

CSDI 2009
March 7-9
ISR-SRO Ann Arbor

Abstracts
in presentation order

Comparatively Speaking - Comparison Concepts in Comparative Survey Research

Peter Ph. Mohler

University of Mannheim

Sidney Verba and Erwin Scheuch discuss in the late nineteen sixties the importance of context for adaptation in order to produce comparable measurement in different cultural contexts. Their ideas of establishing comparability were forgotten or overlooked for some 30 years. Instead technological 'solutions' such as mechanical literal translation and statistical modeling were pursued by mainstream comparative researchers.

In conjunction with recent developments in questionnaire pretesting and research on cognitive aspects in survey methodology (CASM) as well as advances in instrument adaptation and theories of translation, the notion of linking collateral and cultural data with statistical assessment has again been gaining attention.

The paper outlines Verba's and Scheuch's positions, traces the discussion of the late nineteen eighties on comparability and looks at today's positions on comparability in an attempt to balance technological solutions with theory and methodology.

Data Collection Methodology: "Did we say adaptation?"
Martine Quaglia
Ined Survey Department, France

Adaptation to the field and to the context in which the survey is to be made is one (one could say "the") basic requirement that has to be taken into account when talking about data collection methodology. Whether the survey is conducted in a country belonging to the researcher's own culture or in a foreign country, adaptation certainly has limits, and these have to be studied in relation to choices done within the institutional, scientific, cultural and political environment of the research. How do these backgrounds impose on the researcher's choices and for what consequences?

Through a few examples of practices and questions raised while constructing and conducting international, national and local surveys we will try to list some of the choices that are usually made in terms of language used to address the respondents. Some papers on heterogeneous contexts such as India and Sub Saharan countries will be used as examples to talk about field work complexity, and presentations done by Maoris, Crees and Botswana researchers in previous conferences will also be recalled to raise the question of 'decolonization'. We will

finally discuss a few examples of questions commonly asked in 'western countries' surveys and their consequences on the respondent's understanding of the researches.

As a conclusion on the researcher's posture towards the respondents and more generally towards the general population, choices and innovations that are being done in terms of dissemination of results will be presented and discussed.

Incentives: A Cultural Perspective

Safaa R. Amer

NORC at the University of Chicago

The use of incentives is very common in the North American and European social survey research literature as a way of increasing response rates, improving data quality, reducing non-response bias, and even for building respondent's trust. Many researchers have conducted experiments to determine the impact of a wide range of incentives on different groups within these populations (e.g. students, senior citizens). While studies investigating non-response have been conducted in international cross-cultural settings in African and Asian countries, very few have considered use of incentives. This paper presents some examples of incentive use in international projects with a focus on developing countries and the concerns and challenges faced as incentives were considered or used in different settings. Ethical and cultural considerations are discussed with a closer look to types of incentive by survey mode of administration and their suitability for different population subgroups. The roles of factors such as socioeconomic level, urbanization, age, and gender seem to play different roles within specific populations are explored, as are funding and sponsorship consideration for projects in developing countries and challenges in determining an adequate amount of incentive.

DDI Across the Life Cycle: One Data Model, Many Products

Mary Vardigan, Sue Ellen Hansen, Peter Granda, Sanda Ionescu, Felicia LeClere

University of Michigan

Panel Coordinator - Mary Vardigan: Producing DDI-compliant documentation from computer-assisted interview software has long been a goal of the DDI community. Generating such documentation upstream in the data life cycle has benefits for data producers because the resulting documentation is machine-actionable and can be used to inform the interview software in subsequent data collection cycles. Data archives benefit as well because they can ingest comprehensive DDI documentation with question text integrated into variables and generate statistical software setup files from the documentation. Two units of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research - Survey Research Operations and the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research - came together early in 2008 with a strategy to create a shared DDI 3.0-compliant relational database model. This data model served as a foundation for several products and services, which this session will demonstrate.

