

Florida State University Libraries

2016

Multilingual Versions of Popular Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Tests: Considerations for Training School Psychologists

S. Kathleen Krach, Kanessa Miller Doss and Michael P. McCreery



Assessing Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Problems:
Use of Multilingual Versions of Tests

S. Kathleen Krach, Ph.D., NCSP

Florida State University

Kanessa Miller Doss, Ph.D.

Troy University

&

Michael P. McCreery, Ph.D.

University of Nevada Las Vegas

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. S. Kathleen Krach,
Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, Stone Building, Florida
State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4459. Email: skrach@fsu.edu

Abstract

This paper focuses on bias in the translation of social, emotional, and behavioral tests. Specifically, the authors address tests developed in the United States (U. S.), but later adapted for use with non-English speakers, and / or individuals who live(d) outside of the United States. Ethics and best practices for use and selection of test translations are described, along with problems endemic to ad-hoc translation. In addition, the authors surveyed publishers to determine what languages and normative data have been made available other than the English version (with U.S. norms). This information is tabulated and presented. The most popular language available was English; normative data was available for English speakers from the United States, Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Spanish was the second most popular, with 12.59% of the tests translated into Spanish (8.3% with norms). These Spanish norms may be general (all Spanish speakers) or specific (e.g., Puerto Rican norms). In addition, country-based norms are described for some tests, but the actual language is not (e.g., there are norms for Spain but it is unclear if the language is Castilian, Basque, Catalan, Galician, or Occitan).

Assessing Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Problems:
Use of Multilingual Versions of Tests

The International School Psychology Association (ISPA, 2011) states in its ethical code that school psychologists should, if possible, speak to clients and their families in their native languages. However, in the United States, only 10.8% of all school psychologists describe themselves as bilingual (Curtis et al., 2010). Sixty-seven percent of monolingual, English-speaking school psychologists report that they have tested children whose language differs from their own (Ochoa, Riccio, Jimenez, de Alba, & Sines, 2004; Ochoa, Rivera, & Ford, 1997), and 87.2% report that they have worked with children who are culturally and linguistically diverse (Sotelo-Dynega & Dixon, 2014). This means that most school psychologists in the United States are not able to meet the ISPA requirement to speak directly to some of their clients. Instead, they use translators to conduct interviews and resort to using translated (professionally or ad-hoc) versions of tests to make diagnoses (Ochoa et al., 2004).

To compound this problem, school psychologists are conducting multilingual assessments with very little training. Most school psychologists in the United States (about 80%) felt that their training did not adequately prepare them to work with children who do not speak fluent English (Ochoa et al., 2004). Even individuals who self-identified as bilingual school psychologists described a lack of training in working with translators. When O'Bryon and Rogers (2010) surveyed bilingual school psychologists, they found that only 5% of respondents' cases in graduate school involved the use of translators. However, in their work after graduation, about 14% of those cases

necessitated the use of translators. When asked how they felt about using translators, these bilingual specialists described themselves as only “somewhat comfortable ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.16$)” (p. 1026) on a 5-point scale. This lack of training conflicts with ethical guidelines stating that assessments must be culturally sensitive, fair, unbiased, and within the test administrator’s training skill set (APA, 2009, 2010).

These APA (2010) and ISPA (2011) guidelines also conflict with legal requirements in the United States to test students in a timely manner (IDEA, 2004). Thus, many test administrators both in and outside of the United States describe the appropriate translation procedures (ITC, 2010) as far too time-consuming, complicated, and impractical for regular use (Jeanrie & Bertrand, 1999).

Given the described conflicts, it is imperative that school psychologists be given guidance on how to work with translators and translated versions of tests in the most effective, but least onerous, manner. This paper will first address the guidelines, requirements, and steps for accurately translating tests for both language and norms. Next, the authors will clarify problems endemic to the use of ad hoc translation. Finally, information about available, professionally translated social, emotional, and behavioral instruments will be provided and discussed.

Guidelines for Translating a Test Instrument

Interpreters strive to ensure that individuals from different language backgrounds can understand one another orally. Translators do essentially the same task, but focus instead on written language (Brown, 2011). Both interpreters and translators work with school psychologists in meetings and counseling sessions, and while testing individuals who are culturally and linguistically diverse. Their primary goal is to accurately provide

comprehensive translations from one language to another without any information loss or gain. Just like school psychologists, translators have their own code of ethics governed by the American Translators' Association (ATA, n. d).

Ethical guidelines addressing the use of translators by school psychologists are provided by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2010), the International School Psychology Association (ISPA, 2011), and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 2011). However, it should be noted that other organizations have developed specific guidelines that must also be considered. For example, the American Education Research Association (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME) formed a joint commission that published guidelines for using translators and translations in 1999. In addition, the National Council on Interpreting in Health Care (NCIHC) published its own set of guidelines in 2004.

Overall, these ethical guidelines ask that any school psychologist be knowledgeable about cultural and linguistic differences when considering information from interpreters. This awareness of information must begin at the consent stage, continue to the testing and data collection stage and on through interpretation and accurate presentation of the information to parents and teachers. It ends with intervention, planning, and implementation. Although most of these guidelines are general in nature, Table 1 summarizes the specific sections that address culturally sensitive assessment practices with non-English speakers.

