



# **PRESENTATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ISOQOL TRANSLATION AND CULTURAL ADAPTATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP (TCA-SIG)**

**26 October 2009**

**Monday 4:30 - 5:30 pm**

**PODIUM SESSION IV: PRO/QOL METHODS –  
DEVELOPMENT**

**Le Palais des Congrès de Paris in Paris, France**

- **Presenter:** [Katrin Conway](#), Mapi Research Trust, Lyon, France



# Overall objective of TCA-SIG

1. To advance research on translation and cultural adaptation of PRO instruments
2. To provide an evidence database on good practices for translation and cultural adaptation of PRO instruments

# Organisational chart of TCA-SIG

## Translation Cross-Cultural Adaptation (TCA)-SIG Chairs

Donald Patrick and Katrin Conway

### Steering Committee

Donald Patrick, Katrin Conway, Mona Martin, Sonya Eremenco

**Administrative support:** Iliana Petkova

#### Subgroup 1

##### Cross-Cultural Issues

Group Leader : Sonya Eremenco  
Members: Caroline Anfray,  
Barbara Wolf, Benjamin Arnold,  
Helena Correia

Linguistic  
Issues  
for PROs

Copyright  
Issues

ePRO  
issues

#### Subgroup 2

##### Translation Methodology

Group Leader : Mona Martin  
Members : Barbara Gandek,  
Michael Koller, Adam Bailey  
Sonya Eremenco, Valeska Kantzer,  
Linda DeWolf, Donald Patrick

Error  
Impacts

Document  
ation

Recon-  
ciliation

#### Subgroup 3

##### Pooling of Cross- Cultural Data

Group Co-leaders : Donald  
Patrick and Don Bushnell  
Members : , Antoine Regnault,  
Ron D. Hayes, John Brodersen,  
Leo Morales, Graeme Hawthorne

#### Subgroup 4

##### PRO Translation Certification Working group

Co-Chairs: Mona Martin & Katrin Conway  
Members: Donald Patrick, Sonya  
Eremenco, Michael Koller, Risa Hayes,  
Robert Gerber, Ingela Wiklund, and  
Barbara Gandek  
ISOQOL Board Liaison: Jane Scott



# **Sub-Group 1 (SG1): Cross-Cultural Issues**

## **Work Group 1 (WG1) - Translation Difficulties**

### **Objective**

Create a list of good practices for instrument developers based on the review of common translation difficulties and propose solutions as to how to avoid them.

### **Scope of Work**

- Collection and analysis of translation difficulties
- Recommendations for instruments developers
- Publication of findings



## (SG1 WG1) Research Results

- Review of 25 original instruments
- Collection of 71 examples of translation difficulties due to:
  - Cultural differences: 20
  - Semantic/conceptual differences: 26
  - Idiomatic differences: 3
  - Grammatical/script differences: 7
  - Different use of questionnaire: 0
  - Ambiguous original: **15**



## (SG1 WG1) Research Results

- **Ambiguous Original: 15 cases**

= « *What the hell* » *this item means?*

= Interpretation difficult in the absence of a **clear definition of concepts**



## (SG1 WG1) Example of ambiguous original

Original item: How much have your problem made you choose a different kind of **holiday or short break** that you would have preferred?

Response scale: 1 =Not at all; 2 =A little bit; 3 =Moderately; 4 = Quite a bit;  
5 = A great deal

---

Nature of translation difficulty: **ambiguous original**

Issue 1: use of 2 words (“holiday” and “short break”) with different semantic fields to describe one overall (undefined) concept

Issue 2: unclear focus (2 different verbs)

---

Solution : Define the overall concept to facilitate choice of most appropriate term and rewrite item

---

Reformulated item: “How much has your problem determined your choice of holiday?”



## (SG1 WG1) Recommendations for Developers

- Create a list of concepts (see handout 1)
- Use Guidelines in the field of instrument development, e.g. Brislin's Guidelines\* (see handout 2)
- Assess translatability of the original before its finalization (see handout 3)
- For international use: think about developing an English version if original language is not English

\* Brislin RW. The wording and translation of research instruments. In: Lonner WJ, Berry JW, eds. *Field methods in cross-cultural research*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1986:137-164.






## **Sub-Group 2 (SG2)**

# **Translation Methodology**

- To identify, prioritize and pursue a research agenda for the development and comparison of methodologies in the field of translation and cross-cultural research
- To publish scientific papers on methodologies and recommendations for the TCA process




# SG2 Work Group 1: Impact of Errors

Which aspects of the currently employed linguistic validation methodologies make a difference?

**Premise:** aspect of translation methodology that makes a difference is step of process during which most errors are spotted and repaired.

**Initial Directions:** To evaluate current linguistic methodologies and their impact on translation results by:

- Identifying the errors reduced at each step
- Describing the nature of the error
- Describing consequences to the research data (were errors to remain)
- Summarizing the types of errors by the stage it occurs in the translation



**(SG2 WG1) Types of Errors** that are detected during the development of new language versions:

- A. Errors in the reflection of a concept
- B. Errors in the selection of word-fit to concept
- C. Errors in tense, spelling, grammar, conjugation
- D. Errors in idiomatic appropriateness to culture
- E. Errors due to lack of clarity in items
- F. Errors from uncommon word preference or language patterns
- G. Errors in spacing or word value of response options



# (SG2 WG1) Example

## Greek Language Version of the I-QOL

Author: Donald L. Patrick

Condition: Urinary incontinence

N° of items: 22

TOTAL Errors dropped during CCA process: (17)

During reconciliation: (A:1)

During back translation evaluation: (A:4, B:2, C:1, D:1, E:2, F:2, G:1)

During debriefing revision process: (E:3)

During developer review process: (none)

During harmonization and proofreading: (none)

- A. Errors in the reflection of a concept
- B. Errors in the selection of word-fit to concept
- C. Errors in tense, spelling, grammar, conjugation
- D. Errors in idiomatic appropriateness to culture
- E. Errors due to lack of clarity in items
- F. Errors from uncommon word preference or language patterns
- G. Errors in spacing or word value of response options



## **Sub-Group 3: Pooling of Cross-Cultural Data**

- To investigate methods for analyzing the effects of pooling PRO data across all language versions and cultural groups in a clinical trial or PRO investigation
- To develop criteria for when pooling is not advisable



## **Sub-Group 4: PRO Translation Certification**

- Development of rationale for Translation Certification in PRO field
- Publication in peer-reviewed journal



# Are you interested in joining us?

- Contact Iliana Petkova at (ipetkova@mapigroup.com)
- For more information, please consult the ISOQOL website ([www.isoqol.org](http://www.isoqol.org)) and search under «Special Interest Groups »
- Do not miss our meeting in New Orleans on 29 October 2009 during the ISOQOL Conference
  - Janet Harkness: presentation of CSDI guidelines for cross-cultural research
  - Ben Arnold: “Translation of the PROMIS into Spanish”



# List of planned publications

Working titles:

- Translation Certification
- Efficiency Of Translation Methodology In Error-Reduction In The Development Of New Language Versions Of PRO Instruments
- Pooling PRO Data from Global Clinical Trials
- Copyrights
- Translation Difficulties