MQDS - Sue Ellen Hansen: The Michigan Questionnaire Documentation System (MQDS) was designed to create comprehensive eXtensible Markup Language (XML) metadata for Blaise survey instruments. With the development of the DDI 3.0-compliant relational database model,

MQDS was updated to change the method of processing data collection instruments. MQDS is able to process any size instrument and provides greater flexibility in processing instruments in part or whole. From the database, MQDS provides the ability to export data to DDI-3 XML and provides the ability to use database methods for queries, comparisons, and merging of data. MQDS imports the Blaise BMI files into a relational database. From the database, MQDS produces a DDI 3.0 compliant XML file. Style sheets are then used to produce other file formats needed (.html, etc).

Editing Tool - Peter Granda: During the course of Computer-Assisted Interviewing (CAI) it is often necessary for data producers and processors to customize the content of variable descriptions. Such elements as variable and value labels, question texts, and universe statements must be understandable to a broad audience when public-use files appear. A special editor, with a Web-based interface, has been developed to serve the needs of funding agencies and the Institute of Social Research as they collect, review, and process the a variety of datasets. Based on output from CAI instrument, this editor permits internal and external users to update pertinent information about all variables, specify those to include in public-use files, and provide a permanent, DDI-compliant record of decisions made through the data life cycle.

ICPSR Social Science Variables Database - Sanda Ionescu: ICPSR has developed a Web-based tool that allows users to search the new database for variable descriptions across studies, refine searches using certain parameters, and examine the context of relevant hits within a study or series of studies. The database is compliant with both DDI 2.1 and DDI 3.0 and may serve to perform transformations between the two versions. This project currently uploads variable-level documentation marked up in DDI 2.1, displays search results, and can generate DDI 3.0 descriptions. We will discuss how a first batch of approximately 3,500 DDI files, representing about 1,300 ICPSR studies, was prepared for the initial database ingest. We will review the criteria used for selecting, or prioritizing, certain types of studies, the sources for DDI markup, the quality standards and checks performed, as well as content upgrades as necessary. We will also describe how we moved to automated upload as part of the routine archival processing procedures once the database became functional. The first version of the public interface will be presented, alongside with a discussion of enhancements projected for the near future.

ICPSR Internal Variable Search - Felicia LeClere: ICPSR has created a database application that allows an internal metadata search to create dynamic metadata crosswalks for data collections in shared portfolios. The Integrated Fertility Survey Series is a federally funded data system designed to harmonize ten data files from the Growth of American Families in 1955 to the NSFG, Cycle 6 in 2002. This internal search application, based on the shared SRO-ICPSR data base, allows us to search and display variables across a variety of data files in order to identify comparable questions and variables. The search mechanism allows us to search all elements of the metadata including variable description, question text, variable and value labels, and other elements of the metadata record.

Quality in Cross-Cultural Data Collection: The Missing Pieces
Beth-Ellen Pennell, Sue Ellen Hansen, Kirsten Alcser
University of Michigan

Very little contemporary literature discusses the details of data collection procedures and protocols in cross-national and cross-cultural surveys. This presentation will provide an overview of best practice in quality monitoring in cross-cultural data collection, providing a range of examples drawn from several large-scale cross-national surveys. Within the context of a broader survey quality framework. We will make recommendations with regard to documentation, technical developments, and achieving greater transparency through quality profiles. Barriers to implementation of these recommendations will also be discussed.

Implementing a Program of Certification on the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)

**Kirsten Alcser, Grant Benson, Heidi Guyer
University of Michigan**

This presentation provides a case study of the steps taken on one current longitudinal, cross-national survey project to measure and document survey-agency performance and compliance with key project requirements in order to enhance overall quality of the data. Active monitoring on key measures of survey quality enables improvement in real time. It also provides the opportunity to identify problems to avoid in future waves of data collection and to define specific monitoring tools for quality assessment related to those problems.