In addition to these ethical guidelines, the International Test Commission (ITC, 2010) has developed a clear set of test adaptation practice guidelines for individuals and

test publishers. According to their website (<http://www.intestcom.org/>), the ITC consists of 21 national professional organizational members in psychology, 64 affiliate members (including test publishers, testing research organizations, etc.) and over 700 individual members. The current council board consists of 17 members from 10 different countries.

The ITC Guidelines for Test Adaptations provide parameters for translating and adapting assessments and psychological instruments, intended to ensure score equivalence across culturally and linguistically diverse groups (Hambleton, Merenda, & Spielberger, 2005; ITC, 2010). There are 22 guidelines in 4 categories: Context; Test Development and Adaptation; Administration; and Documentation / Score Interpretations. Of these, the current paper will focus only on those pertaining to translation and normative data. These specific guidelines are also outlined in Table 1.

Steps in Test Translation

Because there are multiple sets of established guidelines, the process of translating or adapting assessments into different languages may be approached in different ways. For the purposes of this article, the authors address only some of the most common methods. This list of techniques is by no means exhaustive, and although it originates from multiple sources, it leans heavily on the work of Geisinger (1994) and Butcher (1996).

1. Translate / Adapt the Instrument

In general, the first step is to adapt the instrument by translating it into the target language at the item-by-item level. In addition, sections of the tests (including items) are explored for cultural relevancy (Geisinger, 1994; Bornman, Sevcik, Ronski, & Pae, 2010). “Cultural relevancy” addresses whether the intended meaning of each item

remains consistent once the words are translated. For example, when a rating scale allows for “never, sometimes, often, always” as choices, these words may have different meanings for different cultural groups. Thus, a direct translation may not be sufficient to ensure accuracy in equivalent understanding. Given the complexity of these tasks, literal translation and cultural relevancy adaptation should only be completed by highly skilled individuals. These individuals should be fluent in both the original and targeted test languages, knowledgeable about the cultural norms influencing both versions, and expert in the constructs assessed by each instrument (Geinsinger, 1994).

Usually, the translators start by using a technique called forward translation, in which a single translator or group of translators transmute the instrument from the source language to the target language (Hambleton et al., 2005). Then, another group of translators judge the equivalence of the two versions (Hambleton et al., 2005). For example, an item in English with the word “light” might be forward-translated to the Spanish word “luz.”

Forward translation is appropriate for making direct judgments about the equivalency between the source and the target language versions of the test. However, there are frequent inconsistencies in forward translations. For example, one person might translate the word “anxious” to a word more similar in meaning to “fretful, or another might choose one more similar to “worried.” Although these are not incorrect translations, they are inconsistent. Factors that might contribute to inconsistent and inaccurate forward translations include differences between the translator’s educational and cultural background and the targeted test-takers’, or the translator’s lack of fluency in

either the original or the target language (Hambelton et al., 2005; Weeks, Swerissen, & Belfrage, 2007).

2. Examine the Translated / Adapted Instrument

The next step focuses on the need to ensure translation equivalency. In this step, the translated or adapted version of the instrument should be subjected to a back translation (in which an independent reviewer translates the target language version back to the original language) to ensure language equivalency (Hambleton et al., 2005). An example of a back translation might be to take a phrase such as “going to grandma’s house” and forward translating it to “ir a casa de la abuela.” In a back translation, the sentence now could become “to go to house of the grandmother.” It is now up for experts to review whether the translated version loses or changes significant meaning.

3. Use Reviewer’s Comments to Adapt the Measure

The next step is a comprehensive review by an expert panel to ensure cultural equivalency between the two versions (Geinsinger, 1994; Butcher, 1996; Bornman et al., 2010). This panel should include neither the person who conducted the original translation nor the one who performed the back translation. This panel should have both versions (first language and target language) available when considering equivalency. As with translators, the panel must be knowledgeable about the language and the culture for both the original and targeted test populations. After the review is complete, the recommendations of this comprehensive panel review should be implemented (Geinsinger, 1994; Bornman et al., 2010). For example, if the panel feels that a particular item cannot accurately be translated to the target language, then the item should be removed or replaced by something more culturally appropriate.

4. Pilot Test

Pilot testing / pretest field studies of the instrument should be implemented to assess the appropriateness of the administration procedures and test-item translations. Based off of pilot test findings, test modification should be implemented (Geinsinger, 1994; Butcher, 1996; Bornman et al., 2010). All modifications should highlight the clarity of the instructions, ease of test administration, sufficiency of time limits, item wording, formatting acceptability, and other pertinent information that addresses the overall quality of the instrument (Geinsinger, 1994; Hertzog, 2008).

5. Field Test

After pilot testing has been completed and the instrument has been revised accordingly, then the instrument should be field tested and evaluated for culturally appropriate normative data. The target population should be adequately represented by a sizeable sample that is representative of the eventual population to be evaluated with the assessment device, to state that findings are applicable to them. Data analyses of this data collection should be performed and should include internal consistency reliability, test-retest reliability (if possible), traditional/ item-response theory item, and differential item functioning analyses. The results of the original instrument and the adapted version should be compared (Geinsinger, 1994; Butcher, 1996).

