & Remael, 2020).

Regarding temporal constraints, a translator must be familiar with the aspect of spotting or timing, i.e. determining when subtitles appear and disappear. According to Cintas & Remael (2020),

the primary guideline for spotting is that the subtitle must appear immediately with the utterance, and the translator must pay attention to pauses and other prosodic elements in the SL utterance. The maximum time that two-line subtitles are displayed is six seconds.

Rapid Internet development has led to the growth of various types of audiovisual translation, which Bogucki (2009) refers to as amateur subtitling, or *fansub* as used by Cintas & Remael (2020). Fansubbing is a collaborative work since it allows anime fans to explain the incorporation of foreign cultural components into local culture, thereby enhancing the target audience's understanding of the anime episodes they are viewing. As a means of translation, fansubbing enables anime fans to share their knowledge and interests via a free digital network. According to Cintas & Sánchez (2006), fansub is the practice of non-professional subtitling and the online sharing of movies, TV series, and other snippets from the world of cinema. In an attempt to popularize Japanese manga and anime, Fansub originated in the 1980s. Since the mid-1990s, fansubbing has increased tremendously due to the availability of free computer software and subtitling tools on the Internet.

Currently, fansubs are also undertaken in various language and audiovisual media combinations, including films. Fansubs are currently a social phenomenon in cyberspace, as proven by the rapid rise of virtual communities on several websites and forums. The purpose of fansub is to contribute to a particular pastime and spread it in other nations so that readers/viewers from different language communities may more easily access it (Bogucki, 2009).

The forum Indonesian Data and File Library (IDFL) is one example of the widespread practice of fansubbing in Indonesia. There are many things to debate on these online forums, but the primary activity is the exchange of movie/series file links and subtitles. This forum was officially established on February 20, 2012, and its founders were once active members of Indofiles or Indowebster. Until the beginning of July 2018, IDFL members reached more than 190 thousand users in various locations, including Surabaya, Bandung, and Jakarta (Wirastama, 2018). The number of concurrent daily visits to this website ranges between 150 and 200 thousand. Lebah Ganteng, one of the most renowned fansubbers, claims to have translated over 500 English films into Indonesian (Rasudi, 2016). The subtitles created by fansubbers are therefore freely accessible on a variety of internet streaming platforms, such as IndoXXI and LayarKaca21.

One of the model used to assess the subtitle quality is FAR Model. This model evaluates subtitle quality based on functional equivalence, acceptability, and readability. Error analysis underpins FAR. In this model, each subtitle inaccuracy is penalized. FAR model offers holistic approach to evaluating subtitles. The model ensures a well-rounded analysis that goes beyond literal translation. It takes into account the cultural, linguistic, and technical aspects necessary for creating high-quality subtitles that enhance the audience's understanding and engagement with the content.

Functional equivalency is how well subtitles reflect the source text's message. Semantic and stylistic subtitle errors lie under functional equivalence. The semantic error is 0.5; 1 is standard, 2 is serious. Minor errors include lexical and terminology errors. This error does not affect the film's plot. Untranslated dialogue is a standard error. Semantic mistake happens when a subtitle error inhibits the viewer from understanding the film's plot or if the viewer spends time trying to grasp the error.

According to Pedersen (2017), the semantic equivalence penalty points are minor: 0.5, standard: 1, and severe: 2. Minor errors are lexical errors that have no effect on the film's plot or primary meaning. Standard errors are described as a subtitle that contains errors but still conveys the intended content and does not impede the viewer's progress beyond that particular subtitle. Standard semantic errors would also include the omission of subtitles for plot-relevant dialogue.

A severe error is described as a subtitle that is so erroneous that it prevents viewers from understanding it and impedes their development beyond that subtitle, either by leading to narrative



misunderstandings or by being so severe that it disrupts the contract of illusion for more than one subtitle.

Pedersen (2017) stated that stylistic errors are less harmful than semantic errors because they do not hinder the comprehension of a film. Examples of stylistic faults include incorrect terms of address, incorrect register (too high or too low), and any other language that is inconsistent with the original's style (e.g. using modern language in historic films).

