Leibniz Institute
for the Social Sciences

Documenting Survey Translation

Dorothée Behr, Anouk Zabal

Februar 2021, Version 1.1

Abstract

Survey documentation is an integral part of methodically sound survey research. These guidelines aim at providing the persons coordinating survey translations (e.g., researchers responsible for survey translation in a larger study, or those wishing to translate and adapt an existing instrument for their own research) with a framework within which they can plan and document survey translations both for internal as well as for external purposes (publications or technical reports). It summarizes different aspects of translation documentation and reviews elements to be included in such a documentation.

Citation

Behr, D., & Zabal, A. (2020). Documenting Survey Translation. Mannheim, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (GESIS- Survey Guidelines).

DOI: 10.15465/gesis-sg_en_035

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for the helpful comments and suggestions we received from Dr. Brita Dorer and Prof. Michael Braun (both: GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences).

1 Introduction

Survey documentation in general provides the basis for internal quality assurance and monitoring at all stages of the survey life cycle. Furthermore, it informs external data users and other researchers about the survey design and implementation, allowing them to independently assess the set-up, procedures, and quality of the study. This information can be taken into account during data analysis or may be useful in developing new study designs (P. P. Mohler et al., 2010).

The two-fold use of documentation also applies to translation documentation, which is an essential element of the TRAPD translation model (J. Harkness, 2003), one of the most widely acknowledged frameworks for best practice in survey translation. TRAPD stands for Translation, Review, Adjudication, Pretest, and Documentation. In a nutshell, according to TRAPD, two translations are produced independently from each other (T).[1] During the review step, a reviewer meets with the translators to reconcile these translations (R). During the adjudication step, final decisions are made (A). Pretesting – qualitative and/or quantitative – serves to empirically test the questionnaire with members of the target population (P). Documentation of various translation-related aspects (D) is addressed in this document. More information on TRAPD can be found in the GESIS Survey Guideline “Measurements in Cross-National Surveys” (Behr, Braun, & Dorer, 2016), in the translation section of the Cross-Cultural Survey Guidelines (P. Mohler, Dorer, Jong, & Hu, 2016) or in the translation guidelines of the European Social Survey (ESS (European Social Survey), 2018).[2]

Translation documentation can occur at different levels. In the following, we want to differentiate three basic levels (based on Behr, Dept, & Krajčeva, 2019):

- **input documentation**: instructions and guidelines provided to translation teams before translation [see section 2];
- **documentation of the translation method**: translation method, incl. translation personnel and quality control [see section 3];
- **output documentation**: final translation product and comments on this (e.g., on problems or adaptations); various intermediate versions leading up to the final product and comments on these; also called translation process documentation [see section 4].

This guideline document aims at providing the persons coordinating survey translations (e.g., researchers responsible for survey translation in a larger study, or those wishing to translate and adapt an existing instrument for their own research)[3] with a framework within which they can plan and document survey translations both for internal as well as for external purposes (publications or technical reports). It summarizes different aspects of translation documentation and reviews elements to be included in such a documentation. To date, detailed information, in particular on the translation method used in comparative studies, is often missing in published research, thus depriving secondary researchers of crucial information with which to assess the quality of instrument translations (Rios & Sireci, 2014).

If the translation documentation is to be shared with a wider audience, please note that it should be written in English (or another common reference language) in order to be understood by international researchers, data users, etc.

One note with respect to terminology: Different disciplines, different studies, and different scholars make use of their own terminology related to translation methods, which can sometimes be used interchange-

[1] Multiple or even split translations may be produced, but typically two translations are the norm.
[2] More information on characteristics of good translations can be found in Behr (2018) or ESS (European Social Survey) (2018)
[3] Different studies use different terms for those responsible for survey translation: coordinator, manager, lead, etc.

ably and sometimes not. We do our best in this document to find a common language and, in case of doubt, explain what we mean by specific terms.

2 Input Documentation

Input documentation includes everything that is fed into the translation process by translation coordinators, who are ideally supported by questionnaire developers. Translators do not translate in a vacuum but must understand the specific survey context and be aware of the general objectives of the survey and of essential parameters of the data collection method (e.g. whether the question is to be read out loud by an interviewer or read online by the respondents themselves).

Translation input documentation may include a wide variety of material, ranging from translation standards and specific item instructions to additional material that may be useful either in preparing for or during translation itself. In international surveys, this material is typically produced by the international coordinating unit.[4] For one's own research project (e.g. the adaptation of a personality scale), researchers may need to establish and produce the pertinent information themselves, if possible integrating input from questionnaire developers. Table 1 provides an overview of typical types of input documentation. However, not all of these need to be provided. For instance, comprehensive translation guidelines, which are often produced for larger surveys, make briefing documents superfluous.