In addition, normative data should be relevant to the target population in terms of language exposure and cultural experiences. In any write-up of the normative data, the specifics about the sample should be clear. For example, tests translated into Spanish may be described as having “Spanish” norms, but this is to be discouraged as being too vague. Instead, the test publisher should state if the normative sample was derived from Spanish-

speaking individuals from within the United States, or, if the sample came from Spanish-speaking individuals living within a different native country. This is because the cultural experiences of a Spanish-speaking individual from Guatemala may be dramatically different than that of a second-generation immigrant from Guatemala living within the United States. Ensuring appropriate normative data may result in the need for more data collection within the targeted language and cultural group (Geinsinger, 1994; Butcher, 1996).

6. Conduct Validity Research

Geinsinger (1994) advises that, to determine whether it assesses the same qualities in both the original and translated test versions, the test should be revalidated. The three possible sources of validity to be addressed are content, construct, and criterion. A panel of experts can use a table of specifications to ensure content validity by checking that each item measures what is intended (Sattler, 2014). Criterion validity is achieved by having bilingual individuals complete both language versions to determine if the scores correlate. Finally, construct validity can be established through factor analysis. The same number of factors should be found on both language versions. The factor-analytic approach is the most commonly used construct validation procedure in translated adaptations of tests. (Geinsinger, 1994).

7. Standardize the Scores

The normative data from the first language version of a test cannot be used for the translated version. This would not be appropriate for numerous reasons, but validity is the main concern. Specifically, a new-language version may not measure the same constructs as the original due to differences in word meaning from one version to another, as well as

differences in perception from one cultural group to another. Some cultural differences may include time orientation, need for achievement, need for affiliation, etc. (Geinsinger, 1994). Therefore, it is important for publishers to re-norm any version for both cultural differences (e.g., by nationality) and language differences (e.g., English and Spanish).

8. Develop a User Manual and Necessary Materials

Appropriate documentation verifying the value of using the translated version of an assessment and communicating appropriate use is necessary for professional use. It should not be considered professionally standard to simply adapt a measure without adequate rationale and resources (Geinsinger, 1994).

9. Train Users

Test adapters are responsible for developing training programs and resources to ensure that users are knowledgeable about the translated version of assessments. The training program should cover “how to administer, use, and interpret scores from the newly revised measure” (Geinsinger, 1994, p. 308), thus preventing users of the original instrument from misinterpreting scores from the translated version due to possible changes in validity, reliability, interpretation, or scoring of the instrument.

10. Collect Feedback

The test adapter should gather feedback from users of the translated measure. The data collected could influence necessary modifications and needs for future research, and may provide information about whether or not the translated instrument is being used correctly (Geinsinger, 1994).

Issues Specific to Social, Emotional, Behavioral Testing

It is apparent that translating tests is a complicated process under the most basic conditions, but equivalency becomes even more complicated when applied to social, emotional, and behavioral tests. Equivalence is difficult to achieve with these constructs due to the culture-laden nature of specific questions. For example, if the goal is to translate the word “sad” from English to another language, the translator might choose words with any of these near-equivalent meanings: “blue,” “depressed,” “unhappy,” “down,” or “glum.” Each of these may represent an accurate translation, but each may have a different cultural interpretation. If the test also includes Likert-type items using potentially elusive terms such as “strongly agree” and “strongly disagree,” the entire translation process become even more complex (Hambleton et al., 2005; Sattler, Oades-Sese, Kitzie, & Krach, 2014).

Achieving content equivalence when evaluating social, emotional, and behavioral constructs can be further challenging because any translated version should take into account cultural relevance for the targeted population (Okawa, 2008; Sattler et. al, 2014). If an assessor is examining a child’s social skills, the cultural expectations for the parent / child or teacher / child interactions might vary greatly from one cultural group to another (Cartledge & Milburn, 1996). For example, one cultural group may consider eye contact a sign of respect, while for a different group it may be a sign of disrespect (Blais, Jack, Scheepers, Fiset, & Caldara, 2008). Thus, it is not sufficient to simply translate the words and the norms; one must also take these cultural variables into consideration (ITC, 2010).

Ad-Hoc Translations

The process of ethically and accurately translating a test can be costly and time-consuming. It should not be completed by individual practitioners, but by test developers

and publishers. However, if no translation is commercially available, ad-hoc translations often occur. Ad-hoc translation is a process by which a practitioner translates (or has translated) materials from their original language to the target language. This may occur ahead of time or on-the-spot. Although this is considered to be a highly questionable practice, half of all school psychologists in the United States report that they have used ad-hoc translators in their work with English-language learners (Ochoa, et al., 2004). About one fourth of all bilingual school psychologists reported using translators to interpret standardized tests, and about 13% of them had test translations performed on-the-spot (O'Bryon & Rogers, 2010). Given that these same bilingual school psychologists reported themselves to have better-than-average knowledge of appropriate assessments for bilingual populations (O'Bryon & Rogers, 2010), these numbers are quite troubling.

