









Contents

- 1. Overall problems
- 2. Experiment
- 3. Methods (quantitative and qualitative)
- 4. Next steps
- 5. Further research questions





1. Overall problems

- 1) Different understandings of 'close vs. adaptive / free translation':
- Survey research: Ask-the-Same-Question (ASQ) / Functional Equivalence includes mainly *close* translations
 →adaptive / free translations to be avoided for keeping comparability
- Translation studies: 'Good' / functionally equivalent translation includes both close and free / adaptive translation, depending on the particular context
- Translation studies: very difficult if not impossible to draw firm line where adaptation starts





1. Overall problems

2) Situation in multilingual surveys:

- How to give guidelines that apply to 20-35 and more language versions?
 - → most translation/adaptation mechanisms are language pair specific
- ⇒ SERISS translation experiment to shed light into this issue





2. Experiment

- Countries: GB, EE, SI
- Source language: English
- Target languages: Estonian, Slovenian
- Translation approaches: adaptation, close translation
- Questionnaire: 60 items, different latent constructs (from ESS, EVS, SHARE, ISSP)
- CRONOS panel Wave 5 (1 item in Wave 6)





Experiment: Translation Design

 Within each country (i.e., EE, SI) translations were done following the design below:

Batch	Item	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3
1	1-20	Close	Adapt	Adapt
2	21-40	Adapt	Close	Adapt
3	41-60	Close	Adapt	Close





Experiment: Questionnaire Design

		Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
Batch	Items	Арр.	Team	App.	Team	Арр.	Team
2	25-27	Α	3	Α	1	С	2
3	42-60	Α	2	С	3	С	1
1	1-17, 20	С	1	Α	2	Α	3
2	21-40	Α	3	Α	1	С	2
1	18-19	С	1	Α	2	Α	3
3	41	С	1	Α	2	С	3

Note. App. = translation approach; A = adaptation; C = close translation.







3. Method

Goals

- a. Compare measurement quality
- b. Check for measurement equivalence
- To keep in mind
 - Small groups (n ≈ 143-216)
 - No translations in GB
 - Teams did not always follow translation instructions
 - Different (same) translation approaches do not necessarily lead to distinct (same) translations







Method cont'd

- Independent coders in both languages (1 / language)
- Brita/Lydia don't understand Estonian nor Slovene (methodological problem: completely dependent on third persons in all assessments)







EE and SI coders rated for each item:

- translation potential (source)
- translation score (translation): question + RC

overly close	close	rather close	somewhat close/adaptive	rather adaptive	adaptive	overly adaptive
			auaptive			
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

Question Scale

Q3	Q2	Q1		
	S1 S2 S3			

Translation potential Translation scores





Quantitative analysis (Lydia)

Means in data from CRONOS:

- 1. Means deviate significantly between 3 versions:
 - → Check whether caused by translations
- 2. Translations deviate (free-adapt) but means are very similar
 - → Check translations

⇒Patterns? Depending on constructs / languages?





Qualitative analysis (Brita)

List all adaptations made in all translated questions (based on native speaker codings)

4 groups of adaptations:

- pragmatic-semantic (meaning)
- factual-technical (reality)
- syntactic-grammatical (structure)
- (survey) methodological (survey habits)





Qualitative analysis (Brita)

Compare qualitative findings:

- Compare 4 adaptation types between items / constructs
- Compare 4 adaptation types between languages
- Is close translation possible at all or not?
- Linkage with quantitative data







5. Further research questions

Can patterns be found on:

- Findings based on adaptation type?
- Findings based on language?
- Findings based on construct / item?





Questions or comments?

brita.dorer@gesis.org lydia.repke@gesis.org