The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) explores the social, economic, and health experiences of people throughout Europe as they grow older. Thirteen countries are contributing to the SHARE core data collection effort, eleven of which are currently collecting the third wave of data and two of which are currently collecting the second wave of data. The countries are a balanced representation of the various regions in Europe, ranging from Scandinavia (Denmark and Sweden) through Central Europe (Austria, France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic and Poland) to the Mediterranean (Spain, Italy and Greece). Close to 50,000 respondents (persons age 50 and above plus eligible spouses) are currently part of the SHARE core panel.

The focus of this presentation is on the assessment of quality of the process and procedures pertaining to interviewer training and field data collection and the integration of this assessment with other forms of assessment into a *Quality Profile* for the SHARE project.

Response Rates and Other Quality Indicators: Trade-offs in Cross-nations Surveys

Ineke Stoop

Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP

Response rates on a survey is one of the most common quality indicators. The real quality indicator in this area would of course be nonresponse bias. Nonresponse bias is hard to measure, however, and is likely to differ across variables within a single survey. Leaving this aside, response rates are not the only determinant of survey quality. A high response rate will be of very little use when it is achieved in a survey with a low coverage, or irrelevant, poorly phrased and badly translated questions. The situation is even more complicated in cross-national surveys. Probably the best way to obtain comparable survey outcomes in each country is to use comparable survey methods and achieve a comparable response rate. This will mean

that the possibilities of deploying response enhancing strategies will be severely limited in those cases where they might threaten optimal comparability.

The presentation will give an overview of response efforts and outcomes in the European Social Survey and the unsteady balance between high response rates, low nonresponse bias, high total survey quality and optimal comparability.

A Translation Experiment on the 2008 General Social Survey

Tom W. Smith

NORC/University of Chicago

In 2006 the General Social Survey (GSS) secured support from the National Science Foundation to add Spanish to its standard, English-language version. With this expansion the GSS target population becomes adults living in US households and able to do an interview in either English or Spanish.

This paper first describes the experience in adding Spanish to the 2006 GSS: 1) the process by which the Spanish-language version of the GSS was developed, 2) the different language-use/ability groups in which Hispanics are distributed, 3) the changes in the coverage of the Hispanic population and in the total, target population of the GSS including changes on demographics, interviewer variables, and non-demographics, 4) evidence of language problems in the translations, and 5) the implications for trend analysis on the GSS.

Next, based on possible language problems that were identified from the 2006 GSS analysis, experiments were added to the 2008 GSS in which an original and revised Spanish translation for several questions were asked of random samples of Spanish speakers. Comparisons will be carried out between the two Spanish versions and both Spanish versions will be compared to the English version in a manner similar to that done on the 2006 GSS.

Research on Translation Assessment Procedures: Back Translation and Expert Review

Janet Harkness¹, Ana Villar¹, Kathleen Kephart¹, Dorothee Behr², Alisú Schoua-Glusberg³

¹University of Nebraska-Lincoln; ²GESIS, Germany; ³Research Support Services, Evanston Ill.

Back translation, although described over the decades as limited in its usefulness as a means of assessing translation quality, remains the procedure most often cited in the literature. The paper presents the first findings from two steps of a larger project comparing various means of assessing the quality of translations.

The first step: evaluators were asked to compare two sets of questions in English; one set consisted of the original source questions and the other set consisted of “back translations” of these questions from Spanish and German translations previously made in international studies. The second step: evaluators were asked to look at qualitative reviews undertaken in earlier assessment work of the Spanish and German translations used in the international studies. In this case the translations were also included.

In each case, the evaluators were asked to try to make decisions about possible problems in the Spanish and German texts on the basis of the material they were given. In the first assessment, their decisions were based on the two English texts and in the second assessment, they could

use the earlier reviews, the source questions and, depending on their own expertise in Spanish and/or German, the translations.