As mentioned previously, the ITC (2010) standards set out what should be done to accurately translate a test. Other organizations (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999; APA, 2010; NASP, 2011; NCIHC, 2004), have guidelines for selecting who should translate a test. These organizational guidelines indicate that any translators (including ad-hoc) should be knowledgeable about both the original and the target languages, knowledgeable about testing and measurement, and also trained in ethical testing. However, the reality is often very different from the ideal.

O'Bryon and Rogers (2010) interviewed bilingual school psychologists and found that 32.9% reported working with untrained translators. Often, this is because only untrained translators are easily available. For example, Paone, Malott, and Maddux (2010) found that the most popular school-based translators in the United States were secretaries and janitors, many of these whom were not evaluated on their ability to speak

in either the child's language or in English. Another popular translator is the child's older sibling, or even the child him- or herself (regardless of the child's language ability and / or academic skills) (García-Sánchez, Orellana, & Hopkins, 2011; Tse, 1995). In addition to not being able to ensure the sibling-translator's language skills, using this individual leads to additional dual-relationship ethical issues (APA, 2010; NASP, 2011)

Instead, schools might consider a foreign-language teacher from within the district to be the most qualified available person. However, even this solution has its faults. First, it should be noted that certified professional translators must have proficiency in the advanced-high range in both languages, where foreign-language teachers are only expected to have proficiency in the advanced-low range (Swender, 2003). This means that many of these teachers may have inadequate language skills for the job. In addition, many foreign-language teachers are uncomfortable with the role of translator (Colomer & Harklau, 2009), often feeling that they should not be used or considered as good choices for translation services, especially for technical work such as test development (Colomer & Harklau, 2009).

Finally, ad-hoc translations are strongly discouraged because of problems with standardization, psychometrics, and score interpretations (Figueroa, 1990). Test error can be introduced at any point in the process, and deviations from approved procedures will only increase the likelihood of this. Thus, if ad-hoc translations are done at all, they should only be attempted by well-trained individuals. Unfortunately, in the United States, only about 50% of school psychologists have received any level of training in working with translators (Ochoa et al., 2004). Given the poor psychometrics of ad-hoc tests (even using qualified personnel) and the lack of trained translators and school psychologists to

use them, the risk seems high that information derived from these tests may provide poor data on which to base decisions.

Therefore, it is clear that only a very few school psychologists should attempt ad-hoc translation, and then only in rare instances. However, more than 50% of school psychologists report that they have used ad-hoc translations, especially with rating scales (Ochoa et al., 2004). No information is provided as to why these school psychologists decided to use ad-hoc translations, but it can only be assumed that they did so for one of the following reasons: 1) they were unaware that ad-hoc translations are psychometrically unsound (Ochoa et al., 2004), 2) they felt that translating tests appropriately was too burdensome a task (Jeanrie & Bertrand, 1999), or 3) they were unaware that professionally-translated tests were available. This final reason is the focus of the remainder of this paper.

When this study began, the authors were aware that several instruments were available in both Spanish and English versions. The original purpose of this data collection was to identify which social, emotional, and behavioral tests were in Spanish as well as English, and to identify if these tests were normed appropriately. The publishers notified the authors that their tests were available in many languages other than Spanish (with and without normative equivalents). Subsequently, this paper was designed to share this publisher information so that other school psychologists can be made aware of the best instruments available for their students. It is also designed to help school psychologists become better consumers of the translated versions of tests that are available.

Methods

Test Selection. The tests selected for study came from lists available in the Sattler and Hogue (2005) textbook, *Assessment of Children: Behavioral, Social, and Clinical Foundations*, Fifth Edition. This textbook is considered to be “the gold standard in best assessment practices” (Joyce, 2006, p. 124). Therefore, the tests described within it will be ones frequently used by school psychologists.

Data collection. The data collection took place in several stages. First, the publisher’s websites (both the U.S. and foreign versions) were searched for tests available for purchase online. Emails were then sent to the publishers to ensure that all versions of the tests available for purchase were considered. Some of the tests had non-English versions sold by different publishers than the ones who sold the English version. Emails were therefore sent to multiple publishers to ensure that as many tests as possible were included in the study. Follow-up phone calls were conducted with publishers as needed.

Results

There were several different types of social, emotional, and behavioral tests listed in the Sattler and Hogue (2006) text. Among these were broad tests covering several areas in a single administration (e.g., the Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second Edition [BASC-II], etc.), as well as narrower instruments that measure only one construct, such as antisocial behavior, adaptive behavior, anxiety, autism, brain injury, depression, parenting and family, and visual-motor perception and motor perception. It should be noted that all of the tests used in the text (Sattler & Hogue, 2006) were designed for a U.S. audience, and none were originally based on a translated version from a different country. Table 2 provides specific information about normative / translation data available for each test. Of the 45 tests examined (see Table 3), 108 normed

variations and 143 translated variations exist.

Although many countries recognize numerous official languages, often the normative / translation data from the publisher did not specify which language was used in the norms. For example, there are norms for Spain; however, Spain recognizes five languages, including Spanish, Basque, Catalan, Galician, and Occitan. Without additional information, it is unclear which of these was used when gathering these norms. The same occurs with Canadian norms (e.g., whether the tests were administered in French or English).