The second component of the FAR Model is acceptability, which is determined by the compliance of subtitles to the linguistic rules of the target language. Acceptability issues may arise if the audience finds the subtitles unfamiliar. They can be split into three categories: grammatical errors, spelling errors, and idiomatic errors. Grammar errors can be categorized as minor, standard, and major. Based on the severity of the error, misspellings are also classed as major, minor, or standard. If it is only a spelling error, it will be regarded as a minor error, but if it alters the meaning, it will be called a standard error—unreadable text results from serious faults. Pedersen penalizes severe mistakes by one point and standard errors by half a point. Minor mistakes incur a 0.25 penalty. Serious mistakes result in inaccurate or misleading information, whereas standard errors hinder understanding and may undermine the text's coherence. Errors in capitalization, apostrophes, and adding small words are considered minor.

Errors in readability are closely tied to technical issues or rules. This component includes problems in segmentation and spotting, punctuation and graphics, reading speed and line length. Spotting errors occur when subtitles are out of sync with the dialogue, such as when they appear or disappear too fast. Spotting faults are deemed fatal when subtitles arrive too late or too rapidly inside a single sentence. Minor spotting occurs when subtitles come too late or disappear after a few seconds of delay.

There were some previous studies related to the types of errors in subtitles. Abdelaal (2019) researched the types of errors in movie subtitles. He analyzed the subtitling strategies applied to translate culture-bound terms based on Pederson's typology of subtitling strategies which include retention, specification, direct translation, generalization, substitution, and omission. The data found were subsequently analyzed regarding their subtitling quality assessment using Pederson's FAR Model. There were 32 data obtained from a movie entitled *American Pie* since it had many cultural references such as names and sex-related taboos in Arabic culture. The findings showed that all strategies, but substitution, were employed in the translation of the cultural references. As for the quality, the research showed that most of the subtitles of culture-bound terms were of good quality as very few cases consisted of serious errors.

Another study related to subtitle quality assessment was carried out by Romero-Fresco & Pérez (2015). Their research was focused on the accuracy rate of live subtitling. In order to assess the accuracy, NER Model was employed since this model suit the needs of such types of subtitling as respeaking and automatic subtitling. The data were obtained from a corpus of 35,000 words made up of live subtitles from some of the most watched news programmes in the UK, Spain, Italy and Switzerland: BBC Six O'Clock News and SKY News (English), 59 segundos and Telediario en TVE (Spanish), Telegiornale RAI (Italian) and 10vor10 and Tagesschau on SF1 (German). The errors found were then analyzed based on the penalty point categorizing them into serious, standard, and minor errors.

The first study conducted by Abdelaal primarily focused on analyzing the types of errors in movie subtitles, particularly related to the translation of culture-bound terms. The study employed Pederson's typology of subtitling strategies to understand how different strategies were used to translate these terms. Additionally, the study utilized the FAR Model to assess the quality of the subtitles. In contrast, the second study by Romero-Fresco and Perez was centered on assessing the

accuracy rate of live subtitling in news programs. The study used the NER (Number Edition Recognition) Model to evaluate the accuracy of live subtitles. The focus here was on categorizing errors based on their severity rather than the types of translation strategies used.

Abdelaal's study used the FAR Model to assess the quality of subtitles based on subtitling strategies and their application to culture-bound terms. The focus was on identifying errors and evaluating their quality. However, the severity of errors wasn't a central focus. On the other hand, Romero-Fresco and Martinez's study utilized the NER Model to assess the accuracy of live subtitling in news programs. Their focus was on quantifying errors based on severity levels (serious, standard, minor).

The first study indicated that the analysis of penalty points (severity of errors) could be a valuable area of future research. This suggests that researchers could explore the severity of errors in subtitles using a similar model or approach. The second study did not delve into the subtitling strategies used or the quality assessment based on strategies, which could be an avenue for further investigation. This current study applied FAR Model in order to analyze the typology of the subtitle errors. The movie used as the data source was *How to Train Your Dragon: Hidden World*, different from that of used in Abdelaal and Romero-Fresco and Perez. In addition, this research centered on analyzing the types of errors in fansubbed version subtitles available in LK21 (LayarKaca21), one of the unofficial movie streaming websites. The severity of each error and subtitling strategies were not of the focus of this study due to limited time the researchers had in completing this paper. The analysis of the penalty point will be of valuable future research.

METHOD

The research design used in this study is descriptive case study and it is of qualitative approach because it focuses on product-oriented translations, in this case English and Indonesian movie subtitles. According to Leavy (2017), the qualitative approach aims to "investigate and learn about social phenomena; to unpack the meanings people ascribe to activities, situations, events, or artifacts; or to build a depth of understanding about some dimension of social life." Thus, this approach is used when the main purpose of the research is to explore, describe, and explain a phenomenon. This research is also descriptive because the data obtained are described and interpreted. In this case, the data obtained will be described based on subtitle error typology in the FAR Model. For the purpose of the current study, Pedersen's FAR Model is considered more appropriate because it is tailored for the assessment of subtitling in particular.

