

## **Translatability Assessment of Draft Questionnaire Items**

Steve Dept (cApStAn Linguistic Quality Control)

**Contribution to the Session** “Advancing the field of questionnaire translation - identifying problems, discussing methods, pushing the research agenda. A tribute to Janet Harkness”

**5<sup>th</sup> Conference of the European Survey Research Association (ESRA), Ljubljana, July 16, 2013**

### **Abstract:**

In multilingual surveys, there is a strong trend towards performing more upstream work to reduce the need for downstream corrective action. Along these lines, a new step has been designed and implemented recently, and its output is most promising: newly developed questionnaire items undergo a *Translatability Assessment* before they are finalised and sent to countries for translation/adaptation.

This *Translatability Assessment* consists in submitting draft versions of new items to a pool of experienced linguists covering a broad range of language groups. These experts go through the exercise of producing draft translations of those items. Their translations are not intended for further use, but help them identify and describe the headaches translators will be confronted with. A set of 13 translatability categories is used to report on the potential translation, adaptation and cultural issues identified and, whenever possible, alternative wording is proposed. This new formulation proposes a way to circumvent the problem. In some cases, the linguists suggest inserting a translation note to clarify a given term or expression, or to indicate the type of adaptation that may be necessary.

The translatability report is sent to the item developers, who can take this feedback into account: they have the opportunity to eliminate ambiguities, e.g. Anglo-Saxon idiosyncrasies that may be difficult to render in certain languages, double-barrelled questions, cultural issues or unnecessary complexity. In a nutshell, an attempt is made to fine tune the initial version of the items so that it becomes a translatable source version.

“The success or failure of this ask-the-same-question (ASQ) approach is largely determined by the suitability of the source questions for all the cultures for which versions will be produced” (Harkness, van de Vijver & Johnson, 2003).

“Development procedures for source questions must therefore ensure that the questions selected are understood similarly in the various languages and locations of the study.” (Harkness, Edwards, Hansen, Miller & Villar, 2010).

Professor Harkness relentlessly insisted on how important it is to craft questionnaire items carefully before they serve as a basis for adaptation into multiple languages. Her holistic approach contributed to raise awareness of questionnaire localisation issues in item writers and, as a consequence, their scope of work has extended: it now routinely includes drafting translation/adaptation notes in the form of item per item guidelines. However, item writers may not always be in a position to identify some of the hurdles translators will be confronted with. In this paper, a methodology to identify potential translation and adaptation difficulties in (draft) survey items is described. This methodology has been used in three different multilingual, cross-cultural surveys and has yielded information that item writers have found useful to improve the *translatability* of their survey items and to produce targeted adaptation notes.

A data collection instrument written in language A for a target audience proficient in that language, piloted in language A and then reviewed, may still contain, for example, (i) items that are not suitable for use in language B without extensive adaptation; (ii) items that are idiomatic for language A and difficult to translate into language B; (iii) items that are difficult to adapt in a particular cultural or language group; (iv) items that are potentially ambiguous when translated; (v) items with redundancies that seem natural in language A but would seem awkward in one or several other languages. Under those conditions, the questionnaire version in language A might be suitable as a *target version* (language version that is ready to be fielded in a territory where language A prevails) but should not, in its current state, be used as *source version* (language version out of which a translation is produced).

One could challenge that item writers who produced the language A version are in the best position to engineer this version so as to make it more suitable for translation into other languages: while the item writers know the underlying construct of each item well, they may not be conversant in more than one or two of the potential target languages into which their items need to be adapted. They

may not have been confronted with adaptation difficulties that are typical to survey items AND typical to e.g. Slavonic languages, and it is quite natural that they could not have anticipated them. This is partly due to the fact that item writing practices initiated in English (and for English speakers) 30 to 40 years ago are still predominant. Our experience is that items exclusively written - or extensively reviewed - by native English speakers tend to be less fit for the purpose of adaptation into multiple languages than items in which due consideration is given to adaptability, preferably a reviewing team that represents several language groups. Note that a good *source version* in English language may require substantial adaptation for use in e.g. Australia, Canada, India, Ireland, Singapore, South Africa or the United States.