The single most popular language in which the tests were offered was English (100%). Some tests provided normative data for English-language tests for countries other than the United States (i.e., Australia and the United Kingdom). As expected, Spanish was the second-most available language (8.3% normed and 12.59% translated). Chinese was the third-most translated language (2.78%); however, German was the third population with specific norms (7.41%).

Although many countries recognize numerous official languages, often the normative / translation data does not specify which one was used in the norms. For example, there are norms for Spain; however, Spain recognizes five languages including Spanish, Basque, Catalan, Galician, and Occitan. Without additional information, it is unclear which of these languages were used when gathering these norms. The same occurs with Canadian norms (e.g., were the tests administered in French or English).

Discussion

Newell, et al. (2010) provide a structured framework for improving university-based training for preservice school psychologists. As part of their work, they cite the

cross-cultural competencies outlined by Lopez and Rogers (2001) and Rogers and Lopez (2002). Specifically, they describe a required need for school psychologists to be able to understand cross-cultural issues across 14 areas, including assessment, culture, language, research, and working with interpreters. To accomplish the goal of meeting cultural competency in these 14 areas, the model by Newell, et al. (2010) includes specific goals such as integrating cross-cultural content throughout courses, as well as providing at least one stand-alone course. They discuss creating a culture of multiculturalism within the program through recruitment, training, practice, and research opportunities.

O'Bryon and Rogers (2010) found that training in multicultural issues is required for best practice with practitioners. When they surveyed bilingual school psychologists who were currently practicing, the best predictor of best practice by these school psychologists was not the quality of their university-based training, but the types of continuing education that they have pursued. Thus, any attempt to improve training for practitioners working with children for whom English is not their first language should be based on materials usable by both graduate students and current practitioners.

The purpose of this current paper was to provide additional information for trainers to use in teaching bilingual assessment to their students as part of either course materials or continuing education. Specifically, current practitioners describe lacking knowledge of how to work with interpreters, translators, and multilingual assessments (O'Bryon & Rogers, 2010; Ochoa et al., 2004). Information in the current paper provides data about how to choose a test, how to work with translators and interpreters when testing, and how to address specific concerns for bilingual versions of social, emotional, and behavioral assessments.

For example, when tests are translated from their original language and / or normative version, there will always be some loss in the original meaning (Sattler, 2001). Several organizations (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999; APA, 2010, NCME & NCIHC, 2004; NASP, 2011, ISPA, 2011; ITC, 2010) have developed standards to minimize this loss and to maintain the integrity of the assessment process for linguistically diverse children. Based on their guidelines, school psychologists hold the responsibility to understand best practices when working with both translators and translated versions of tests.

One of the more popular methods of translating tests is the ad-hoc technique (Ochoa et al., 2004), in which translations are done by the practitioner and / or a translator, but not the publisher. In general, ad-hoc translation is regarded as an ill-considered and not psychometrically sound testing technique (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005). Also, if tests are translated in an ad-hoc manner, their normative data should no longer be used or considered in the evaluation. Therefore, practitioners may wish to pursue professionally translated versions of popular tests instead.

Test publishers have progressed significantly in the versions available. Of the 44 surveyed, popular tests that measure social, emotional, and behavioral issues, all but nine offered a language option other than English. Although Spanish and Chinese were the two most translated languages from English (with Spanish and German as the two most normed), many of the instruments provided many other language options. For example, some of the tests were translated and normed for as many as 25 different nationalities.

It was not easy to identify which translated versions existed. The publishers' websites were not always helpful (or consistent). These inconsistencies limit the ability of the average practitioner to discover what is available. And, even though many more

languages are available than a quick online search will show, there are still children from low-incidence language populations who are not represented.

The call to the field is to try to fill in these language gaps so that accurate test data can be obtained for all children. However, until then, the best way to get a complete picture is to continue to rely heavily on the use multiple data sources, such as a review of records, interviews with parents and teachers, observations across settings, and informal assessment tools (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999; Rhodes et al., 2005). Finally, more research is needed to determine how school psychologists outside the United States conduct assessments and work with translators. With information such as this, trainers of school psychologists can ensure that they are providing the most accurate learning opportunities for their students when it comes to bilingual assessments and working with translators.

References

- American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- American Psychological Association (2010). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association (1990). Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Translators' Association (n.d.). Code of Ethical and Professional Practice. Retrieved from http://www.atanet.org/aboutus/code_of_professional_conduct.php

