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Cross-national questionnaire design and pretesting

- **Goals**
  - Minimizing *instrument* and *respondent* components of total survey error (Smith 2011)
  - Producing questions that result in equivalent measures.

- **Know-how**
  - Ask the Same Question (ASQ) and Translate approach vs. adaptation
  - Sequential, parallel or simultaneous design of source and target versions
  - Questionnaire design as an iterative process
  - Conceptual and measurement validity (Billiet 2016)
The challenges of cross national questionnaire design in the ESS

The source questionnaire should work in the British context and at the same time, it is an instrument that after translation should work equally well in 25+ languages.
Cross-national questionnaire design and pretesting

- **Where we are?**
  - State-of-the-art literature includes comprehensive inventory of options and current practices to design comparative survey questions.
  - Guidelines describe approaches used in a variety of social, political, health and psychological survey research
  - Useful as an inventory for potential strategies

- **What is missing?**
  - An analytical evaluation of the approaches listed
  - A blueprint of how to best organise the process of questionnaire design and pre-testing overall, considering its iterative nature
In this invited paper we....

- Introduce the European Social Survey (ESS) Questionnaire Design and pretesting model

- Evaluate the extent to which the 17 stage model ensures the effective design of the source instrument

- Use the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) methodology to analyse the components of the process in a clear, concise, logical and systematic way.
1. Proposals from QDT
2. Expert review of questions
3. Use of Survey Quality Predictor Program
4. Revised proposals from QDT and CST
5. Consultation with ESS National Coordinators
6. Omnibus Testing & Cognitive Interviewing
7. Omnibus Analysis, CI Analysis
8. Revised proposals from QDT and CST
9. Split ballot MTMM experiments developed
10. Large-scale two-nation quantitative pilot & Advance Translation
11. Pilot analysis & results of advance translation
12. Expert review & revised proposals from QDT and CST
13. Consultation with ESS National Coordinators
14. Final source Q’aire produced
15. Translation & Translation Verification
16. SQP coding
17. Country pre-tests

Questionnaire alerts (only when necessary)

Mainstage fieldwork
How to evaluate the questionnaire design and pretesting in the ESS using the LFA?

- **Goals**
  - Minimizing *instrument* and *respondent* components of total survey error
  - Producing questions that result in equivalent measures.

- **Purpose**
  - Producing an effective questionnaire allowing comparable measurement across countries

- **Outputs**
  - Theoretical, conceptual and items specification finalised in template and updated when necessary
  - Questions finalised for cognitive interviewing, omnibus survey(s), pilot study
  - Optimal source questionnaire released
The overall goals can be verified after questionnaire design, once data is collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Measurable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing <em>instrument</em> and <em>respondent</em> components of total survey error</td>
<td>Questions with high measurement quality</td>
<td>Assessment of the measurement quality of questions using SQP and MTMM experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing questions that result in equivalent measures</td>
<td>Concepts found to be measurement equivalent</td>
<td>Assessment of the quality and equivalence of complex concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific purpose and outputs are assessed to the extent they contribute to design better questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and outputs</th>
<th>Measurable indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producing an effective questionnaire allowing comparable measurement</td>
<td>Use of an array of pretesting methods</td>
<td>Pretesting methods and findings used in combination to improve questions. Methods developed in the process are accepted by the academic community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and items specification</td>
<td>Documentation of the process, published for end users</td>
<td>Concepts are clearly defined and tapped by questions intended to measure them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final questions for each pretesting stage</td>
<td>Questionnaires finalised, sent to NCs, translated and sent to fieldwork agencies</td>
<td>QD Template documents that questions were changed based on evidence from triangulating pretesting findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source questionnaire released</td>
<td>Optimal question formulation chosen based on evidence collected during the process</td>
<td>Academic community, policy makers and governments accept the questionnaire as state-of-the-art for that topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important assumptions

- The success of the questionnaire design process relies upon important assumptions
  
  ✔ Assessment methods are correct tools for assessing measurement quality and equivalence
  
  ✔ Resources are available for pretesting and scientists participating in the process
  
  ✔ National teams engage fully in the process
  
  ✔ Triangulation of findings is performed rigorously
  
  ✔ QDT and CST seek changes and improvements derived from evidence
An example: dropping an item in Round 6

- “How difficult or easy do you think it is for immigrants to get the right to vote in national elections in [country]? (0 = far too difficult; 10 = far too easy)”

- Decision after quantitative and qualitative evidence suggested that there was a ‘source question problem’ (CNEST) (Fitzgerald et al, 2011).

- **Expert review** pointed out this was an issue which respondents in general simply did not know about.

- **Pilot study** showed a substantial proportion of ‘don’t know’ or mid-point response in both the UK and Russia.

- **Cognitive interviewing**. Some respondents interpreted this as a ‘knowledge’ question: lack of knowledge about the relevant legal situation for immigrants or lack of relevant experience, they were not immigrants, they could not judge the difficulty of getting the ‘right to vote.”
Conclusions

- The ESS Cross-national Questionnaire Design and Pretesting provides a structured, multi-layered and culturally sensitive framework for cross-national projects.
- It produces a questionnaire that minimises instrument and respondent components of TSE and yields equivalent measures.
- Core elements are specification, documentation, multidisciplinary input, qualitative and quantitative testing, advance translation and detailed data analysis.
- Questions are developed by triangulating findings from an array of qualitative and quantitative methods.
- Rigorous environment for developing a source questionnaire translatable into target languages across Europe.
Conclusions

- Current challenges include:
  - The long time period for development (24 months)
  - Limited pretesting of the target questionnaires
  - Large resources required to fund the work
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