Table 1: Typical Translation Input Documentation

Documentation type	Specification	Examples
Briefing document	Outlines the most important aspects of the survey needed to make appropriate translation decisions in line with the study goal.	See Appendix A
General translation guideline	Provides comprehensive information on requirements and particularities of a (larger) specific study. All participating countries/study partners are provided with the same input information, maximizing standardization (translation is carried out following the same principles). Ensures the comparability of data across countries and/or languages. National additions to these guidelines (if desired) could, for example, include instructions on gendering (addressing male or female respondents) or style requirements.	Translation guidelines of the European Social Survey[5] or European Values Study[6]

[4]International material may be enhanced by national specifications specific to culture or language.

[5]https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/round9/methods/ESS9_translation_guidelines.pdf (Accessed 13 May, 2020)

[6]https://europeanvaluesstudy.eu/methodology-data-documentation/survey-2017/pre-release-evs-2017/documentation-survey-2017/ (Accessed 13 May, 2020)

Documentation type	Specification	Examples
Item-specific guides[7]	Item-level instructions and explanations to inform translation of specific items/questions (e.g. on concept, adaptation[8] requirements, meaning of key terms). Ensures correct interpretation of concept or wording in source version.	See source questionnaires of European Social Survey[9] (ESS) or International Social Survey Programme[10] (ISSP) (see also Behr & Scholz, 2011; Hall et al., 2018; Wild et al., 2005)
Reference and further material	Additional material to support translators in translating according to known and pre-predefined needs.	Glossaries (e.g. bilingual word lists, possibly enriched with definitions), style guides (e.g. on gendering requirements), quality assurance check lists, existing translations from the same survey to provide context for new items, comparable translations from other studies, similar items from national surveys, instructions on translation tools, FAQs of translation queries, etc.
Translation training material	Training packages to introduce translators to the survey, translation methods, and translation software (in-person or web modules)	Component offered by the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC).

3 Documentation of Translation Method

The documentation of the translation method summarizes how a particular language version was produced. It includes details on source and target languages, outlines the translation and review steps, qualifications of key translation personnel, and measures of quality control (see also checklist in Appendix B). Information on methods are indicative of the quality of a translation, following the logic that sound methods, together with professional and experienced personnel, determine the quality of a product (Behr, 2009). Translation methods should be documented in technical reports and/or scientific publications and be thus available for external data users. However, *project-internal* documentation is indispensable to adhere to sound scientific practices.

Table 2: Documentation of Translation Method

Key information	Specification	Examples
Source language / source culture	Document *language* and *culture* of *source* questionnaire to indicate how it is rooted in a given language/culture.	e.g. English/UK; French/Canada
Target language / target culture	Besides *target language*, document *target culture* of recipient group since terminology and grammar are often country-specific.	e.g. French/Canada; Arabic/Syria; Spanish/harmonized for Spanish-speakers in US

[7] Also called annotations or item-by-item guides.

[8] Adaptations are understood here as deliberate changes to an instrument in order for it to be suitable for a different context (see also Behr & Shishido, 2016; Harkness, Villar, & Edwards, 2010).

[9] https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/round-index.html (Accessed 13 May, 2020)

[10] https://www.gesis.org/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-year (Accessed 13 May, 2020)

