

How Does the French Culture Impact the Translation of Survey Materials? - An Examination of French Translations for a U.S. Survey

Erica Saleska, RTI International
Dr. Musindu Kanya-Ngambi, University at Buffalo
Herman A. Alvarado, US Census Bureau

Correspondence regarding this paper should be directed to:
Erica Saleska
3040 Cornwallis Road, P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Email: esaleska@rti.org

Download a copy of this paper at www.RTI.org/AAPOR

Paper presented at the 64th Annual Conference
of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
Hollywood, Florida
May 16, 2009

The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of ACS French language team members,
Ms. Hélène Coignet and Ms. Marie Chouchani.

ABSTRACT

Based on 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) figures, approximately 1.3 million Americans, aged 5 and over, speak French in their household, and almost 300,000 of those Americans self-report that they do not speak English “very well.” To ensure that French speaking populations are represented in the federally mandated American Community Survey, the Census Bureau translated ACS survey materials to be used with French speakers selected for this study. This paper explores the need to account for language and cultural differences when developing French survey materials, including differences within the French speaking population itself for native speakers from different cultural and geographic backgrounds. These variations prove to be important as the understanding of the survey materials translation can sometimes differ depending on the extent of the speaker’s English comprehension and native birth place.

This paper examines the findings from cognitive interviews that were conducted to test the French materials. Through these cognitive interviews, we hoped to learn if the French translations were accurate and appropriate for the target language and culture, if respondents were able to understand the intended messages of the survey materials, and if there were any specific concepts that were difficult to translate into French. The accuracy of each intended survey message and any identified solutions to problems with the translation are examined. Differences between native French speakers who have some knowledge of English and native French speakers who do not have any English competency are highlighted. This paper will also investigate potential differences between native French speakers from different geographic regions, including Africa, Europe, and North America. Finally, this paper will explore some of the potential challenges researchers should be aware of for future projects involving translated materials in French.

INTRODUCTION

Based on 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) figures, approximately 1.3 million Americans, aged five and over, speak French in their household, and almost 300,000 of those Americans self-report that they do not speak English “very well.” To ensure that French speaking populations are represented in the federally mandated American Community Survey, conducted by the US Census Bureau, ACS survey materials were translated for French speakers selected for this study. This paper explores the need to account for language and cultural differences when developing French survey materials, including differences within the French speaking population itself for native speakers from different cultural and geographic backgrounds. These variations can be important as the understanding of the survey materials translation may sometimes differ depending on the extent of the speaker’s English comprehension and native birth place. Other factors such as education level can also impact comprehension of key messages.

For all languages other than English, pretesting translations can ensure that translated survey instruments and supporting materials have the equivalent function of the English originals. The Census Bureau Pretesting Standard (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003) requires that non-English survey instruments and supporting materials be pretested in the languages that will be used in the production survey or census. The Census Bureau Guideline for Translation (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004) calls for a committee approach in translation and specifies that pretesting procedures should be built in as one of five steps in the translation process.

Since 2000, the Census Bureau has conducted respondent-based research with survey letters and other supplemental survey materials. Face-to-face cognitive interview research has been used to create and pretest various messaging strategies within these materials that respondents can easily, correctly, and consistently comprehend/interpret (Landreth, 2001, 2003, 2004). Prior to 2006, the Census Bureau conducted this type of research mainly in English, with some cognitive pretesting of the Spanish/English survey materials. But since 2006, the Census Bureau, in collaboration with RTI International and Research Support Services, has expanded this research effort to cover cognitive testing of translations of ACS materials in four non-English languages (Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Russian). In 2007, the French language was selected for translation, thus requiring the need to pretest the French translated materials. Research results show that cognitive testing not only detects translation issues, but also identifies respondents’ interpretation and comprehension problems due to variations in cultural expectations and communication styles (Pan and Landreth, 2006, Pan et al., 2006, Pan et al., 2007, Park and Pan, 2007). These findings help improve translated materials to ensure that translations have the equivalent communicative effect as the English originals.