The data source in this study was *How to Train Your Dragon: Hidden World* whose subtitles were available both on Netflix and LK21. The data collection technique was carried out by data reduction techniques as follows:

1. Selecting randomly one movie available on both LK21 and Netflix. The movie chosen was *How to Train Your Dragon: Hidden World*.
2. The subtitles of Netflix and LK21's versions were taken and downloaded from subscene.com. However, the researchers had to make sure that the downloaded subtitles versions were the ones used in the movie available on Netflix and LK21.
3. Watch the movie and identify the subtitles do not accurately reflect the meaning or context of the original dialogue.
4. Comparing the English version of the movie, LK21's version, and the Indonesian subtitles available on Netflix.
5. Identifying and highlighting the errors. The Indonesian subtitles on LK21 that did not comply with Netflix's were considered errors.

The data analysis technique applied in this research is content analysis. Content analysis or document analysis is a method for systematically analyzing data in the form of text. Content analysis is also a way to examine documented human communication (Leavy, 2017). Various types of texts and materials can be studied using content analysis methods, including historical documents, speech transcripts, newspapers, magazines, books, blogs, and diaries. Text can also include an audiovisual component, including film or video. This research used content analysis because the data used is in the form of film subtitles.

The steps for analyzing the data are as follows:

1. Related to errors on functional equivalence, the researchers looked for discrepancies in meaning, nuances, idioms, and cultural references, determined if errors result from inaccuracies in translation, improper context representation, or simplification that might lead to loss of meaning.
2. Related to acceptability aspect, the researchers assessed whether the subtitles use proper grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure according to the target language. The researchers also checked if the subtitles used language that could be offensive or culturally inappropriate in the target audience's context.
3. Related to readability aspect, the researchers determined if the subtitles are displayed clearly, with appropriate font size, color, and contrast against the background. Ensure that subtitles remain on-screen for an appropriate amount of time, allowing viewers to read them comfortably. Evaluate whether the subtitles are synchronized with the characters' speech, avoiding overcrowded screens or excessively fast-paced text.

The results of the analysis were used to draw conclusions. At this stage, the answers to the research problems were described. The conclusion was in the form of what types of errors taking place in the subtitles of the selected movie.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the types of errors found in the movie's subtitles on LK21 were analyzed based on Pederson's FAR Model. The total data found were 716 falling into such categories as functional equivalence (316 errors), acceptability (105 errors), and readability (295 errors).

Table 1. Types and Numbers of Errors Found

Types of Errors	Numbers of Errors
Functional Equivalence	316
Acceptability	105
Readability	295

The types and frequencies of errors found in the selected movie used as the data source were detailed in Table 1. Functional equivalence errors were the most prevalent, followed by readability and acceptability errors.

Errors on Functional Equivalence

The errors found in the functional equivalence aspect are divided into two, namely semantic and stylistic errors. Semantic errors occur in some subtitles as described below:

Table 2. Example of Semantic Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
----	----------------------	-----------

00:12:10,980 --> 00:12:13,232
Mmm. That does sound like *a nuisance*.

00:12:11,522 --> 00:12:13,607
Itu terdengar *mengganggu*.

00:12:12,861 --> 00:12:15,626
Itu terdengar *masuk akal*.

In the above utterance, there is a semantic error in the translation of the word *nuisance*. According to Cambridge Dictionary (2023), *nuisance* means *something or someone that annoys you or causes trouble for you*. However, the word *nuisance* is translated into *masuk akal*. According to KBBI Daring (2016), the expression *masuk akal* means *dapat diterima oleh akal; tidak aneh; tidak mustahil; logis*. Thus, the word *nuisance* should be translated as it is in the Netflix version, i.e. *mengganggu*. There is a change in the word class in the translation. In the SL, *nuisance* is a noun, but in the Netflix version, it is translated into *mengganggu* which is an adjective. However, the meaning and message can be conveyed well.

LK 21 translated *nuisance* into *masuk akal*. This falls into semantic error because the words *mengganggu* and *masuk akal* have totally different meanings. As a result, the audience's understanding of the message conveyed will be disrupted. The audience will have a different mental image and comprehension when the word *nuisance* is translated into *masuk akal*, instead of *mengganggu*.