Linguists who have acquired experience in questionnaire adaptation or in documenting cross-linguistic equivalence problems may be better equipped to detect potential issues at an early stage i.e. before the draft items become a *source version*. In line with the current trend of performing more upstream work in multilingual comparative research – and with the expectation that this may reduce the need for downstream corrective action, an experimental step has been introduced in the *source* questionnaire design of three multilingual surveys<sup>1</sup>: newly developed questionnaire items underwent a *Translatability Assessment* before they were finalised and released for adaptation into multiple languages. This step aimed to combine linguists' expertise with that of item developers in a collaborative effort to bridge the gap between a draft item written in the source language and an actual *source version* of that item, suitable for translation/adaptation.

A *Translatability Assessment* consists in submitting draft versions of new items to a pool of experienced linguists covering a broad range of the target language groups. If the survey is to be administered in Latin-America and South-East Asia, for example, one might have two Spanish linguists (one from a country in Central America and one from a country in the Cono Sur), a Portuguese (Brazilian), a Chinese, a Vietnamese and an Indonesian linguist. For a survey with worldwide coverage, one might select a panel covering Arabic, Chinese, a Bantu language, a Romance language, a Germanic language and a Turkic language, for example. These linguists go through the exercise of producing advance translations of the items. To keep the operation cost-efficient, only one or two linguists produce an advance translation of each item, and the others

---

<sup>1</sup>All newly developed items for (i) OECD's PISA 2015 School, Student, Teacher and Parent Questionnaires; and (ii) Pew Research Center's 2013 spring edition of the Global Attitudes Project went through a Translatability Assessment; similarly, 1058 existing items from ETS' Tailored Adaptive Psychological Assessment System (TAPAS) went through a Translatability Assessment before being released for Translation. So the experiment was carried out with one educational survey, one attitudinal survey and one psychological assessment.

translate the items mentally and write down their translation only for those items that do not seem straightforward to translate or adapt. It should be noted that these advance translations are drafts that are not intended for further use. While they can be annexed to the translatability report for documentation purposes, they are not translations that meet professional standards. Much rather, these advance translations are a step that helps contributors identify and describe the headaches translators will be confronted with at a later stage.

A set of 13 *translatability categories* (see Annex 1) is used to report the translation, adaptation and cultural issues identified: for each entry, the linguists either select the category “Straightforward” if they see no potential hurdle in translating the item, or select one of the other 12 categories and (i) describe the problem; (ii) if possible, volunteer a solution.

In some cases, the proposed solution might be to insert a *translation* or *adaptation note*. A *translation note* clarifies the meaning of the source segment to put translators on the right track. In Figure 1 below, for example, the source version uses the word “rattled”, which is idiomatic and may be difficult to render in some languages. The linguists have proposed a translation note: “to get rattled” can be rendered as e.g. “to lose one’s nerve, to get upset”.

**Figure 1 – Translation Note in a Translatability Report.**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
I sometimes get rattled in stressful situations, but that's not the norm.	POTENTIAL ISSUES	"rattled" is idiomatic	<b>Add a translation note:</b> "to get rattled" can be rendered as e.g. "to lose one's nerve, to get upset".

Advance translation is also helpful in identifying which adaptations might be necessary. An adaptation note acknowledges that an intentional deviation from the source may be necessary to obtain or maintain functional equivalence between the target version and the source version, and possibly gives advice about the scope of adaptation. Typically, the adaptation note is suggested by experts in the target culture and language, but finalised by the item writers. In Figure 2 below, the statement “Foreigners tend to irritate me” is an item taken from of an instrument that is to be used in very different cultures. The perception of “foreigners” will presumably be different in a country that accommodates a large population of migrants versus a country that is largely dependent on tourism, for example. In the Translatability Report, the suggestion was made to insert an adaptation note to that effect.

**Figure 2 – Adaptation Note in a Translatability Report.**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
Foreigners tend to irritate me.	POTENTIAL CULTURAL ISSUE	The perception of "foreigner" will greatly vary from one culture to the next e.g. it may depend on immigration and integration patterns in one country and on tourism industry in another country. Likeability of such an item may also vary greatly depending on a number of non-psychological factors.	Add an adaptation note: "foreigners" refers to people from foreign countries, whether they are tourists or have settled in your country. Please keep the translation as general as possible, so that it does not refer to a given group of people from a given origin.