Most of the cognitive testing regarding French-speaking populations has been related to marketing trends and services. Turmel (1998) presents how cultural identity can influence attitudes towards the purchase of products, while Yuen (1989) emphasizes in the importance of a multicultural approach to face a diverse ethnic and multicultural population. To contribute to the literature on cognitive testing French translations, this paper will examine the findings from twenty-four cognitive interviews that were conducted with native French speakers to test the translated ACS materials. Through these cognitive interviews, we attempted to learn if the French translations were accurate and appropriate for the target language and culture, if

respondents were able to understand the intended messages of the survey materials, and if there were any specific concepts that were difficult to translate into French; it was particularly important to see if French respondents had a similar understanding of the intended communication as English-speaking respondents.

METHODS

Purpose of the American Community Survey (ACS)

The American Community Survey is an on-going, monthly household survey that provides estimates of housing, social, and economic characteristics every year for all states, as well as for all cities, counties, metropolitan areas, with population groups of 65,000 persons or more. The ACS will provide more accurate and up-to-date profiles of America's communities every year, not just every 10 years. Community leaders and other data users will have more timely information for planning and evaluating public programs for everyone. The survey is conducted using mail self-response, and for households that do not respond by mail, interviewer staff use computer-assisted interviewing technology (by telephone or personal visit). The ACS is a mandatory survey and households selected for the survey are required by Title 13 of the United States Code to complete the questionnaire that is mailed to them or provide the survey information to a Census Bureau representative. The materials mailed to the address indicate that this is a mandatory survey.

The ACS has been in full implementation since early 2005. In order to meet the challenge of obtaining high-quality data from the increasingly multi-lingual and multi-ethnic universe of respondents, the ACS language team provides translations of informational brochures and ACS survey letters in multiple languages. Some of these languages have already been used in the past with ACS promotional materials (Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian, and Vietnamese), while another new group of languages has been incorporated, including French. These materials are to be used in mail operations or by field representatives to help gain cooperation from respondents when they encounter households whose members speak one of these languages.

ACS Survey Materials

The following ACS Survey materials were tested in the French cognitive interviews:

1. Introductory letter. This one-page letter is handed to respondents as a standard part of the ACS interview. It is similar in content to the letter included in the mailing package and it explains the ACS, confidentiality, etc.
2. Thank you letter. A brief letter thanking the respondent for participation in the ACS.
3. Informational brochure. A multi-colored trifold brochure with basic information about the ACS, including regional office phone numbers. This brochure is used regularly by interviewers to encourage response.
4. Q&A brochure. Frequently asked questions in a booklet format. It explains in a clear format

answers to major questions about the survey, its uses, privacy, confidentiality, the mandatory nature of the survey, etc.

All of these documents were translated by a Census Bureau's translation contractor prior to cognitive testing.

Cognitive Testing Procedures

Language team. The French language team served as expert reviewers and language consultants who conducted the cognitive interviews. Each panel member had a native level of language proficiency in French, with some type of formal academic or literacy training in French, and at least one of the members should be able to acknowledge linguistic differences within a language (eg: European French vs. Canadian French). This panel was responsible for the translation of the cognitive interview protocol; conducting cognitive interviews in French to test the translation; reviewing findings from the cognitive interviews and suggest recommendations of revision on problematic terms and wording in the translation; and drafting debriefing questions to be included in the debriefing section of the cognitive interview.

Protocol development and translation. In collaboration with Census Bureau staff, RTI and RSS developed a cognitive interview protocol including standard probes and special instructions. Working with RTI, French language experts translated the interview protocol.

Because in-depth cognitive testing of the ACS materials was a cognitively-demanding task for respondents, the four documents were divided into two sets, with two documents in each set. Prior to beginning the interview, each participant was assigned to one of the protocols. Only one set of documents was tested in each cognitive interview. The interviews were conducted in two rounds for each language, with twelve interviews in each round. In each round, half of these interviews were done with each set of materials. The protocol began by providing the participant with an explanation of the research and having the participant review and sign the informed consent document. If the participant agreed, the interviewer tape recorded the interview.