Material/workload	Document the type and number of instruments to be translated in a study. The objective is to specify the translation task and, if possible, provide an indication of the translation volume and overall workload in a study/among translators. May include word count or number of items.	"Items were taken from the JCQ [Karasek et al., 1998] and the Quality of Work Life module in the General Social Survey [Murphy, 2002]." (Fujishiro et al., 2010) "The translation reconciliation sessions lasted a total of 21 hours. In that amount of time, they discussed question by question the 503 pages of text (many questions did not require discussion as they were almost identical to others already reviewed)." (Martinez, Marín, & Schoua-Glusberg, 2006, p. 534)
Step	**Specification**	**Examples**
Translation[11]	Document the number of independent translations to indicate the range of options going into the next phase. *Double (or parallel) translation* is regarded as best practice since it shows divergent interpretations and offers variants to choose from (multiple translations are also possible). *Split translation* relies on splitting up a questionnaire among two or more translators, giving each a subsection (on the same topic) to translate. Saves time and money, but still ensures involvement of several translators if these take part in a review meeting (see below, review personnel). *Single translation* is done by one individual. *Adaptation* uses, as the basis, the version from another country and tailors it to the cultural and linguistic particularities of the target country.[12]	"Following the ISPOR guideline [62], two persons (MH and MB) independently forward translated the instruments." (Hoben et al., 2013, p. 4) "For the NSFG, RSS used the modified committee approach, in which the original translation was performed by three translators, doing one third of the instrument each, instead of three whole independent translations [. . .]." (Martinez et al., 2006, p. 533) "Create a translation for Spain. Provide the translators for the other three target countries [e.g. Argentina] with the Spanish-Spain translation and ask translators to adapt it for each of their target countries." (Wild et al, 2009, p. 434)
Review[13]	Document reviewing procedures to give indications of objectivity, sharing of expertise, and overall quality. Reviewing procedures may be carried out by an *individual*; by *different individuals in subsequent steps*; by a *team*. A team review ensures a balanced view of critiques. Different reviews may be combined in a *multi-step review*, where the last review is typically used to sign off a translation. (The sign-off step may also be called "adjudication".)	"Second, an alignment meeting was held where psychological experts, the two translators, and an expert in questionnaire translation reviewed the various translation proposals and developed the final translation." (Nießen, Partsch, Kemper, & Rammstedt, 2019). "Forward translations were synthesised into one German version by the project leader." (Schuster, McCaskey, & Ettlin, 2013, p. 3)

[11] In processes where back translation (i.e. the re-translation of a translation back into the original language) is employed, this step is also called forward translation (Eremenco et al., 2018; Wild et al., 2005).

[12] Sometimes also called "harmonization."

[13] Also called "reconciliation" if two or more translations are merged.

Harmonization	Document harmonization procedures to indicate consideration of comparability needs on a larger scale (if applicable). *Same-language harmonization* includes different degrees of cooperation (e.g. joint review meetings) between countries with a common language, e.g. Portuguese for Portugal and Brazil; *harmonization within a country* refers to cooperation and finetuning within a country, e.g. for German, French, and Italian in Switzerland; *international harmonization* refers to steps undertaken to ensure comparability between all language versions in a study (e.g. through joint discussions or FAQ lists distributed among all country teams).	"The committee that worked on the NSFG translations included translators who are native speakers of some of the main varieties of Spanish spoken by the Hispanic population in the United States (one Mexican, one Puerto Rican, and one Peruvian)." (Martinez et al., 2006, p. 534).
Pretesting	Document pretesting activities to indicate validation procedures among the target population. Should include information on the type of pretest (e.g. cognitive interviewing, quantitative pilot study), mode, sample size, outcome regarding translation quality.	"We planned to conduct nine cognitive interviews to test the Chinese translation, nine cognitive interviews to test the Korean translation, and nine cognitive interviews to test the Vietnamese translation. As described below, we later conducted an additional round of five cognitive interviews to test a second revision of the Vietnamese-language translation." (Forsyth et al., 2007, p. 272) "To be sure *STD* or *sexually transmitted disease* would be properly understood, interviewees were asked in Spanish, "What is a sexually transmitted disease?" and "What is a venereal disease?" It was clear from responses (something you get from "sexual contagion," "AIDS," "gonorrhea") that respondents understood *enfermedades de transmisión sexual* and did not need any reference to *enfermedades venéreas*, an older term more charged with negative connotations." (Martinez et al., 2006, p. 538)
Other (quality control)	Document further procedures to cover all steps implemented in a translation endeavor, such as back translation(s), back translation comparison, external quality control, and proof-reading (and who produced each of these steps).	"In step six, finalisation of the test version, the FACIT project manager evaluated the completed reviewer assessments and final translations, and then communicated any remaining or new concerns to the reviewer/language coordinator. The resolution resulted in a test version that was formatted into the instrument and then proofread for final grammatical, spelling and formatting errors by the reviewer/language coordinator and one of the forward translators." (Rask, Oscarsson, & Swahnberg, 2017, p. 3)