Once the individual reports come in from the linguists involved, their feedback is centralised and analyzed by one or several senior linguists with expertise in linguistic quality assurance designs for data collection instruments. The comments are collated, filtered and edited. Insofar as possible, alternative wording is proposed for problematic items. This wording does not “improve” the draft item but offers a solution to circumvent the potential translation or adaptation issue detected. It is the item writers’ responsibility to consider the proposed wording, to adopt or edit it, perhaps to reject it and either come up with a new solution or draft an adaptation note, or, in some cases, to drop the question from the item pool.

The linguists performing the Translatability Assessment may only have a partial picture, and provide advice from their perspective. One of the tasks of the senior linguist who collates and edits the contributors’ feedback is to check whether issues reported may be generalised to other language groups, or at least whether they could apply to several languages of the same group. When a given item raises concerns for two or more of the language groups examined, the linguist who produces the consolidated Translatability Report will indicate that the potential threat is compounded. He might then decide to use the “Requires Review” category, which has the definition: *The current source version of this segment is not suitable for translation/adaptation and needs to be edited before submitting for translation/adaptation.* Figure 3 shows an example of such a case, where an item that seems straightforward in English contains an idiomatic expression that gives rise to translation difficulties in several languages.

**Figure 3 – Use of the translatability category “Requires Review”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
It takes a lot more to get me depressed than most people.	REQUIRES REVIEW	"It takes a lot more" idiomatic expression in English (4 linguists have found this difficult to translate)	What might make most others depressed would not be enough to make me depressed.

If frequency or quantity markers are present in both the item stem and the response categories, for example, respondents are likely to be confusing in most languages. “Does your school have a high rate of truancy?” with response categories *Not at all, very little, to some extent, A lot* is a case of an item that requires review, merely because it would be awkward to respond that the school has *very little* of a *high rate* of truancy.

Conversely, some of the issues reported may be specific to one language or one language group and may be problems that professional translators are already acquainted with. These may be of less interest to item writers. A category was created for such cases: “Known difficulty, known workarounds”, with the following definition: *A translation/adaptation difficulty has been recognised in this segment and has been encountered in the past. Satisfactory solutions to this issue have been successfully implemented.* When this translatability category has been selected, it is often unnecessary to amend the source items. In the example shown in Figure 4 below, the response category “never or rarely” is reported to cause a known translation difficulty in Korean: “Never” cannot be translated without addition of a verb and, once this verb has been added, it is necessary to check grammatical agreement between the verb used in the items and the response category. Questions with ‘never’ + a verb have been widely used in Korea, so the source does not need to take this problem into consideration.

**Figure 4 – Use of the translatability category “Known difficulty, known workarounds”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS alter
Always or almost always	STRAIGHTFORWARD		
Often	STRAIGHTFORWARD		
Sometimes	STRAIGHTFORWARD		
Never or rarely	KNOWN DIFFICULTY, KNOWN WORKAROUNDS	Korean - "never" cannot be translated without addition of a verb, and grammatical match with rb in items must be checked.	
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">           STRAIGHTFORWARD  <b>KNOWN DIFFICULTY, KNOWN WORKAROUNDS</b>            POTENTIAL ISSUES            POTENTIALLY AMBIGUOUS            UNNECESSARILY COMPLEX            REQUIRES REVIEW            POTENTIAL CULTURAL ISSUE            DOUBLE-BARRELLED         </div>		

In the consolidated translatability report, it can be expected that a majority of items might be reported as “Straightforward” to translate, which means *No potential translation or adaptation problems identified during the advance translation of this segment into languages from at least two language groups.*

The translatability category “Potential Issues” is quite general and functions as a bit of a catch-all category. Its definition covers a broad scope of potential adaptation problems: *The current wording or content of this segment is likely to give rise to translation or adaptation problems in some languages, to the extent that functional equivalence may be difficult to achieve.* This can refer to a problem due to a lexical choice. When idiomatic formulation is at the expense of universality, simpler wording can be proposed: For the statement “When children [...] grow up, do you think they will be *better off* or *worse off* than their parents?” the alternative formulation proposed in the translatability report was “do you think they will have *a better financial situation* or *a worse financial situation* than their parents?”.