The protocol called for two readings of the documents under test. The first reading was to be a silent reading by the respondent. In the second reading, the respondent read aloud certain paragraphs to be specified by the Census Bureau. The scripted probes in the first reading addressed the general impression and comprehension of the message(s) contained in each document. The scripted probes in the second reading focused on the reaction to certain specific information and messages conveyed in these documents, and on the interpretation of specific terms and phrases. A debriefing section allowed for additional testing of suggested changes after a sufficient number of cases revealed major problems in translations in the early cycle of interviews. After completion of the interview, respondents received a forty dollar cash incentive.

The interview protocol addressed the following issues:

First reading:

- Do respondents understand the purpose of the letters?

- What salient messages do respondents remember from the first reading?
- What messages are appealing to respondents?
- Do respondents have an idea what the ACS survey might be about?
- Do respondents know who is conducting the survey?
- Are there parts of the letter or messages that respondents find difficult or confusing?

Second reading:

- Do respondents find any words or wording awkward after reading the specified paragraph?
- What terms or concepts do not make sense to respondents in the target language?
- Are there any terms that have a negative connotation in the target culture?
- Do respondents have a sense of how their data will be used?
- Do respondents understand the confidentiality message in the letter/brochures?
- Do respondents understand the mandatory nature of the survey?
- Do respondents know how they are selected for the survey?
- How do respondents feel after reading the letter? Will they be more or less likely to participate in the survey?
- What is the respondents' reaction to the opening and signature of the letter?

Interviewers observed the participants while they read, noting any specific signs of difficulty, confusion, hesitation, or annoyance. Interviewers asked probing questions to determine the cause of any observed or spoken confusion or concern on the part of the participants. For some sections, interviewers followed scripted probes to discuss meanings of specific statements or terms. Sometimes, the protocol guide inquired about specific meanings or alternative wordings that would have been more effective.

Analysis of key messages. Upon completion of each cognitive interview, language team members reviewed their observations and recordings to develop a summary report for each interview. This summary report highlighted the respondent's understanding of key messages and mentions of problematic text/concepts. All summary reports were then consolidated to facilitate analysis and identify patterns among all respondents, with particular emphasis on translation issues that could be adjusted in subsequent versions of the translation.

Protocol for developing/testing revised alternative wording. After all first round cognitive interviews were completed and documented in summary reports, the language team met to reassess the language used for problematic statements in the letters and brochures. They developed alternative translations, as needed, to be included in the second round of interviewing. The language team also drafted additional debriefing questions appropriate to the target language to test the alternative translations. All the proposed alternative translations were tested in the second round of interviews.

After the completion of two rounds of interviews, the language team met one additional time to review the results and to make recommendations to improve the translations for the ACS materials.

RECRUITMENT AND PARTICIPANTS

Recruitment Procedures

The French language team recruited French monolingual and bilingual speakers in the greater Buffalo, NY and Frenchville/Madawaska, ME areas through diverse methods; these methods included: calling and e-mailing posters to a French speaking community groups in Buffalo and Maine, posting flyers in French speaking markets/restaurants and in local Buffalo schools and universities, working closely with French speaking student groups, speaking with institutes that teach English as a second language in Buffalo, and working with local refugee services and government consulates in Buffalo. Word of mouth and personal networking were also used to distribute information in the French speaking community. These geographic areas were selected based on the belief that French speakers would be more prevalent in the population. Potential participants were prompted to call language team members, at which point the person was screened to ensure they met our basic study requirements.

The team attempted to recruit French-speaking respondents based on specific targeted demographics provided by ACS staff. From ACS data, French-speaking subjects' characteristics suggested the need to include high school and college graduates as well as people who had not graduated from high school; people who lived in the United States at least one year ago should be over sampled relative to recent immigrants, if possible; respondents should come from a mix of countries including Haiti, France, Canada, Morocco, and other French speaking countries; and respondents should vary in age including populations 34 or younger, aged 35 to 54, and 55 and older. In addition, a new category was added to minimize the number of interviewed respondents who were currently living in a refugee camp. Refugee service organizations proved to be a valuable source of recruiting monolingual French speakers in Buffalo, NY, and there was some concern that refugees may have a different attitude towards the government. We limited the number of refugees to prevent an introduction of bias into our results.