- Blais, C., Jack, R. E., Scheepers, C., Fiset, D., & Caldara, R. (2008). Culture shapes how we look at faces. *PLoS One*, 3(8), e3022.
- Bornman, J., Sevcik, R. A., Ronski, M., and Pae, H. K. (2010). Successfully translating language and culture when adapting assessment measures. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 7, 111-118.
- Brown, S. A. (2011). Do interpreters translate? Results of an e-mail survey of AIIC members to determine if interpreters also work as translators. Consortium for Training Translation Teachers. Retrieved from <http://isg.urv.es/cttt/cttt/research/browncorrected.pdf>
- Butcher, J. N. (1996). *International adaptations of the MMPI-2: Research and clinical applications*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. F. (1996). *Cultural diversity and social skills instruction: Understanding ethnic and gender differences*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Colomer, S. E., & Harklau, L. (2009). Spanish teachers as impromptu translators and liaisons in new Latino communities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 658-672. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01048.x
- Curtis, M. J., Lopez, A. D., Castillo, J. M., Batsche, G. M., Minch, D., & Smith, J. C. (2008). The status of school psychology: Demographic characteristics, employment conditions, professional practices, and continuing professional development. *Communique*, 36, 27 – 29.
- Figuroa, R. A. (1990). Best practices in the assessment of bilingual children, In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology, Volume 2* (pp. 93-106). Washington, D. C.: National Association of School Psychologists.

- García-Sánchez, I. M., Orellana, M. F., & Hopkins, M. (2011). Facilitating intercultural communications in parent-teacher conferences: Lessons from child translators. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 13, 148-154. doi: 10.1080/15210969.2011.594387
- Geisinger, K. F. (1994). Cross-cultural normative assessment: Translation and adaptation issues influencing the normative interpretation of assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 6, 304-312. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.304.
- Hambleton, R. K., Merenda, P., & Spielberger, C. (2005). *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence S. Erlbaum Publishers.
- Hertzog, M. (2008). Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31, 180–191.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).
- International School Psychology Association (2011). Code of ethics. Retrieved from http://www.ispaweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/The_ISPA_Code_of_Ethics_2011.pdf
- International Test Commission (2010). *International test commission guidelines for translating and adapting tests*. Retrieved from <http://www.intestcom.org>.
- Jeanrie, C., & Bertrand, R. (1999). Translating tests with the International Test Commission's guidelines: Keeping validity in mind. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 15(3), 277.
- Joyce, D. (2006). [Review of the book, *Assessment of children: Behavioral, social, and clinical foundations: Fifth edition*, by J. M. Sattler & R. D. Hoge]. *The School Psychologist*, 60, 123-124.

- Lopez, E. C., & Rogers, M. R. (2001). Conceptualizing cross-cultural school psychology competencies. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 16, 270–302.
doi:10.1521/scpq.16.3.270.19889
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2011). *Principles for professional ethics*. Washington, DC: NASP
- National Council on Interpreting in Health Care (2004). *National code of ethics for interpreters in health care*. Washington, D.C.: NCIHC. Retrieved from <http://www.ncihc.org>
- Newell, M. L., Nastasi, B. K., Hatzichristou, C., Jones, J. M., Schanding Jr, G. T., & Yetter, G. (2010). Evidence on multicultural training in school psychology: Recommendations for future directions. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25(4), 249.
- O'Bryon, E. C., & Rogers, M. R. (2010). Bilingual school psychologists' assessment practices with English language learners. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(10), 1018-1034.
- Ochoa, S. H., Riccio, C., Jimenez, S., de Alba, R. G., & Sines, M. (2004). Psychological assessment of English language learners and/or bilingual students: An investigation of school psychologists' current practices. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 22(3), 185-208.
- Ochoa, S. H., Rivera, B., & Ford, L. (1997). An investigation of school psychology training pertaining to bilingual psychoeducational assessment of primarily Hispanic students: Twenty-five years after *Diana v. California*. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 329–349.

- Okawa, J. (2008). Considerations for the cross-cultural evaluation of refugees and asylum seekers. *Handbook of multicultural assessment: Clinical psychological, and educational applications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 165-94.
- Paone, T. R., Malott, K. M., & Maddux, C. (2010). School counselor collaboration with language interpreters: Results of a national survey. *Journal of School Counseling*, 8(3). Retrieved from <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v8n13.pdf>
- Rhodes, R. L., Ochoa, S. H., & Ortiz, S. O. (2005). *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide*. NY: Guildford Press
- Rogers, M. R., & Lopez, E. C. (2002). Identifying critical cross-cultural school psychology competencies. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40, 115–141. doi:10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00093–6
- Sattler, J. M. (2001). *Assessment of children: Cognitive applications*, Fourth edition. San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.
- Sattler, J. M., & Hoge, R. D. (2005). *Assessment of children: Behavioral, social, and clinical foundations*, Fifth edition. San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.
- Sattler, J. M. (2014). *Foundations of behavioral, social, and clinical assessment of children*, 6th Ed. San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.
- Sattler, J. M., Oades-Sese, G. V., Kitzie, M., & Krach, S. K. (2014). Culturally and linguistically diverse children. In J. M. Sattler, *Foundations of behavioral, social, and clinical assessment of children*, 6th Ed. (pp. 125-160). San Diego: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher, Inc.
- Sotelo-Dynega, M., & Dixon, S. G. (2014). Cognitive assessment practices: A survey of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51(10), 1031-1045.

Swender, E. (2003). Oral proficiency testing in the real world: Answers to frequently asked questions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 520–526. DOI: 10.1111/j.1944-

9720.2003.tb02141.x

Tse, L. (1995). Language brokering among Latino adolescents: Prevalence, attitudes, and school performance. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 17, 180–193. doi:

10.1177/07399863950172003

Weeks, A., Swerissen, H., & Belfrage, J. (2007). Issues, challenges, and solutions in translating study instruments. *Evaluation Review*, 31, 153-165.