These early findings reveal interesting points about evaluator behavior, corroborate other literature about the potential and limitations of back translation and indicates where the back translation evaluation lags behind the “review of the review”. Further analysis remains to be made of these steps and other assessment methods.

Coding Interpreted Interviews

Ana Villar¹, Janet Harkness¹, Clarissa Steele¹, Yelena Kruse², Ying Wang¹

¹University of Nebraska-Lincoln; ²Knowledge Networks

The paper describes our work to date on developing a coding scheme for interaction between interviewer, interpreter and respondent in interpreted telephone surveys. Our goal in developing this scheme was originally to be able to classify and quantify various challenges to interview quality in interpreted interviews. As we considered the data, we added codes to capture describe emerging “typical” features of the interaction in the interpreted interviews. These may be useful in better understanding the interaction process and enable us longer term to develop training materials for those requiring to engage in interpreted standardized interviews.

Interpreted Telephone Survey Interviews

Janet Harkness¹, Ana Villar¹, Yelena Kruse², Laura Branden³, Brad Edwards³, Clarissa Steele¹, Ying Wang¹

¹University of Nebraska-Lincoln; ²Knowledge Networks; ³Westat

The paper reports of first findings from a small project investigating interaction in interpreted telephone interviews in Russian and Spanish, using a commercial interpreting firm, Westat interviewers and respondents in Russia and Spain. Control telephone interviews with scripted translations of the questions that were interpreted were conducted by interviewers who were native speakers of Russian and Spanish. In this paper we report only on data from the interpreted interviews, focusing mostly on issues of burden, negotiation (interview metatalk) and of interpreting challenges found in the interviews. A better understanding the character of interpreted standardized interviews, the roles of participants and the various challenges that arise may enable us to prepare better for conducting interpreted interviews when no other option is available both in terms of interviewer and interpreter training, respondent briefing and material development.

The Use of Vignettes in Cross-Cultural Cognitive Testing of Survey Instruments

Patricia L. Goerman and Matthew Clifton

U.S. Census Bureau

Cognitive interviewing, a pretesting technique commonly used to test survey instruments, elicits respondents’ interpretations of survey questions and concepts as a means to evaluate

and revise survey questions. This direct contact with respondents can be particularly useful in the testing of a survey translation since the researcher can compare respondent interpretation across languages and thereby evaluate and revise the translation when necessary. Vignettes are sometimes used as a part of the cognitive testing method. Vignettes are brief stories or scenarios presented to respondents, who are then asked to respond to survey questions in the context of the imaginary situation (Martin, 2004). Vignettes are a particularly useful technique when sensitive or complex survey items need to be tested (Finch, 1987; Lee, 1993; Gerber, et al., 1996). They are also useful for testing survey questions that are infrequently asked in the field because they apply only in rare situations. It is not always feasible to recruit cognitive interview respondents who meet the criteria to be asked rare questions. An imaginary vignette situation enables researchers to test infrequently asked questions with larger numbers of respondents without the expense of recruiting only people with special characteristics.

There has been little research on the use of vignettes in the testing of survey translations. A number of questions arise: Do vignettes need to be modified for use across language or cultural groups?; Are vignettes equally effective across languages?; Finally, are vignettes useful for testing survey translations? This paper examines the use of vignettes in two Spanish/English pretesting projects at the U.S. Census Bureau. In one of the projects, vignettes were used to examine respondents' interpretation of different "relationship" terms. In the other study, vignettes were used to test a series of questions about whether respondents lived in or had separate "other living quarters" within their homes. This paper will examine findings across English and Spanish cases in the two studies and will discuss areas in need of future research.

Key words: Vignettes, Bilingual cognitive testing methodology, Spanish survey research.