Problems reported a “Potential Issues” might include cases where the semantic distance between response categories is blurred, such as in “Not at all, very little, some, quite a bit, very much”: translators may be at a loss to gauge the distance between ‘some’ and ‘quite a bit’; or overlaps in response categories such as in the time scale: “up to three times a week, once a week”.

In the example in Figure 5 below, the item for which the issue is reported is one of the statements with which a respondent is expected to agree or disagree (Likert scale). The presence of a negative frequency qualifier (“not often”) in the item makes the disagreement part of the scale difficult to use. As a general rule, explicit and implicit double negations may confuse translators (and respondents) and should be avoided. For instance, to “*Learning a foreign language would not be easy for me*”, with an agreement scale, it would be awkward to respond “*I disagree that is would not be easy*”.

**Figure 5 – Use of the translatability category “Potential Issues”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS (including suggestions for alternative wording)
Other school activities do not often interfere with basic skills (reading and maths) instruction in this school.	POTENTIAL ISSUES	It is difficult to express agreement or disagreement when there is a negative frequency qualifier ("not often") in a statement.	Other school activities do not interfere with basic skills (reading and maths) instruction in this school.

The category “Potentially Ambiguous” is more precise and has proven extremely useful. The definition is unambiguous: *The current wording or content of this segment could be interpreted in more than one way and it is desirable to disambiguate the source version of this segment before submitting it for translation/adaptation.*

In the example shown in Figure 6, there are two possible interpretations of the relatively simple statement “I can solve my problems on digital devices myself”, and this ambiguity was detected in the process of producing a draft translation.

**Figure 6 – Use of the translatability category “Potentially Ambiguous”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS (including suggestions for alternative wording)
I can solve my problems on digital devices myself.	POTENTIALLY AMBIGUOUS	The sentence seems straightforward, but in fact it is unclear whether the respondent knows how to use digital devices to solve his/her problems, or whether the respondent knows how to solve problems related to the digital devices s/he is using.	When I have problems with digital devices, I can solve them myself. OR I can use digital devices to solve my problems by myself.

It may occur that an item is written in a complex way that may sound natural in the source but is nevertheless somewhat contorted, thus creating difficulties for translators. This can be due to a complex syntax, e.g. with an interrogative clause embedded in a question, which is difficult to transpose in a way that ensures functional equivalence: “Which of the following factors determine whether trainees are admitted or not...” The complexity may also occur at word level: some English words and expressions used in questionnaires are known to give translators headaches: “How would you characterize each of the following?” is a known example. In these cases, the category “Unnecessarily complex” is used. Linguists are advised to use this category if they see a way of simplifying the source without loss of meaning: *The current wording or syntax of this segment is somewhat contorted, for example due to use of several clauses, questions embedded in questions or unnecessary use of passive voice. The source version can be simplified without loss of meaning.* In the example shown in Figure 7, the translatability report contains a proposal to simplify the item:

**Figure 7 – Use of the translatability category “Unnecessarily Complex”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
Who should bear the greatest responsibility for people's economic wellbeing in their old age – their families, the government or themselves?	UNNECESSARILY COMPLEX	since "in one's old age" refers to "being old", the sentence could be phrased in a different way that would be easier to translate	Who should bear the greatest responsibility for economic wellbeing of old people – their families, the government or themselves?

The “Potential Cultural Issue” category, used when *the semantic content of a segment may be difficult to adapt for a particular cultural or language group*, is of particular interest for



international survey researchers, because it is often difficult for item developers to anticipate cultural issues when they craft the questions. In the example in Figure 8, a simple statement that refers to handshakes and hugs is likely to be culturally biased due to very different patterns of body language across cultures. The Translatability Report proposes to insert an adaptation note.

**Figure 8 – Use of the translatability category “Potential Cultural Issue”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
I don't mind handshakes, but a hug from a casual acquaintance is a bit too much for me.	POTENTIAL CULTURAL ISSUE	body language has a very different cultural load. In a number of Middle-East countries, a woman should not accept a handshake from a man. A hug is far more unusual in China than in Chile. This item may require adaptation.	<b>Add an adaptation note:</b> If handshakes are not widely used between e.g. peers and friends and/or if hugs are not part of your culture, try to adapt to two gradations of body language whereby the first is suitable for most informal contacts and the second can (but isn't always) regarded as something that is reserved to very close friends.