Personnel	Specification	Examples
Translation personnel	Document who produced the independent translation(s) to indicate the linguistic and substantive knowledge that was brought to the process. The quality of the translation depends on the qualifications, experience, and skills of those translating. Typical translation personnel include *professional translators* and *subject-matter experts* (the latter often from the research teams but may also be external experts). Mother tongue, relevant (educational) background, and previous experience with translating measurement instruments should be indicated.	"Two translators, both bilingual health professionals working in the field of rheumatology with Dutch as their mother tongue and proficient in English independently produced a forward translation of the 124 items." (Voshaar et al., 2012, p.2) "First, two professional translators (native speakers) translated the items independently of each other into British English and American English, respectively." (Nießen et al., 2019)
Review personnel	Document who was involved in the review step(s) to indicate the linguistic and substantive knowledge that was brought to the process. Typical review personnel include *project lead, translation coordinator, subject-matter experts* (from research teams or external), *questionnaire design experts*, and the *translators* from the initial translations. Mother tongue, relevant (educational) background, experience with translating measurement instruments should be indicated.	"In a two-hour long consensus conference all forward and backward translators, two occupational therapists, an additional physiotherapist, an additional physician, and the project leader reviewed the synthesised forward translated German and the backward translated English version. All healthcare professionals were experts with experiences in the treatment of patients with a WAD." (Schuster et al., 2013, p. 3).

4 Output Documentation

Output documentation refers to all the "products" that are produced during the translation process. A comprehensive translation output (or process) documentation should ideally archive the initial translation(s), interim translation versions produced at subsequent steps, and the final translated version. Furthermore, translation documentation should encompass pertinent details pointed out by translators, reviewers, or other parties involved in the translation process, notably comments on difficulties and noteworthy decisions, dubious translations, and adaptations (Behr et al., 2019; Brislin, 1986). These comments are useful for internally managing and monitoring the ongoing translation process. They also inform data users about the final translation/adaptation output. Such comments draw attention to translations that were not straightforward and easy to produce and may provide an indication of measurement quality and measurement comparability. Moreover, publishing information on translation challenges can help other researchers with their own studies and study documentations (Fujishiro et al., 2010; Martinez, Marín, & Schoua-Glusberg, 2006; Quittner et al., 2000; e.g. Sterie & Bernard, 2019; Van Ommeren et al., 1999; Voshaar, Klooster, Taal, Krishnan, & Laar, 2012).

In repeated surveys (cross-sectional or longitudinal), output documentation should also include changes to existing translations (e.g. correcting erroneous translations and adjusting to evolved language usage or societal change). Furthermore, in these types of surveys, challenges and solutions are not only relevant per se but also important for further waves or rounds of the study. For example, translation documentation is very helpful to new translation teams or even the original translation teams when "trend" items (repeated items) and superficial deviations from the international instrument versions need to be (re-)evaluated in hindsight years later.

Table 3 presents different relevant translation details to be documented by translation teams (translators, reviewers) at the various steps of the translation process.

Table 3: Translation Output Documentation – Comments on Individual Translation Issues or Decisions

Rationale	Specification	Examples
Difficulties / dubious translations / noteworthy decisions	Difficulties experienced during the (initial) translation – may have resulted in lengthy web searches, reflections or discussions, trade-off-decisions	Difficulty: "The greatest challenge was finding an appropriate translation for "ethnic group" that would be understood (in a similar way) by adults with very different backgrounds. [. . .] The translation of "ethnic group" – Herkunftskultur (culture of origin) – that was agreed on during the translation reconciliation process was subsequently tested in a cognitive pretest." (Maehler, Zabal, & Hanke, 2019, p. 249).
	Dubious translations where a (sub-optimal) version was eventually decided on but where at the same time its comprehensibility or general meaningfulness is questioned	Dubious translation: Feedback that it was difficult to translate *'organized learning activity'* in a way that would be comprehensible to respondents. The final German translation translates back as "organized learning" – this was chosen to maintain equivalence with the source, even though the concept is difficult to understand. (internal documentation, PIAAC Consortium, German translation for cognitive pretest)
	Noteworthy decisions that may seem at first sight like a deviation or an error but that are well grounded	Noteworthy decision: "In the English version of IPOS, two items of the physical symptom subscale have explanatory parenthesis: 'nausea (feeling like you are going to be sick)' and 'vomiting (being sick)'. Both translators found that the explanatory brackets could be waived for 'vomiting', as it contains an idiomatic expression which doesn't have an equivalent in French, while the term 'vomiting' (vomir) is frequently used in French and less so in vernacular English [. . .]" (Sterie & Bernard, 2019, p. 4).
Adaptations	Intended deviations (related to culture,[14] measurement, and construct) to make the instrument more suitable for the target context.	Culture: 'Walking around the block': In the Netherlands street patterns are irregularly shaped, unlike in the US where blocks are a central element in urban planning. The item was therefore changed to: 'can you walk 150 meters' (Voshaar et al., 2012). Measurement: "We added 'sehr' ('very') to increase the item difficulty, because otherwise this item appeared to cause a high degree of social desirability" (Bluemke et al., 2020). Construct: "We translated 'working with a group' into 'mit anderen zusammenarbeiten' ('working with others') to include same level *and* hierarchical relationships in cooperations as well as collaborations between two or more people - which is both in accordance with the construct 'Citizenship/Teamwork'". (Bluemke, et al., 2020).