Focus groups, cognitive interviews and card sorting: Three strategies to improve measurement across diverse cultural and linguistic groups

Susan Sprachman, Sally Atkins-Burnett, Nikki Aikens, Margaret Caspe

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc

Parent rating of children's behavior is a commonly used technique to assess socio-emotional development. However, parents from different cultural and language backgrounds may vary in their perceptions of the importance of different social-emotional indicators and their willingness to discuss particular behaviors. This paper presents findings from a multi-language study that integrated three strategies – focus groups, card sorts, and cognitive interviewing - to inform the reliable and valid assessment of children's socio-emotional behavior via parent report.

Participants were drawn from a larger study of preschool services in an urban county known for its language diversity located on the west coast of the United States. Six focus groups were conducted with 57 parents from diverse backgrounds (i.e., Filipino, Korean, Chinese, African American and Latino). Parents were asked to discuss the social skills and problem behaviors that were of importance and concern to them. Parents examined single-item index cards with widely used parent-report measures of children's social-emotional behaviors and noted whether they felt the question was easy, difficult or uncomfortable to answer. Last, parents participated in cognitive interviews to demonstrate their understanding of and rationale for answering items about their child's socio-emotional development.

Findings from this paper will highlight the themes that emerged across the three tasks including the variations in how cultural groups perceive children's social-emotional development. Discussion and implications will center on challenges and solutions to wording questions used in obtaining parent ratings of social-emotional development and ways researchers can begin to infuse these methods into their own survey work.

Developing a Model to Conceptualize the Results of Comparative Pretesting

Gordon Willis

National Cancer Institute, NIH

Development and evaluation of survey questionnaires increasingly demands attention to the application of pretesting techniques as a means for the establishment of cross-cultural comparability. In particular, practitioners use both cognitive interviewing and behavior coding across language, cultures, and nations to assess item function, and presumably to identify flaws and to pave the way towards improvements that enhance comparability. However, at this point the application of pretesting methods is largely atheoretic in orientation, as we lack a unifying model that characterizes the component sources of non-comparability (that is, there exists no model in this realm that is comparable to the Tourangeau (1983) cognitive model of the survey response process which emphasizes the processes of comprehension, retrieval, judgment/decision, and response). The current paper will consider this issue by reviewing several models that purport to categorize pretesting results from a cross-cultural perspective, including that proposed by Willis and colleagues, and another by Fitzgerald and colleagues. Further, I will demonstrate how several comparative projects – including one that involves cognitive interviewing of a cancer risk factor scale, and another that applied behavior coding to evaluate a tobacco-use questionnaire – illustrate the presence of the defined categories, as they represent errors of translation, problems of cultural adaptation, and generic problems. As a result of this analysis, I will make conclusions concerning the usefulness of existing models or taxonomies, and the degree to which cognitive interviewing and behavior coding either converge or diverge with respect to the varieties of issues they detect within comparative studies.

Design and Analysis of Cognitive Interviews for Cross-National Testing

Rory Fitzgerald and Kristen Miller

City University, Centre for Comparative Social Surveys; National Center for Health Statistics

This paper will discuss the potential of cognitive test methods for examining the comparability of questions intended for multi-national and cross-cultural surveys. In order to find better ways of tackling this problem during the questionnaire design phase, researchers from the Budapest Initiative¹ and the European Social Survey² formed a collaborative work group known as the

¹ The Budapest Initiative is the name of a working group who came together to try and improve questions to test health measures. The initiative was named after the location of the first meeting.

Comparative Cognitive Test Workgroup³. The group's aim was to develop an effective methodology for employing cognitive interviewing.

Although cognitive test methodology is generally accepted for mono-national and even cross-cultural studies, there are specific characteristics inherent to the method that generate possible limitations for conducting comparative fieldwork and analyses. Those characteristics include (but are not limited to):

- Small sample sizes
- Non-representative samples
- Non-standardized interviewing protocol
- Requirement of highly trained interviewers
- Under-developed literature and practice regarding rigor of analysis
- Lack of standardized criteria for what constitutes a cognitive interview finding

These issues are then compounded by difficulties in ensuring equivalence between testing in different countries and a lack experience in conducting comparative analyses of cognitive interviewing data. Only when equivalence is achieved can differences found at the analysis stage be attributed to real differences rather than those that simply arise due to methodological differences. Because multi-national cognitive testing usually implies a coordinated effort among various international testing sites, it is critical that testing sites jointly consider these methodological characteristics to ensure that the cognitive interviews and ensuing analysis are consistent.