Table 1: Organizational Guidelines for Translators and Translating Tests

Authors	Date	Standard Description
AERA, APA, NCME	1999	Interpreters used in assessments should be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experts in translating • fluent in the original and target language • have a basic understanding of the assessment process
NCIHC	2004	Interpreters are expected to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • translate information accurately • ensure that they work within a cultural context
APA	2010	Psychologists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • take into account culture and language in test interpretation • ensure consent for testing is without linguistic or cultural bias • are knowledgeable about cultural or linguistic differences
NASP	2011	School psychologists should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that consent for testing is understandable taking into consideration the language and culture of the client • practice in a non-discriminatory manner regarding individuals who are linguistically different • conduct fair assessments taking into consideration culture and language
ISPA	2011	Use these steps when choosing someone to work with linguistically diverse clients <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first, identify a school psychologist who speaks the language • next, use a knowledgeable colleague who speaks the language • finally, bring in a properly prepared translator. <p>School psychologist are responsible to ensure that the translator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be prepared • translate with accuracy • maintain client confidentiality
ITC	2010	Ensure score equivalence across culturally and linguistically diverse groups by having test developers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • verify cultural and linguistic differences when adapting a test • write test materials (e.g., handbooks, directions, etc.) to include any language issues related to the intended population • ensure that test procedures used are familiar to all populations • present evidence (including statistical evidence) that ensures and documents equivalency across all language versions • consider content validity ensuring items meets standards for cultural / linguistic equivalency • offer test instructions in the original and translated languages • document any changes from one translated version to another (including evidence of equivalence and validation) • provide information on the influence of socio-cultural and ecological context when interpreting scores

Notes. American Education Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), International Test Commission (ITC), International School Psychology Association (ISPA), National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), National Council on Interpreting in Health Care (NCIHC), National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME).

Table 2: Languages Availability Information for Popular English Tests

Test name	Languages or Societies	Extras
Autism		
Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS)	Australian ^a Canada ^a Danish ^a Dutch ^a Finnish ^a U.S. English French ^a German ^a Greek ^a Hebrew ^a Hungarian ^a Iceland ^a Italian ^a Korean ^a Norwegian ^a Romanian ^a Russian ^a Spanish ^a Swedish ^a United Kingdom ^a	WPS ^b
Autism Diagnostic Interview–Revised (ADI–R)	Australian ^a Canada ^a Danish ^a Dutch ^a Finnish ^a U.S. English French ^a German ^a Greek ^a Hebrew ^a Hungarian ^a Iceland ^a Italian ^a Japanese ^a Korean ^a Norwegian ^a Romanian ^a Russian ^a Spanish ^a Swedish ^a United Kingdom ^a	WPS ^b

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)		
Test name	Languages or Societies	Extras
Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ)	Australian ^a Canada ^a Danish ^a Dutch ^a U.S. English Finnish ^a French ^a German ^a Greek ^a Hebrew ^a Hungarian ^a Iceland ^a Italian ^a Japanese ^a Korean ^a Norwegian ^a Romanian Russian ^a Spanish ^a Swedish ^a United Kingdom ^a	WPS ^b
Gilliam Autism Rating Scale–Second Edition (GARS–2)	U.S. English Spanish ^b Korean ^b Italian ^b Turkish ^b	Pro-Ed
Gilliam Asperger’s Disorder Scale (GADS)	U.S. English Spanish ^b Italian ^b Korean ^b	Pro-Ed
Childhood Autism Rating Scale–Second Edition (CARS2)	English-Only	WPS
Adaptive Behavior		
Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, Second Edition (Vineland–II)	U.S. English Spanish Hebrew	Pearson
Scales of Independent Behavior–Revised (SIB–R)	U.S. English-Only	Riverside
Adaptive Behavior Assessment System–II (ABAS–II)	U.S. English Spanish	WPS
Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI–2)	Spanish ^a	Riverside
Broad Measures of Behavioral, Social, and Emotional Functioning		
Adolescent Psychopathology Scale (APS)	U.S. English Portuguese	PAR
Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (MACI)	U.S. English Spanish ^a	Pearson / PEA
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory–Adolescent (MMPI–A)	Croatian ^b Dutch/Flemish ^b U.S. English French ^b Italian ^b Korean ^b Mexican Spanish ^b Central American Spanish ^b Spanish for Spain ^b South American Spanish ^b Spanish for the U.S. ^b	Univ. of Minn Press
Personality Inventory for Youth (PIY)	U.S. English Spanish	WPS
Behavior Assessment System for Children–Second Edition (BASC–2)	U.S. English Spanish	Pearson