[14] Culture-related adaptation are needed to accommodate differences in norms, values, and practices (norm-driven) as well as

Changes to existing translation		"Term '400-Euro-Job' updated to '450-Euro-Job' due to changes in the limit of tax-free income from 400 to 450" (internal documentation, National Project Management PIAAC Germany). Gendering of language versions (for male and female respondents) due to evolved language use. Report on changes to existing translations in the European Social Survey.[15]

In cross-national or cross-cultural studies, these comments are typically provided in a language that the (national and international) project team and/or future users can understand and may additionally include the corresponding target term or phrase in the target language itself. The comments go beyond a "mere back translation" of a target term by providing the reasons for a certain difficulty, decision or adaptation (see Voshaar et al., 2012).

Please note: Translation is always a decision-making process. To be informative, documentation should not include every single decision but only crucial/difficult ones that will be important to know about during subsequent translation steps or data analysis.

Documenting important obstacles or particularities encountered during translation should be an explicit aspect of the translators' assignment and does require clear instructions and financial compensation for this extra work. Comments from the initial translation are a valuable input for the subsequent review steps and render these more efficient. Other comments may help to earmark items for further queries to developers or for a pretest.

It is generally desirable to have a *summary* documentation on the final translation. If possible, relevant comments on the *final* translation should be economically summarized per item, for example in *one* concluding column in a spreadsheet or as comments in a Word document. The European Social Survey (ESS) provides an example of an Excel with dedicated columns for documentation at each step of the process.[16] If translation software is systematically used, documentation may make use of dedicated comment fields.

An example of a documentation on a *final* scale is provided by Partsch, Behr and Krasnoff (2020; https://osf.io/yz87n/). This documentation refers to the publicly available Values-in-Action (VIA) inventory based on the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP-VIA) and accompanies a research article currently being prepared by Bluemke, Partsch, Saucier, & Lechner (2020, https://osf.io/3mfyw/). Beyond the final translation documentation, Partsch et al. additionally developed a coding scheme that was tested and implemented for the first time with this scale. According to this scheme, challenges in translation or more extensive changes due to cultural, construct, and measurement adaptations are assigned a value. The higher the value, the more extensive the change. Such a documentation can provide those interested in translating/adapting a specific scale with an idea of the degrees of freedom allowed for adaptation, or even an indication of the amount of adaptations that may be required to produce that scale for a new linguistic and cultural context. The same information could also be crucial for instrument developers when it comes to the cross-cultural application of their scales or questionnaires.

in country characteristics (terminological/factual-driven); measurement-related differences are needed to counteract response styles or different familiarity with tasks; construct-related adaptations are needed to better operationalize a construct and improve content validity, regardless of culture (Bluemke, Partsch, Saucier, & Lechner, 2020; Behr & Shishido, 2016).

[15] https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/round5/methods/ESS5_changes_to_existing_translations.pdf (Accessed 20 September, 2020)

[16] https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/methodology/ess/_methodology/translation/translation/_assessment.html (Translation and Verification Follow-up Form can be found on the right-hand side of the webpage.) (Accessed 12 May, 2020)

Keying	IPIP Item (English Wording)	IPIP Item (German Wording)	Translation (T) Adaptation (A)	0: Translation straightforward 1: Translation complex 2: Adaptation culture-related 3: Adaptation measurement-related 4: Adaptation construct-related	Discussion/Decision
-	**Am rarely aware of the natural beauty in the environment.**	**Ich mache mir die Schönheit der Natur nur selten bewusst.**	A	4	**JK:** We chose the expression "sich bewusst machen" instead of "mir bewusst sein", because it describes a behavior rather than a passive mood/state; it is therefore more active than the English original (construct-related adaptation). "Natural beauty in the environment" was translated as "Schönheit der Natur" in consultation with GS, referring to the beauty of a *natural* environment (e. g. a landscape). (challenges/decision)
+	**Experience deep emotions when I see beautiful things.**	**Wenn ich etwas Schönes sehe, bewegt mich das sehr.**	T	0	–
-	**Fail to notice beauty until other comment on it.**	**Ich bemerke Schönheit erst dann, wenn andere darauf aufmerksam machen.**	T	1	**JK/MP:** To avoid a negation, we reverse and translate the item "I fail to notice" to "ich bemerke [...] erst dann, wenn" ("I only notice [...], when ...") for linguisitc simplification.