The category dubbed “Double-barrelled” is used to report cases where *a question touches upon more than one issue, yet allows only for one answer. Many double-barrelled questions can be detected by the existence of the grammatical conjunction “and” in them.* In an item from the European Social Survey, a question read “*If a violent crime or house burglary were to occur [...] how quickly do you think the police would arrive [...]?*” This is a double-barrelled question because, depending on the country, the police may react differently in the case of a violent crime. The example in Figure 9 is perhaps rather subtle, but it was picked up by two of the linguists working on the Translatability Assessment. This was a question to parents of students in secondary education, and the atmosphere of the school is described from the parents’ perspective, using two adjectives.

**Figure 9 – Use of the translatability category “Double-barrelled”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS (including suggestions for alternative wording)
My child's school provides an inviting and accepting atmosphere for parents to get involved.	DOUBLE-BARRELLED	"inviting and accepting" are overlapping adjectives that point to 'tolerance' (interpreted differently in multicultural versus monocultural environments), whereas 'inviting' by itself is overarching.	<b>My child's school provides an inviting atmosphere for parents to get involved.</b>

“Agreement issue” is used when *there is either an agreement issue within the segment (e.g. subject-verb agreement, or sequence of tenses, or a pronoun-antecedent agreement) or an agreement issue between two segments (e.g. no grammatical match between a question and response options).* In the example in Figure 10 below, the question is “Which of the following policies regarding grade retention are implemented in your school?” This question is followed by a set of statements, and

there are Yes/No radio buttons next to each statement. The reviewer proposes to reword the question so that it works better with *Yes* and *No*:

**Figure 10 – Use of the translatability category “Agreement Issue”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS (including suggestions for alternative wording)
Which of the following policies regarding grade retention are implemented in your school?	AGREEMENT ISSUE	This is yes-no question. Consider changing "Which of the following...are..." to "Are the following..."	Are the following policies regarding grade retention implemented in your school?

The definition of the “Consistency” category reads *In this segment, a different term, expression or form of address has been used versus other occurrences of similar content; and this inconsistency seems to be unintentional.* The scope of this category may seem limited, yet this is an important point, often overlooked when questionnaire items are written by different item developers who use different words to refer to a same concept. Even if these different terms are synonyms in the source language, the translated/adapted version could end up referring to two different concepts.

There is a separate category for unnecessary repetitions, the “Redundancy” category, with the definition *This segment contains a tautology or unnecessary repetition. Removing it would not alter the meaning of the segment,* as in the case presented in Figure 11: “I prefer eating fat-free foods” may sound natural in English, but ‘eating foods’ could be an obvious tautology in Indonesian. Since removing the verb “eating” would not affect the semantic content of the statement, the linguist indicated this as a redundancy. Another linguist chose to report this as a “Logical problem” i.e. he found that *This segment contains a logical problem or there is a logical problem between this segment and another segment, and this issue seems to be unintentional.*

**Figure 11 – Use of the translatability categories “Logical Problem” and “Redundancy”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
I prefer eating light or fat-free foods and drinks.	LOGICAL PROBLEM	Only the verb "eating" was used in this sentence although there were also drinks mentioned. In ESP this would not sound right. Additionally, "fat-free" should be linked with foods, and "light" with drinks.	I prefer fat-free foods and light drinks.
	REDUNDANCY	food is always the object of eating. "Eating foods" would be redundant in Indonesian: it would translate in repeated identical words.	

The set of translatability categories is a framework that helps linguists formulate their comments when reporting a potential translation or adaptation issue. If two different linguists report a problem in the same item, it is a good indicator that the source could benefit from a revision, and whether the linguists have actually used the most appropriate category to report the issue may not be of paramount importance. The senior linguist who prepares the consolidated Translatability Report will make choices when collating the feedback; and these choices will be directed at alerting the item writers to any potential issue that can probably be avoided by tinkering with the wording.