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)	Languages or Societies	Extras
Test name		
Behavior Dimensions Scale–School Version (BDS–S)	U.S. English-Only	Hawthorne Ed. Serv
Behavior Dimensions Scale–Home Version (BDS–H)	U.S. English Spanish	Hawthorne Ed. Serv
Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 6–18 (CBCL/ 6–18); (TRF) (YSR)	Australia Belgium Chile China ^a Denmark ^a U.S. English Finland France Germany ^a Iceland ^a Iran ^a Italy ^a Korea (South) Kosovo Lithuania ^a Netherlands ^a Peru Portugal ^a Romania ^a Singapore Spain Taiwan Turkey United Arab Emirates	ASEBA ^c
Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 1½–5 (CBCL/ 1½–5); (C–TRF)	Australia ^a Belgium ^a Chile ^a China ^a Denmark ^a U.S. English Finland ^a France ^a Germany ^a Iceland ^a Iran ^a Italy ^a Korea (South) ^a Kosovo ^a Lithuania ^a Netherlands ^a Peru ^a Portugal ^a Romania ^a Singapore ^a Spain ^a Taiwan ^a Turkey ^a United Arab Emirates ^a	ASEBA ^c
Connors’ Rating Scales–Third Edition (CRS–3)	Hebrew U.S. English Spanish	MHS

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)		
Test name	Languages or Societies	Extras
Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI)	Afrikaans Chinese Danish Dutch Australian/ English ^a U.S. English Finnish German Japanese Korean Norwegian Russian Spanish Swedish Urdu	PAR ^c
Sutter-Eyberg Student Behavior Inventory–Revised (SESBI-R)	Afrikaans Chinese Danish Dutch Australian/ English ^a U.S. English Finnish German Japanese Korean Norwegian Russian Spanish Swedish Urdu	PAR ^c
Jesness Inventory–Revised (JI–R)	U.S. English Spanish	MHS
Personality Inventory for Children–Second Edition (PIC–2)	U.S. English Spanish	WPS
Revised Behavior Problem Checklist (RBPC)	Cambodian U.S. English	PAR
Reynolds Adolescent Adjustment Screening Inventory (RASI)	U.S. English German ^a Urdu	PAR ^c
Student Behavior Survey (SBS)	U.S. English-only	WPS
Parenting and Family Variables		
Parent-Child Relationship Inventory (PCRI)	U.S. English Spanish	WPS
Parenting Satisfaction Scale (PSS)	U.S. English-only	Pearson

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)	Languages or Societies	Extras
Test name		
Parenting Stress Index—Third Edition (PSI-3)	Afrikaans Arabic Chinese ^a Croatian Danish Dutch U.S. English Farsi Finnish German ^a Greek Hebrew Hindi Hmong Hungarian Icelandic Indonesian Italian ^a Japanese ^a Korean ^a Lithuanian Norwegian Portuguese ^a Puerto Rican Russian Slovene Spanish Swedish Thai Vietnamese	PAR ^c
Parenting Stress Index: Short Form (PSI/SF)	Amharic Cambodian Chinese ^a Creole U.S. English French German ^a Italian ^a Japanese ^a Kannada Korean ^a Malay Polish Portugese ^a Romanian Serbian Sotho Turkish Zulu	PAR ^c

(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued)		
Test name	Languages or Societies	Extras
Visual-Motor Perception and Motor Proficiency		
Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test (Bender-Gestalt II)	U.S. English-Only	Pearson
Beery VMI-Sixth Edition (Beery VMI)	U.S. English Hebrew	Pearson
Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency, 2nd Edition (BOT-2)	U.S.English-Only	Pearson
Antisocial Behavioral Disorders		
Beck Disruptive Behavior Inventory for Youth (BYI-II)	Romanian Danish U.S. English Swedish Norwegian Dutch Serbian Croatian Chinese French	Pearson
Beck Anger Inventory for Youth (BYI-II)	Romanian Danish U.S. English Swedish Norwegian Dutch Serbian Croatian Chinese French	Pearson
Anxiety Disorders		
Beck Anxiety Inventory for Youth (BYI-II)	Romanian Danish U.S. English Swedish Norwegian Dutch Serbian Croatian Chinese French	Pearson
Depression Disorders		
Beck Depression Inventory for Youth (BYI-II)	Romanian Danish U.S. English Swedish Norwegian Dutch Serbian Croatian Chinese French	Pearson
Children's Depression Inventory 2 (CDI 2)	Chinese U.S. English	MHS
Reynolds Child Depression Scale-2nd Edition (RCDS-2)	U.S. English Spanish Portuguese	PAR ^c
Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale-2nd Edition (RADS-2)	Chinese U.S. English Hebrew Portuguese Spanish	PAR ^c

(Continued)

Table 2(Continued)		
Test name	Languages or Societies	Extras
Brain Injuries		
Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery for Older Children	U.S. English-only (no other authorized by publisher)	www.reitanlabs.com
Reitan-Indiana Neuropsychological Test Battery for Children	U.S. English-only (no other authorized by publisher)	www.reitanlabs.com
Luria-Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery–Children’s Revision	Out-of Print in All Languages	WPS
NEPSY–Second Edition (NEPSY–II)	U.S. English-only	Pearson

Notes:

^a Translated Norms are available

^b Translated Norms may be available

^c Translated versions may be offered by other publishers

Note: Translated versions may be offered by publishers other than the one listed for the English version. To locate the translated versions, you will want to speak with the Permissions Department at the publishing houses.