Figure 1: Final translation documentation of entire scale (Bluemke et al., 2020)

5 Conclusion

Documentation of *input material* and *translation methods* can be collected in a straightforward manner and be included in publications (technical reports, articles). Large-scale cross-national studies often undertake special efforts to make pertinent information widely accessible. The European Social Survey (ESS), for example, provides its entire input documentation related to translation on its study website.[17] The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), another large-scale academic survey, regularly publishes a summary of translation methods implemented by countries in its annual study monitoring reports.[18] Some studies even consider the quality of translation methods in the evaluation of the national data: In the Programme for the Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), a process of data adjudication, which includes the evaluation of translation processes, is used to evaluate the overall quality of each country's data (OECD, 2019). On a smaller scale, it is just as important for researchers to provide details on the translation methods when publishing results about the validation of an instrument, and not 'just' provide information on statistical indicators (Hall et al., 2018; International Test Commission, 2017; Rios & Sireci, 2014).

Translation output (or process) documentation is typically less formalized and streamlined and up to now rarely publicly available, at least for large-scale surveys. International comparative surveys would profit from making translation process documentation more systematically available to a wider recipient group so that data users could resort to it in case of statistical anomalies in the data. Furthermore, researchers stand to learn from translation challenges that others have experienced when these are summarized in scientific publications. In general, concrete examples of challenges and the rationale for specific decisions will also help to raise awareness that sound instrument translation requires careful thought and consideration of many different aspects.

Documentation can be prepared in advance: Large-scale comparative surveys should ideally set up translation documentation procedures via forms or templates with a view to obtaining well-structured and consistent documentation that can (1) be collected prior to translation and help shape, monitor, and facilitate the production of national translations, and (2) be collected as far as possible "en passant" during translation without requiring too much additional effort. It is recommendable to design a documenta-

[17] https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/methodology/ess/_methodology/translation/ (Accessed 26 June, 2020)
[18] https://www.gesis.org/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-topic/social-networks/2017 (Accessed 15 June, 2020)

tion format which can easily be converted to a useful documentation for the end user of the data and survey methodologists. Individual research projects are more flexible in their documentation approach, but they may seek inspiration from large-scale studies for documentation procedures.

To sum, although translation documentation is time and resource intensive, it is in our view a worthwhile and needed investment to inform team members and internal project partners on the one hand, as well as data users, translation scientists, survey methodologists, and developers of measurement instruments on the other hand. A structured approach to translation documentation can reduce the burden and ensure that key elements of the translation are easily available to the scientific community and other recipients of survey data and results.

6 References

Behr, D. (2009). *Translationswissenschaft und international vergleichende Umfrageforschung. Qualitätssicherung bei Fragebogenübersetzungen als Gegenstand einer Prozessanalyse*. Bonn. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-282120.

Behr, D. (2018). Translating questionnaires for cross-national surveys: A description of a genre and its particularities based on the ISO 17100 categorization of translator competences. *Translation & Interpreting*, *10*(2), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.110202.2018.a02

Behr, D., & Scholz, E. (2011). Questionnaire translation in cross-national survey research: On the types and value of annotations. *mda: Methoden, Daten, Analysen*, *5*(2), 157–179.

Behr, D., & Shishido, H. (2016). The translation of measurement instruments for cross-cultural surveys. In C. Wolf, D. Joye, T. W. Smith, & Y.-C. Fu (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Survey Methodology* (pp. 269–287). London: Sage.

Behr, D., Braun, M., & Dorer, B. (2016). *Measurement instruments in international surveys. GESIS Survey Guidelines*. Mannheim, Germany: GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.15465/gesis-sg_en_006.

Behr, D., Dept, S., & Krajčeva, E. (2019). Documenting the survey translation and monitoring process. In T. P. Johnson, B.-E. Pennell, I. Stoop, & B. Dorer (Eds.), *Advances in comparative survey methods: Multinational, multiregional and multicultural contexts (3MC)* (pp. 341–356). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bluemke, M., Partsch, M. V., Saucier, G., & Lechner, C. M. (2020). *Is Construct-valid and Cross-culturally Comparable Character Assessment Possible? Refining the IPIP-VIA Strength Scales*. Manuscript in preparation.

Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field Methods in Cross-Cultural Research* (pp. 137–164). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Eremenco, S., Pease, S., Mann, S., Berry, P., & on behalf of the PRO Consortium's Process Subcommittee. (2018). Patient-reported outcome (PRO) consortium translation process: Consensus development of updated best practices. *Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes*, *2*, 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41687-018-0037-6

ESS (European Social Survey). (2018). *ESS Round 9 Translation Guidelines*. London: ESS ERIC Headquarters. Retrieved from https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/round9/methods/ESS9_translation_guidelines.pdf.