The example presented in Figure 12 contains a clear-cut logical problem, whereas the most appropriate category for the example in Figure 11 would be either “Redundancy” or perhaps “Agreement Issue”. The logical problem points at a source version that is unlikely to succeed in measuring what it intends to measure. It is used rarely, because linguists are aware that they do not have the necessary background to judge whether the item works well to capture data. Their opinion on the way the source item is written should mainly be based on the translation/adaptation hurdles and pitfalls that translators might expect.

**Figure 12 – Use of the translatability category “Logical Problem”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS (including suggestions for alternative wording)
I am more afraid of breaking new technologies than using them in the right way.	LOGICAL PROBLEM	This item has a logical problem: why should the respondent be afraid of using technologies the right way?	I usually fear that I will break new technological devices rather than use them in the right way.

Finally, there is a category to report the need to enhance an item, to clarify its meaning through addition of a piece of information that is only implicit in the original source version. The definition of this category is *The current wording or syntax of this segment is elliptic or unclear, and its implicit meaning is likely to get lost in translation. This could be solved by adding a word or a piece of information.* In some instances, an overlap with the category “Potentially ambiguous” has been observed. In the example below, it can be inferred from the context that the statement “If *people* listened to their parents more often, they would have less problems” refers to *young* people. In such a case, it is desirable – provided that the item writers confirm that this would not alter the intended meaning – to eliminate the need for translators to infer from the context. The addition of “young” to “young people” will solve this neatly, with minimal change to the item.

**Figure 13 – Use of the translatability category “Possible Addition”**

English	Translatability Evaluation	LINGUIST'S COMMENT	SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORDING
If people listened to their parents more often, they would have less problems.	POSSIBLE ADDITION	As a translator, I would be inclined to qualify this statement by adding the word 'young'. Is this about teenagers not listening their parents?	If young people listened to their parents more often, they would have less problems.

This overview is illustrative rather than comprehensive. The focus should be on aspects that need to be taken into consideration to remove ambiguities from the source and develop a data collection instrument that lends itself well to adaptation in multiple languages. In multilingual surveys, item writers should strive to produce source versions that serve as a base for adaptation rather than simply use versions that (i) are known to work well in an Anglo-Saxon context; (ii) or are written in English as a lingua franca that is not necessarily the item writers’ first or even second language, and then reviewed and edited by native English speakers.

Large-scale international surveys and assessments have produced a wealth of data, which has been thoroughly analysed by researchers in a variety of disciplines, including linguists. Cumulative knowledge about efficacy of translation and adaptation designs began making its way into the literature. Linguistic quality assurance and quality control in multilingual data collections has become a field of expertise in its own right.

If a robust linguistic quality assurance design is implemented, potential country/item or language/item interactions due to meaning shifts – which mainly depend on language – or perception shifts, which mainly depend on culture, can often be identified before the instruments are finalised; and appropriate action can be taken before the survey is adapted into multiple. The upfront cost of a Translatability Assessment is surprisingly low with regard to the benefits in terms of functional equivalence across language versions. This also functions as an additional upstream revision, which contributes to reducing errata further down the line.

For further discussion or questions related to this paper: [steve.dept@capstan.be](mailto:steve.dept@capstan.be)