Table 3. Example of Semantic Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
00:05:40,757 --> 00:05:44,218 The service here soars, <i>the cuisine is fiery</i> ,	00:05:40,298 --> 00:05:44,385 Layanan di sini sangat bagus, <i>masakannya berapi-api</i> ,	00:05:42,171 --> 00:05:46,302 Layanan disini baik.
		No translation

The expression *the cuisine is fiery* appears when the character and his group talked about a place that was very suitable for dragons to live in. This expression is important for conveying the message because it is part of the description of the place. In the Netflix's subtitle, the phrase is translated into *masakannya berapi-api*. Based on Cambridge Dictionary (2023), *cuisine* is *a style of cooking*, while *fiery* means *bright red, like fire*. In KBBI Daring (2016), *masakan* is *panganan atau lauk pauk yang dimasak*.

Error in this data falls into semantic error category. This is because the expressions in SL are not translated into TL in the subtitle version of LK21.

Table 4. Example of Semantic Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
00:22:42,319 --> 00:22:45,238 you'll learn to embrace your <i>inner</i> Viking.	00:22:42,235 --> 00:22:45,155 kau akan belajar merangkul <i>jiwa</i> Vikingmu.	00:22:43,691 --> 00:22:46,627 kau akan belajar merangkul viking <i>batinmu</i> .

Semantic error is also found in the example above. The word *inner* in *the inner Viking* phrase is translated in the LK21 version into *batin*. In Cambridge Dictionary (2023), *inner* are *inner feelings or thoughts are ones that you do not show or tell other people*. According to KBBI Daring (2016), *batin* is *sesuatu yang terdapat di dalam hati; sesuatu yang menyangkut jiwa (perasaan hati dan sebagainya)*.

In this context, *inner* should be translated into *jiwa* as in Netflix's subtitle. In Indonesian culture, the word *jiwa* is also used more commonly when talking about something in the same context as the one above. Thus, the translation of *inner* into *batin* can distort the audience's understanding of

what is to be conveyed through the utterance. Eventhough this error does not interfere with the understanding on the plot and storyline, it is still categorized as semantic error because the translation of LK21 is not suitable with the context.

Table 5. Example of Stylistic Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
00:06:21,130 --> 00:06:22,757 Welcome to <i>paradise</i> , mate.	00:06:20,922 --> 00:06:23,049 Selamat datang di <i>surga</i> , Kawan.	00:06:23,112 --> 00:06:25,104 Selamat datang di <i>firdaus</i> .

Stylistic error is found in the above utterance where the word *paradise* is translated by LK21 into *firdaus*. Based on Cambridge Dictionary (2023), *paradise* is a *place or condition of great happiness where everything is exactly as you would like it to be*. According to KBBI Daring (2016), *firdaus* is *taman kesenangan (surga) tempat Adam dan Hawa berdiam sebelum diturunkan ke bumi; surge*. The word *paradise* is translated as *surga* in the Netflix version of the subtitle.

In Indonesian, *firdaus* and *surga* do have the same meaning. In terms of meaning, there is no semantic error in the translation of *paradise* into *firdaus*. However, in an animated movie with a diverse audience in terms of age and different cultural backgrounds, the use of the word *firdaus* is not common. Therefore, there is a register error that falls into stylistic error.

Errors on Acceptability

In the acceptability aspect, most of the errors occurred in the aspects of grammar and idiomaticity, as described below:

Table 6. Example of Idiomaticity Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
00:17:16,535 --> 00:17:18,662 [chuckles] He only <i>has eyes for your mom</i> .	00:17:16,535 --> 00:17:18,704 <i>Dia hanya tertarik dengan ibunya</i> .	00:17:18,633 --> 00:17:20,693 <i>Dia hanya melihat ibunya</i> .

The data above shows an error in the idiomaticity aspect. The expression *has eyes for your mom* was translated by LK21 into *hanya melihat ibunya*. In this case, of course, there is a translation error because according to Cambridge Dictionary (2023), *have eyes for someone* means *to be interested in or attracted to only one person*. This meaning is in accordance with the equivalent in the Netflix subtitle, which is *hanya tertarik dengan ibunya*. According to KBBI Daring (2016), *tertarik* means *menaruh minat (perhatian) kepada*. Therefore, the error in the idiomaticity aspect occurs due to mistranslation in translating the idiom.