Forsyth, B. H., Kudela, M. S., Levin, K., Lawrence, D., & Willis, G. B. (2007). Methods for translating an English-language survey questionnaire on tobacco use into Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, and Vietnamese. *Field Methods*, *19*(3), 264–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X07302105

Fujishiro, K., Gong, F., Baron, S., Jacobson Jr, C. J., DeLaney, S., Flynn, M., & Eggerth, D. E. (2010). Translating questionnaire items for a multi-lingual worker population: The iterative process of translation and cognitive interviews with English-, Spanish-, and Chinese-speaking workers. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, *53*(2), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20733

Hall, D. A., Zaragoza Domingo, S., Hamdache, L. Z., Manchaiah, V., Thammaiah, S., Evans, C., … International Collegium of Rehabilitative Audiology and TINnitus Research NETwork. (2018). A good practice guide for translating and adapting hearing-related questionnaires for different languages and cultures.

International Journal of Audiology, *57*(3), 161–175. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1393565

Harkness, J. (2003). Questionnaire translation. In J. Harkness, F. J. R. van de Vijver, & P. P. Mohler (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods* (pp. 35–56). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Harkness, J. A., Villar, A., & Edwards, B. (2010). Translation, adaptation, and design. In J. A. Harkness, M. Braun, B. Edwards, T. P. Johnson, L. Lyberg, P. P. Mohler, … T. W. Smith (Eds.), *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts* (pp. 117–140). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hoben, M., Mahler, C., Bär, M., Berger, S., Squires, J. E., Estabrooks, C. A., & Behrens, J. (2013). German translation of the Alberta context tool and two measures of research use: Methods, challenges and lessons learned. *BMC Health Services Research*, *13*, 478. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-478

International Test Commission. (2017). *The ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (Second edition)*. Retrieved from https://www.intestcom.org/files/guideline_test_adaptation_2ed.pdf

Maehler, D. B., Zabal, A., & Hanke, K. (2019). Adults' identity in acculturation settings: The Multigroup Ethnic & National Identity Measure (MENI). *Identity*, *19*(4), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2019.1641408

Martinez, G., Marín, B. V., & Schoua-Glusberg, A. (2006). Translating from English to Spanish: The 2002 National Survey of Family Growth. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *28*(4), 531–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986306292293

Mohler, P. P., Hansen, S. E., Pennell, B., Thomas, W., Wackerow, J., & Hubbard, F. (2010). A survey process quality perspective on documentation. In J. A. Harkness, M. Braun, B. Edwards, T. P. Johnson, L. Lyberg, P. P. Mohler, … T. W. Smith (Eds.), *Survey methods in multinational, multiregional, and multicultural contexts* (pp. 299–314). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Mohler, P., Dorer, B., Jong, J. de, & Hu, M. (2016). *Translation: Overview. guidelines for best practice in cross-cultural surveys*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Retrieved from https://ccsg.isr.umich.edu/.

Nießen, D., Partsch, M. V., Kemper, C. J., & Rammstedt, B. (2019). An English-language adaptation of the Social Desirability–Gamma Short Scale (KSE-G). *Measurement Instruments for the Social Sciences*, *2*(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42409-018-0005-1

OECD. (2019). *Technical Report of the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) (3rd Edition)*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/publications/the-survey-of-adult-skills-f70238c7-en.htm.

Quittner, A. L., Sweeny, S., Watrous, M., Munzenberger, P., Bearss, K., Nitza, A. G., … Henry, B. (2000). Translation and linguistic validation of a disease-specific quality of life measure for cystic fibrosis. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *25*(6), 403–414. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/25.6.403

Rask, M., Oscarsson, M., Ludwig, N., & Swahnberg, K. (2017). The Swedish translation and cross-cultural adaptation of the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy–Cervical Dysplasia (FACIT-CD): Linguistic validity and reliability of the Swedish version. *BMC Women's Health*, *17*(1), 24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-017-0381-3

Rios, J. A., & Sireci, S. G. (2014). Guidelines versus practices in cross-lingual assessment: A disconcerting disconnect. *International Journal of Testing*, *14*(4), 289–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2014.924006

Schuster, C., McCaskey, M., & Ettlin, T. (2013). German translation, cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the whiplash disability questionnaire. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, *11*, 45. https://doi.org/