The French language team screened 87 individuals and found 28 persons who meet the basic criterion (French speaker, non-English speaker/reader). Based on their other characteristics such as education level, country of origin, age and year of entry, we recruited 24 persons for the cognitive interviews. **Exhibit 1** displays the demographic categories and the number of respondents in each category.

All respondents confirmed that they were native French speakers during the recruitment screening process. After review of recruiting data during the first round of data collection and to ensure other key demographic targets were met, it was decided that English speakers/readers could be included as a participant as long as they indicated they could only speak/read English "well", as opposed to "very well." In the first round, three respondents indicated that they were at least bilingual (French and English speaker/reader) and could read and speak English "well." In the second round, six respondents indicated they could read and speak English "well." In addition, all of these bilingual respondents indicated that their preferred language was French or no preference. Finally, although this information was not captured in the screening process, the remaining respondents could potentially speak and read other languages and dialects (excluding English).

Exhibit 1: Respondent Demographics (Total n-size = 24)

Characteristic	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Gender		
Female	13	54%
Male	11	46%
Age		
18-34	7	29%
35-54	9	38%
55+	8	33%
Education		
Less than high school	1	4%
High school graduate	12	50%
College graduate	11	46%
Birth Place		
Francophone Africa	10	42%
France	2	8%
Lebanon	1	4%
Haiti	2	8%
U.S.	6	25%
Canada	3	13%
Year of Entry in to U.S.		
Before 1980	9	38%
1990-1999	1	4%
2000-2005	8	33%
Since 2006	6	25%
English Bilingual Status		
English Bilingual	9	38%
Non-English bilingual	15	62%
Refugee Camp Status		
Refugee	3	12%
Non-refugee	21	88%

Recruitment Obstacles

The French language team encountered many obstacles in reaching the initial recruiting goals. The first difficulty was finding monolingual respondents who also fell into the other recruiting categories. Most of the monolingual respondents identified early in the recruitment process had only been in the United States since 2006, which was problematic based on the original recruiting plan. The French language experts felt that this would be a pattern, since typically, the longer that French speakers are in the country, the more likely they are to speak and read English well. To ensure the inclusion of monolinguals, we allowed more respondents to be interviewed if they had immigrated to the United States since 2006.

Another obstacle involved the inclusion of monolingual respondents from France, Canada, and Morocco. The French language team felt this was due to multiple issues, but mainly due to current visa requirements. To reach the goal of including respondents from France and Canada, it was agreed that we should interview respondents who were bilingual and indicated they read and spoke English only “well.”

Finally, the team encountered difficulties in recruiting respondents who had less than a high school education, and respondents who were 55 years of age or older during the first round of interviewing. Visa requirements may be affecting the education category in that French speakers who are accepted in the United States typically have higher levels of education. Only one respondent with less than a high school education was interviewed among the twenty-four respondents. While the French team encountered issues with the older age ranges in the first round of interviewing, the respondents recruited in the second round were able to compensate for this discrepancy from the first round.

RESULTS

General Findings

In general, the French translation was comprehended by most respondents; however, some of our respondents and interviewers did specifically mention that certain concepts or phrases could be difficult for some, particularly readers with lower education levels to understand. This hypothesis was supported by our one respondent with less than a high school education, who struggled with some of the more complex concepts; with the reverse holding true that most of the respondents with college degrees had a very strong understanding of the ACS messages, and respondents holding a high school diploma typically had a basic understanding of the materials.

Findings by message among all respondents

In looking at the responses to some of the key ACS messages and concepts, there was some variation on the level of understanding, with some concepts proving to be more

challenging than others to our French speaking respondents. In the following section, we will review some of these key items that were tested in the ACS materials among all respondents.

Purpose of the ACS. Most of the French respondents understood the purpose of the American Community Survey, and usually tied the purpose to how the data would be used to help improve the lives of American communities. Only one of the twenty-four respondents seemed to have difficulty expressing the purpose of the survey, making vague references to some of the populations that could be assisted by the survey. This one respondent was the only participant with a less than high school education.

