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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
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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
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

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) 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