10.1186/1477-7525-11-45

Sterie, A. C., & Bernard, M. (2019). Challenges in a six-phase process of questionnaire adaptation: Findings from the French translation of the Integrated Palliative care Outcome Scale. *BMC Palliative Care*, *18*(1), 38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-019-0422-9

Van Ommeren, M., Sharma, B., Thapa, S., Makaju, R., Prasain, D., Bhattarai, R., & Jong, J. de. (1999). Preparing instruments for transcultural research: Use of the translation monitoring form with Nepali-speaking Bhutanese refugees. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *36*(3), 285–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/136346159903600304

Voshaar, M. A. O., Klooster, P. M. ten, Taal, E., Krishnan, E., & Laar, M. A. van de. (2012). Dutch translation and cross-cultural adaptation of the PROMIS physical function item bank and cognitive pre-test in Dutch arthritis patients. *Arthritis Research & Therapy*, *14*(2), R47. https://doi.org/10.1186/ar3760

Wild, D., Eremenco, S., Mear, I., Martin, M., Houchin, C., Gawlicki, M., … Molsen, E. (2009). Multinational trials—recommendations on the translations required, approaches to using the same language in different countries, and the approaches to support pooling the data: The ISPOR patient-reported outcomes translation and linguistic validation good research practices task force report. *Value in Health*, *12*(4), 430–440. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2008.00471.x

Wild, D., Grove, A., Martin, M., Eremenco, S., McElroy, S., Verjee-Lorenz, A., & Erikson, P. (2005). Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural Adaptation Pro-cess for Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO) Measures: Report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value in Health*, *8*(2), 94–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.04054.x

Appendix A: Briefing Template

Questionnaire translation in the context of [name of the project]

Combination of languages: from [source language-country] to [target language-country]

Dates, deadlines, and tasks of the translator

Example text

- Translation from [date] to [date]
- Participation in the review discussion: [date]
- Proof-reading from [date] to [date]
- Web validation from [date] to [date]

General information about the study (e.g. topic, aim of the study, link to the study)

Example text

- Time use study
- International comparative study with 24 participating countries worldwide
- Aim of the study: International comparison of time use, comparability is necessary
- Web link of the study: www.example.com

Target group (e.g. age, general population vs. specific population groups, country, migration background)

Example text

- For the German translation: general population, ages 18-65, all educational levels
- For the French-language translation: general population, ages 18-65, all educational levels, French for Belgians

Survey mode (e.g. computer-assisted personal interview, online survey, paper-and-pencil questionnaire)

Example text

- Survey mode: paper-and-pencil questionnaire (for layout refer to the original questionnaire)

Information about original (master/source) questionnaire & goal of the translation

Example text

- Original questionnaire in English, developed by an international team.
- Generally, we assume that a translation is possible. Please document required adaptations (for cultural reasons), such as omission of specific questions, replacement of examples, addition or deletion of response categories. Please inform the project leadership about these changes.

Background information

Example text

- A **glossary** with standard translations for specific response categories and participant instructions will be provided.
- Please consider **already existing translations** of core items. These translations will be provided.

Process of documentation

Example text

- Please use the Excel sheet provided to document the translation as well as comments and problems encountered with specific questions.
- Please comment on necessary adaptations (e.g. omission of questions, replacement of examples, addition or deletion of response categories) in Excel.

Tools (e.g. computer-aided translation tools like TRADOS)

Example text

- No special translation tool is needed.

Contact for queries

Example text

- Name:
- Email:
- Telephone:

Documents sent out

Example text

(1) Original text in Excel
(2) Glossary
(3) Existing translations in pdf
(4) …

Appendix B: Checklist for the Translation Method

Basics	
Source language/source culture	
Target language/target culture	
Workload	Type/name of instrument(s), word count, item number
Step	
Translation	Double (or more) translations, split translation, single translation, adaptation, other
Review (reconciliation)	Individual review, different individuals in subsequent steps, team review, multiple reviews (specify), other
Harmonization	Same-language harmonization, harmonization within a country, international harmonization
Pretesting	Type of pretest (e.g. cognitive interviewing, quantitative pilot), sample size, mode, main findings
Other (quality control) steps	Back translation, back translation comparison, external verification, proofreading (incl. personnel in each case), iterative steps
Personnel	
Translation personnel	Professional translators, subject-matter experts, other (specify) Incl. further information on mother tongue, relevant (educational) background and experience
Review personnel	Project lead, translation coordinator, subject-matter experts, professional translators, questionnaire design experts, other (specify) Incl. further information on mother tongue, relevant (educational) background and experience