Intent of ACS Data Use. Similar to the findings for the concept of “Purpose of the ACS”, most respondents were able to understand the intent of how ACS data would be used. Respondents typically linked these two concepts together as they believed that the purpose of the study was the data and how it would be used in their communities. Respondents seemed to easily recall specific uses for the data and how it would be helpful for their communities and the U.S. as a whole.

Again, the less than high school participant struggled with this concept; this participant’s response was vague and usually just mimicked the key words that were in the original text. One other respondent appears to have confused the use of the data from the cognitive interview with the use of the data from the actual ACS.

Mandatory Participation. The concept of mandatory participation was not as precisely understood as the purpose and use of the ACS data; however, this concept was still conveyed to most of the respondents. Most of them understood that it was mandatory for them to complete the ACS if they were selected to participate, and many of the respondents specifically mentioned their legal “obligation” to take part in the ACS. Some respondents referenced Title 13, which is the U.S. law that requires their response; this law is specifically referenced in the ACS materials. Of the respondents who appeared confused on this issue, the voluntary nature of the cognitive interview may have been confusing the issue of the mandatory nature of the ACS.

The same respondent with less than a high school education who struggled with previous concepts also had difficulty with this text. The interviewer for this case indicated that the respondent did not understand the concept that the study was mandatory. Others that were not as clear on this concept referenced that they were not selected by chance, but did not tie the selection to their obligation to participate.

Confidentiality of Respondent Data. Most respondents were able to define the idea of “confidentiality” in regards to their ACS data quite well, and many eventually made the connection that Title 13 was the law that protected their confidentiality. For those that had just a fair understanding of this concept, most were able to come up with related concepts such as “secret” or “to confide in.” Some of the respondents made a direct link that even if they had some concerns about participating in the ACS, the promise of confidentiality alleviated these concerns because their information would not be revealed. Interestingly, some of the

respondents who clearly understood the concept themselves mentioned that this concept could be difficult for respondents with lower education levels.

Of the respondents who did not clearly understand “confidentiality”, some of them felt that this concept was about “confidence, trust, to confide in” or felt that it was linked to not giving information to businesses for sales purposes, as opposed to protecting data from the ACS survey.

Statistical Purposes. Some of the respondents could articulate either a basic or advanced understanding of the concept of “statistical purposes,” but this appeared to be the most confusing concept that was tested in the ACS materials. Some respondents simply stated that they did not know what that phrase meant, while others were only able to develop a vague sketch of the concept, identifying that it was related to their answers and how their data would be used, but unable to pinpoint the idea of summarizing their data instead of using individual answers.

Appropriateness of the Translation. In general, many of the respondents felt that the materials were easy to understand and that the materials provided ample information for potential ACS respondents. Most respondents also understood the basic purpose of each ACS letter or brochure that was tested; however, with that said, some of our respondents did provide a caveat that they felt the ease of reading would depend on the academic level of the reader. In addition, a few Maine respondents acknowledged that there could be regional differences in understanding selected words. The respondent with the lowest education level specifically indicated that for her, some of “the language [was] difficult.”

Identification of Difficult Words or Ideas. As noted previously, some of our respondents specifically mentioned that there were a few words or concepts that may be difficult for respondents with lower education levels, even if the concept/phrase was not difficult for them to understand personally. Other times, the respondent specifically mentioned that they did not understand. Specifically mentioned the most were the concepts of “confidentiality” and “statistical purposes”, which we have seen in the results of these cognitive interviews. In regards to specific words, the most common respondent mentions included, “autochtones, (American Indian),” “étatiques (state),” “des information actualisées (informed decisions)” and “collectivités (communities).” In general, the suggestions from French respondents were requests for more familiar words and expressions from their particular regions.

After reviewing the difficult words and phrases, the language team identified alternate translations that were tested in the second round of cognitive interviewing. Based on these findings, the translation was refined to address changeable issues identified in the first round of cognitive interviewing with difficult words and phrases that could be adjusted, with the biggest change being the word for “community” in the American Community Survey title. Instead of using “collectivités”, it was decided to use “communautés” in its place, which tested better among our interview respondents.