## References:

- Alcser, K., Kirgis, N. and Guyer, H. (2008), Adapting U.S.-based general interviewing and study-specific training protocols for cross-national survey data collection. Presented at the International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts, Berlin.
- Behr, D., Harkness, J., Fitzgerald, R. & Widdop, S. (2008). ESS Round 4 questionnaire and translation queries. London: European Social Survey, Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University
- Brislin, R., Lonner, W. J. and Thorndike, R. M. (1973), Questionnaire wording and translation. In: Brislin, R., Lonner, W. J. and Thorndike, R. M. (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp 32-58.
- Dept, S., Ferrari, A. and Wäyrynen, L. (2010), Developments in Translation Verification Procedures in Three Multilingual Assessments: A Plea for an Integrated Translation and Adaptation Monitoring Tool. In Harkness, J. et al (eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp 157-173.
- Hambleton, R.K, Merenda, P.F. and Spielberger, C.D., Eds (2005), *Adapting Educational and Psychological Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment*. Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ:
- Harkness, J. (2007). Improving the comparability of translations. In: Jowell, R., Roberts, C., Fitzgerald, R. & Eva, G. (eds.), *Measuring Attitudes Cross-Nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey*. Sage, Los Angeles, pp. 79-93.
- Harkness, J., Edwards, B., Hansen, S. E., Miller, D. and Villar, A. (2010), Designing Questionnaires for Multipopulation Research. In Harkness, J. et al (eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp 33-57.
- Harkness, J., Pennell, B.-E. and Schoua-Glusberg, A. (2004). Survey Questionnaire Translation and Assessment. In: Presser, S., Rothgeb, J., Couper, M., Lessler, J., Martin, E., and Singer, E. (eds.), *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Harkness, J., van de Vijver, F. J. R. and Johnson, T. P. (2003). Questionnaire design in comparative research. In: Harkness, J., van de Vijver, F. J. R. and Mohler, P. Ph. (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp. 19-34
- Harkness, J., Villar, A. and Edwards, B. (2010), Translation, Adaptation and Design. In Harkness, J. et al (eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp 117-140.
- Kleiner, B., Pan, Y. & Bouic, J. (2009). The Impact of Instructions on Survey Translation: An Experimental Study. In: *Survey Research Methods*, **3**, 3, pp. 113-122.
- Marsella, A. J. & Leong, F. T. (1995). Cross-cultural issues in personality and career assessment. In: *Journal of Career Assessment*, **3**(2), pp. 202-218
- Schulz, W. (2009). Questionnaire construct validation in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. *IERI Monograph Series, Volume 2*, 113-135.
- Willis, G., Stapleton Kudela, M., Levin, K., Norberg, A. et al (2010), Evaluation of a Multistep Survey Translation Process. In: Harkness, J. et al (eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, pp 141-156.

## ANNEX 1 – cApStAn’s Translatability Categories

<b>STRAIGHTFORWARD</b>	No potential translation or adaptation problems identified during the advance translation of this segment into languages from at least two language groups.
<b>KNOWN DIFFICULTY, KNOWN WORKAROUNDS</b>	A translation/adaptation difficulty has been recognised in this segment and has been encountered in the past. Satisfactory solutions to this issue have been successfully implemented.
<b>POTENTIAL ISSUES</b>	The current wording or content of this segment is likely to give rise to translation or adaptation problems in some languages, to the extent that functional equivalence may be difficult to achieve.
<b>POTENTIALLY AMBIGUOUS</b>	The current wording or content of this segment could be interpreted in more than one way and it is desirable to disambiguate the source version of this segment before submitting it for translation/adaptation.
<b>UNNECESSARILY COMPLEX</b>	The current wording or syntax of this segment is somewhat contorted, for example due to use of several clauses, questions embedded in questions or unnecessary use of passive voice. The source version can be simplified without loss of meaning.
<b>REQUIRES REVIEW</b>	The current source version of this segment is not suitable for translation/adaptation and needs to be edited before submitting for translation/adaptation.
<b>POTENTIAL CULTURAL ISSUE</b>	The semantic content of this segment may be difficult to adapt in a particular cultural or language group.
<b>DOUBLE-BARRELLED</b>	A question touches upon more than one issue, yet allows only for one answer. Many double-barrelled questions can be detected by the existence of the grammatical conjunction “and” in them.
<b>AGREEMENT ISSUE</b>	There is either an agreement issue within the segment (e.g. subject-verb agreement, or sequence of tenses, or a pronoun-antecedent agreement) or an agreement issue between two segments (e.g. no grammatical match between a question and response options).
<b>CONSISTENCY</b>	In this segment, a different term, expression or form of address has been used versus other occurrences of similar content; and this inconsistency seems to be unintentional.
<b>REDUNDANCY</b>	This segment contains a tautology or unnecessary repetition. Removing it would not alter the meaning of the segment.
<b>POSSIBLE ADDITION</b>	The current wording or syntax of this segment is elliptic or unclear, and its implicit meaning is likely to get lost in translation. This could be solved by adding a word or a piece of information.
<b>LOGICAL PROBLEM</b>	This segment contains a logical problem or there is a logical problem between this segment and another segment, and this issue seems to be unintentional.