Table 7. Example of Grammar Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
Yeah! That's <i>two</i> for me.	<i>Dua angka</i> untukku.	2 untukku.

Another error that falls into the acceptability aspect is seen in the data above. The error above is a grammatical error. The word *two* in the SL is translated into *dua* (in word form) in Netflix. Meanwhile, in LK21, the word *two* is translated into 2 (the form of numbers).

In Indonesian grammatical rules, numbers cannot be used at the beginning of a sentence. The correct format must be in the form of words. According to EYD (2023), numbers written at the beginning of a sentence must be spelled out.

Errors on Readability

Errors in the readability category consist of segmentation and spotting; punctuation and reading speed; and line length. In the data source, there were no errors in segmentation and spotting. All utterances in LK21 had no delay in timing the subtitles' appearance on the screen. The aspect of reading speed itself was not measured in this study because a separate method is needed to measure the reading speed of the audience.

The most common translation errors found in the data source were in punctuation and line length as the following examples:

Table 8. Example of Punctuation Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
00:03:00,096 --> 00:03:02,265 Easy, girl. It's okay.	00:02:59,888 --> 00:03:01,222 Tenanglah.	00:03:02,145 --> 00:03:04,376 Tenang Tidak apa.

In the data above, the utterance is well translated. There are no semantic or stylistic errors. However, the error occurs in the use of ellipsis (...) in the translation of LK21. In the SL, ellipsis is not used because the utterance is short and no information is cut off. With this condition, there is no reason for the translator to use ellipsis punctuation which is usually used to indicate that there is truncated information, which will be continued in the next frame.

The use of ellipsis in LK21's version is a mistake because in subtitles, the number of characters is the most important aspect. This is to ensure that the audience is presented with only a few sentences or utterances, or conversely, does not feel that information is missing. The use of ellipsis in the LK21 version does not make the utterance longer or interfere with the audience's understanding. However, the use of ellipsis that needs to be put in the right place will interfere with readability.

Table 9. Example of Line Length Error

SL	TL (Netflix Version)	TL (LK21)
Point is, you can't keep bringing dragons (41) back here. (10)	Intinya kau tak bisa terus (26) membawa pulang naga. (19)	Intinya, kau tak bisa terus bawa pulang naga kesini. (52)

The data in the table above shows a readability error in the aspect of line length. In the subtitle rule, the maximum number of characters in one line is about 35-42 characters. In SL, the sentence *point is, you can't keep bringing dragons back here* is cut after the word *dragons*. Thus, in the first line, there are 41 characters, and in the second line there are 10 characters. Similarly, Netflix cut the translation to 26 characters in the first line, and 19 in the second line.

This did not happen in the LK21 version of the translation. The audience is presented with a long whole sentence with 52 characters. Although this condition does not interfere with the meaning or message conveyed, it was still categorized as an error in line length because it does not comply with subtitle conventions. The analysis results reveal that subtitle errors occur across three categories. Errors in the aspect of functional equivalence are most prominent, totaling 316 instances, followed by readability with 295 instances and acceptability with 105 errors. This contrasts with the findings of Abdelaal's study. In his research focusing on translation strategies and quality concerning swear words, Abdelaal (2019) discovered that errors related to acceptability constituted the largest number. The second highest was functional equivalence, and readability was the least prevalent. The high occurrence of errors in the acceptability aspect might be linked to the fact that the analyzed films were in English but broadcast in Arabic-speaking countries. Hence, mistranslations of swear words may not align with the idiomatic usage preferred by the target audience due to variations between English and Arabic regarding word pairs or collocations.

In their investigation centered on live news subtitling, Romero-Frezco and Perez (2015) also yielded distinct outcomes. Employing the NER Model for analysis, their study demonstrated that the accuracy level reflected in the "Number" aspect did not exhibit significant issues. The character count in the generated subtitles was similar to the original utterances. In terms of message or meaning, herein equating to Pedersen's concept, live subtitling showcased a remarkable accuracy rate of 98%. Nonetheless, this accuracy was achieved through a preliminary editing process applied to live subtitling. Consequently, certain portions of speech were omitted or excluded from the subtitles as long as the core meaning was effectively conveyed. In this aspect, it is evident that this research and that of Romero-Frezco & Martinez present divergent outcomes at the semantic level. This divergence could be attributed to the data source, which comprised news content characterized by straightforward language discussing current events, enabling the audience to relate to the conveyed information.