Findings comparing respondent groups

In reviewing the findings for all respondents, three different categories appeared to have some influence on the understanding of the ACS messages; those groupings included education level, country of origin, and English bilingual status. By splitting the respondent data and comparing the different groups, we were able to identify trends among certain types of respondents; however, please recall the low sample size for our cognitive interviews, which makes broad generalizations difficult. Our review is meant to help inform future research and the development of translated French survey materials.

Education Level. In general, the level of education seemed to influence the respondent understanding of tested messages in the survey materials. Overall, for all concepts, college graduates tended to have better definitions and explanations of key concepts; high school graduates usually had a good to fair understanding of key concepts and could easily identify simple points, and the less than high school participant struggled with most of the more sophisticated ACS messages.

Interestingly, our less than high school respondent was quick to say that the translation was appropriate but when later asked about difficult words or concepts, she did admit that the language as a whole for one of the documents was difficult. This respondent did not provide any specific examples of difficult language, leading to a potential conclusion that the reading level as a whole may have been too high for her. In further review, there did not seem to be many differences between college graduates and high school respondents in regards to answers about translation appropriateness or challenging phrases and messages.

Country of Origin. While the education groups tended to follow the same patterns for most concepts, there were some differences among regional groups across some of the tested concepts.

As seen in the overall review, most respondents understood the survey purpose and data use messages, so there was not much variation among the groups with these concepts; however it does appear that respondents from developing countries (Francophone Africa) expressed a particular enthusiasm about the ACS material and the purpose of the survey to assist American communities.

On the message of mandatory participation, American and French respondents were very clear about their requirement to participate; respondents who were not quite as clear on this issue were scattered across geographic groups including Canada, Francophone Africa, and Haiti. There does not appear to be a major trend for one particular region in regards to not understanding this message.

With the more sophisticated concept of confidentiality, Americans, Canadians, French, and Haitian respondents were all able to communicate this concept either very well or adequately. A few of the Francophone African respondents struggled with this concept a bit more than in other regions, although many were at least able to tie the idea of confidentiality to keeping a “secret” or making sure their identities were kept secret.

The most difficult message of “statistical purposes” tends to follow a similar pattern, with Western cultures having an easier time understanding, including respondents from the U.S., Canada, and France. Of the two Haitian respondents, one respondent seemed to grasp this concept, while the other had difficulty. Again, we see that the Francophone African respondents seemed to have the most trouble with this concept, compared to other geographic regions, with the most admissions of not understanding the phrase or defining the concept adequately. Also impacting these findings could be the non-English bilingual status of the Francophone African respondent group; all ten respondents were non-English speakers or readers.

As seen in the overall review of all respondents, most of the participants interviewed felt the translation was appropriate, with some indicating that the level might be difficult for lower educated populations to understand. Most geographic groups had someone mention the level of difficulty or point out specific concepts or wording that could be confusing. Respondents from the U.S. were a vocal group, with five of six respondents offering a suggested change to the translation.

English Bilingual Status. With our difficulty in recruiting all monolingual French speakers, we gained the opportunity of comparing the data between monolingual and bilingual speakers with some English competency. Again, we see that there was not much of a difference in understanding between groups for the first two key messages of survey purpose and data use. For the remaining messages, it does appear that the group with some English competency understood the more sophisticated concepts better or could more easily define those messages, particularly for the concepts of confidentiality and survey purpose. Understanding of these messages could also be impacted by education level, as the majority of our English bilingual respondents held a college degree, with seven of nine respondents in the bilingual category having graduated college; in the non-English bilingual group, eleven of fifteen respondents had a high school education or less.

The English bilingual respondents usually did state that the translation was appropriate, but were more likely to mention the reading level of the text as being a potential issue for others; conversely, the non-English bilingual respondents were more likely to say the translation was appropriate as is, with less caveats. Seeming to follow this same pattern, English speakers/readers were more likely to offer suggested changes or identify difficult concepts, with five of nine respondents offering advice for changing the translation; for the non-English speaking group, only six of fifteen offered suggestions. The English bilingual respondents appeared to feel more comfortable suggesting alternatives to the already existing translation.