This paper will discuss how the Comparative Cognitive Test Workgroup addressed these issues. The workgroup consists of representatives from 7 different nations and incorporates 6 different languages: the US (in English and Spanish), the UK, Bulgaria, Portugal, Switzerland (in French), Germany, and Spain. In Autumn 2007, 129 cognitive interviews were across these countries following agreement of a common methodology. In February, 2008, the group held a joint analysis meeting whereby a process was developed to conduct a systematic, comparative analysis of the interviews. Through this process, the group was able to identify various interpretive patterns resulting from socio-cultural and language-related differences among countries as well as other patterns of error that could undermine the comparability of survey data. This paper will:

1. Briefly outline how the group sought to achieve methodological equivalence across different countries, organisations and levels of experience
2. Discuss some different approaches to data organisation and joint analysis
3. Discuss some of the difficulties the project encountered and how these might be addressed in future work.

² The ESS is a biennial cross-national survey of over 30 European countries.

³ The other members of the work group are Rachel Caspar, Martin Dimov, Michelle Gray, Cátia Nunes, José-Luis Padilla, Peter Pruefer, Janet Harkness, Nicole Schoebi, Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Sally Widdop, Stephanie Willson.

Taking Stock: Pretesting in Comparative Contexts
Brad Edwards
Westat

In survey research, pretesting connotes "...a series of activities designed to evaluate...a survey instrument's capacity to collect the desired data, the capabilities of the selected mode of data collection, and/or the overall adequacy of the field procedures." (Cross-Cultural Survey Guidelines, 2009) It encompasses everything from small scale pretests of individual items or instruments, to large scale field tests or pilots designed to replicate all aspects of data collection in a "dress rehearsal" of the main survey.

Pretesting has been transformed in the past 25 years by a vigorous infusion of cognitive testing methods. Its state at the beginning of this decade was well-documented in *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires* (Presser et al, ed, 2002 and Willis 2002); Smith (2002) described problems for pretesting in cross-cultural contexts, and Harkness (2002) offered an agenda for research in translation issues. Since then, much progress has been made in cognitive testing methods for cross-cultural research, and in methods for developing and evaluating translations of survey instruments. Vignettes and paradata have emerged as important pretesting tools with useful applications for comparative surveys. IRT and other analysis tools particularly well-suited for comparative studies have come into widespread use. Recent strides in documentation systems for cross-national surveys can enhance the value of pretests.

The success of cognitive testing methods, anchored in Tourangeau's cognitive model of the survey interview process, has not been matched by developments in other aspects of pretesting for comparative surveys, however. For example, little progress has been made in the use of experiments in comparative contexts. Although mixed mode surveys are sparking increasing interest in the general survey world, research on modes is scarce in comparative surveys. Technological advances enable research on response latency, elements of speech, eye gaze, biomarkers, environmental samples, and other behavioral and physical aspects of populations, but have received scant attention in comparative surveys. Data and metadata dissemination innovations have occurred in mono-cultural surveys, but diffusion has been much slower in comparative contexts, and dissemination is seldom addressed in pretesting. Other pretesting approaches -- usability testing, prototyping, scenario testing, regression testing, and database testing -- are barely mentioned in the current literature, although they are important tools for evaluating data collection systems.