Recognition errors, corresponding to Pedersen's concept of acceptability, expose serious errors resulting in spelling inaccuracies, jeopardizing meaning accuracy. Romero-Frezco & Perez expressed concern primarily regarding technical aspects, notably the speech rate generated by speakers. Live subtitling necessitates a high-speed rate. Utterances delivered at high speeds (exceeding 180 wpm) result in the audience missing approximately 80% of simultaneous information from subtitles and images. The issue of speed rate in the FAR Model relates to readability. In this study, readability ranks as the second most error-prone aspect after functional equivalence. Within the realm of readability, errors frequently manifest in line length. In the context of LK21, numerous subtitles exceed 42 characters in a single line. This factor affects the reading speed for the audience. Longer sentences in one line make it progressively challenging for the audience to keep pace with speech and images in the viewed film.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and results of the analysis, functional equivalence errors occurred the most frequently, with a total of 316 cases. The aspect of readability has the second-most errors, with a total of 295, followed by acceptability, with 105 errors. Compared to the total movie duration, the overall error duration is less than a quarter of the running time.

The number of functional equivalence errors showed that some parts might hinder the audience's comprehension of the message conveyed in parts of the subtitles in question. However, it can be argued that translation errors do not interfere with the audience's ability to comprehend the overall movie's intended message. This may be because the movies serving as the basis of the data are family-friendly animated pictures. In terms of both lexical and grammatical complexity, movies of this nature typically employ straightforward language.

It is advised that movies available on unofficial streaming services only be used as data sources in translation research if the research involves error analysis or assessment of subtitle quality. In addition, research on evaluating the errors and quality of subtitles might be conducted on movies of various genres or by performing comparative studies between genres and focusing on the severity of the errors produced.

REFERENCES

- Abdelaal, N. M. (2019). Subtitling of culture-bound terms: strategies and quality assessment. *Heliyon*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01411>

- Bogucki, Ł. (2009). Amateur Subtitling on the Internet. In C. Jorge Díaz & A. Gunilla (Eds.), *Audiovisual Translation* (pp. 49–57). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230234581_4
- Cambridge Dictionary*. (2023). Cambridge University Press. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Cintas, J. D., & Remael, A. (2020). Subtitling: Concepts and practices. In *Subtitling: Concepts and Practices*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315674278>
- de Linde, Z., & Kay, N. (1999). Processing subtitles and film images. *The Translator*, 5(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1999.10799033>
- EYD. (2023). Badan Pengembangan Dan Pembinaan Bahasa Republik Indonesia. <https://eyd.netlify.app/>
- Ghaemi, F., & Benyamin, J. (2010). Strategies used in the translation of interlingual subtitling. *The Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 39–49.
- Gottlieb, H. (2004). Subtitles and international anglicization. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 219–222.
- Kapsaskis, D. (2008). Translation and film: On the defamiliarizing effect of subtitles. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 4(4), 42–52.
- Karamitroglou, F. (2000). *Towards a methodology for the investigation of norms in audiovisual translation*. Rodopi.
- KBBI Daring. (2016). Bahasa, Badan Pengembangan Dan Pembinaan. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches* (Issue 1). The Guilford Press.
- Matkivska, N. (2014). Audiovisual Translation: Conception, Types, Characters' Speech and Translation Strategies Applied. *Studies About Languages*, 0(25). <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.25.8516>
- O'Connell, E. (2016). *Choices and constraints in screen translation*. Routledge.
- Pedersen, J. (2017). *The FAR model: assessing quality in interlingual subtitling*. <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1134906>
- Rasudi, A. M. (2016). *Sosok di balik Lebah Ganteng, penerjemah subtitle kesohor dunia maya, angkat bicara*. Vice. <https://www.vice.com/id/article/53ge4b/sosok-di-balik-lebahganteng-penerjemah-subtitle-kesohor-dunia-maya-angkat-bicara>
- Romero-Fresco, P., & Pérez, J. M. (2015). Accuracy rate in live subtitling: The NER Model. In *Audiovisual Translation in a Global Context* (pp. 28–29). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sibson, P. (2012). Subtitling norms for television: an exploration focussing on extralinguistic cultural references. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(5), 611–613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.660305>
- Wirastama, P. (2018). *Mengenal markas Lebah Ganteng, Pein Akatsuki, dan para penerjemah subtitle*. Medcom. <https://www.medcom.id/hiburan/eksklusif/nN951GRN-mengenal-markas-lebah-ganteng-pein-akatsuki-dan-para-penerjemah-subtitle>