CONCLUSION

The ACS cognitive interviews provide a look into the understanding of basic survey research concepts among varied French populations. As seen by the overall review of the major concepts, most basic survey concepts including survey purpose, data use, and mandatory participation translated adequately to the French speakers in our study, with confidentiality and especially survey purpose being two ideas that were more difficult to convey. Studies with French translated documents attempting to explain these two concepts should pay particular attention to the wording and context provided to respondents; translators should not assume that these concepts are as readily known to the French speaking population as they may be in English speaking populations or other cultures. This appears to be particularly important if the survey population will potentially include respondents with lower levels of education or respondents from Francophone Africa, who seemed to have more difficulty with these concepts. In subsequent research, determining why these two concepts might be more difficult for certain types of French respondents or cultures would be valuable so that insight could be applied to translation work.

Pretesting the translated documents was a worthwhile step as several changes were identified in the original translation that helped to improve the ACS survey materials and to further help with clarifying key concepts. Our findings support the best practice of pretesting translations with the target language group prior to a full scale implementation of a translation.

Future research should attempt to test all of these concepts with more less than high school educated respondents to determine the ideal translation for this type of population. While we were able to include one respondent with less than a high school education, we are unable to further generalize if the translation and concepts were too difficult for all respondents with this level of education or if the concepts were difficult for this one particular respondent. With that said, other researchers may find it difficult to recruit a large number of French speaking respondents with this level of education, as we encountered and attempted to overcome, but could not. Researchers should also be aware that, in general, recruiting monolingual French speakers is not an easy task, since many of them exhibit a certain degree of bilingualism/knowledge of English that might bias the test.

Future research on French translations should always attempt to include French speaking respondents from different countries of origin given the regional and cultural differences that were documented for some of our key concepts. To ensure that the translation can be understood by as many different French speakers as possible, it is imperative to account for differences among French spoken in Canada, U.S., Europe, Africa, and the Caribbean. Translators should consider whether the translation will be targeting Western countries only or will be including other countries from Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean to ensure that concepts are properly introduced and explained to all cultures reading the translation.

REFERENCES

- Landreth, A. (2001). "SIPP Advance Letter Research: Cognitive Interview Results, Implications, and Letter Recommendations." Statistical Research Division's Working Papers in Survey Methodology #2001-01, Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau, Center for Survey Methods Research.
- Landreth, A. (2003). "Final Report: Results and Recommendations from Cognitive Interviews with Selected Materials Accompanying the American Community Survey." Study Series: Survey Methodology #2003-10. Methodology and Standards Directorate, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Landreth, A. (2004). "Survey Letters: A Respondent's Perspective." In the 2004 American Statistical Association Proceedings of the Joint Statistical Meetings.
- Pan, Y., Hinsdale, M., Schoua-Glusberg, A. and Park, H. (2006). "Cognitive Testing of Translations of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages." In: *Statistical Research Division's Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2006-09)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Pan, Y., Landreth, A., Hinsdale, M., Park, H. and Schoua-Glusberg, A. (2007). "Methodology for Cognitive Testing of Translations in Multiple Languages." Paper presented at the 62nd AAPOR Annual Conference. May 17-20, 2007.
- Park, H. and Pan, Y. (2007). "Cognitive interviewing of translated material with Asian population – Findings from Chinese and Korean interviews in American Community Survey." Paper presented at the 62nd AAPOR Annual Conference. May 17-20, 2007.
- Turmel, Andree. The influence of culture and lifestyles on receptivity to direct mail. Diss. Concordia University (Canada), 1998.ABI/INFORM Global.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). "Census Bureau Standard: Pretesting Questionnaires and Related Materials for Surveys and Censuses."
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). "Census Bureau Guideline: Language Translation of Data Collection Instruments and Supporting Materials."
- Yuen, J. "Changing Face of Canadian Population Challenges Management". Communication World, July/August 1989; 6, 8, p. 17