Why is the state of pretesting so uneven in comparative surveys? Translation offers a metaphor for comparative survey methods: A translation can never exceed the quality of a source document, but it can reveal problems with the source. Comparative pretesting methods cannot exceed the quality of pretesting in a monolingual/monocultural environment, but it can reveal problems with the basic methods. Survey pretesting in general lacks a theoretical framework. We need a unified theory of pretesting that encompasses cognitive testing but addresses other problems beyond the realm of cognitive tests. Quality assessment offers more comprehensive concepts such as "fitness for use" and total survey error. Computer systems development offers risk assessment and management. Business management offers cost-

benefit tradeoffs and life cycle approaches. With more solid theoretical underpinnings for pretesting in place, we may begin to adapt them to comparative surveys.

Health Disparities or Measurement Disparities?

Timothy P. Johnson

Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Chicago

This presentation will provide an overview of an NIH-funded study currently being conducted at the University of Illinois at Chicago that is designed to investigate cultural variability in the information processing of health-related survey questionnaires. Samples of African American, Mexican American, Korean American and non-Hispanic whites living in Chicago are currently being interviewed as part of this research. Study design features include the manipulation of multiple question design characteristics, audio and video behavior coding to assess both verbal and nonverbal communication, assessment of response latencies, the measurement of cultural orientations using both the Hofstede and Schwartz frameworks, and the collection of biometric data with which to validate self-reported health status. An overview of the study's research hypotheses will also be presented and discussed.

Communication and Comparative Survey Research

Janet Harkness and Theresa de McKinney

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The paper presents our first attempt at identifying aspects and theories of "communication" treated, in various disciplines, as relevant for understanding discourse and communication, and to consider their application to comparative survey research. Our aim is to identify those research fields and findings which, in an overarching framework, may be important for survey research in terms of instruments design and the production of different language versions, as well as in terms of interviewer-respondent interaction.

Developing and Maintaining Guidelines: What's Next?

Beth-Ellen Pennell, Kirsten Alcser, Sue Ellen Hansen

University of Michigan

The Cross-Cultural Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI) guidelines were developed to promote internationally recognized procedures and standards that highlight best practice for the conduct of comparative survey research across cultures and countries. The intended audience for the guidelines includes researchers and survey practitioners planning or already engaged in cross-cultural or cross-national research. The guidelines cover all aspects of the survey life-cycle and include the following modules: (1) Study and Organizational Structure; (2) Tenders, Bids and Contracts; (3) Ethical Considerations; (4) Sample Design; (5) Questionnaire Design; (6) Translation; (7) Adaptation; (8) Survey Instrument Design; (9) Pretesting; (10) Interviewer Recruitment and Training; (11) Data Collection; (12) Harmonization of Survey and Statistical Data; (13) Data Processing and Statistical Adjustment; (14) Dissemination of Survey and Statistical Data; and (15) Assessing Quality for Cross-Cultural Surveys

<http://ccsg.isr.umich.edu>). This presentation will discuss the status of the guidelines initiative and possible future directions.

Program for International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC): Overview, Project Status/Schedule, Quality Control of Survey Operations on a Multinational Survey

Pat Montalvan

Westat

PIAAC is a multi-cycle international program of adult skills and competencies sponsored by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). It will assess the level and distribution of adult skills across countries focusing on the cognitive and workplace skills needed for successful participation in the economy and society of the 21st century. Information will be collected on skills required in the workplace, educational background and professional attainment, and the ability to use information in a technology rich environment. The design and implementation of PIAAC is the responsibility of an international consortium of institutions from North America and Europe. Westat is a member of the consortium with responsibility for sampling and survey operations. The first cycle of PIAAC will include a field test in 2010 and a main study in 2011 with a final report due in 2013. At this time there are 28 countries participating. This presentation will provide a general overview of the survey and schedule, and describe the plans for quality control of survey operations.

Towards Developing a Checklist to Assess the Translation Quality of Patient-Reported Outcomes Instruments

Catherine Aquadro

MAPI France

We are currently working on quality assurance and formalizing a checklist to verify and justify the completeness and consistency of our procedures. At the moment it is an internal process focused on: the team, the method of translation, the end-product. My presentation outlines our thinking and questions so far.