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Abstract

Deaf people are known to have significantly poorer reading comprehension skills when compared to their hearing counterparts. This poses significant threats to text-based psychological assessments. The plethora of text-based self-report measures available provides ample opportunity to translate/adapt existing tools from text to sign language. This paper systematically reviewed the challenges and facilitators faced in previous translations/adaptations with the view to inform recommendations for future practice. This paper reports the results of a PRISMA informed systematic review of 30 studies that had translated or discussed the translation of a written self-report measure into sign language following screening against inclusion/exclusion criteria. A systematic search (powered by EbscoHost Research Database and using search terms and Boolean operators), was performed in AMED, Cinahl, Medline, APA PsycInfo and APA PsycArticles. The Quality Assessment with Diverse Studies tool was used for quality appraisal of the included papers. Challenges/facilitators to effective translation/adaptation were grouped under linguistic, procedural and cultural. Examples of specific linguistic, procedural and cultural challenges and facilitators are discussed in the context of previous research and study limitations. Translating/adapting text-based self-report measures to sign language is a linguistically and procedurally demanding endeavour that requires a deep bicultural/bilingual understanding of both deaf and hearing communities. The present results and recommendations can help researchers develop suitably accessible translated/adapted self-report psychological measures and this can have significant implications on healthcare service planning and delivery.
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Public significance statement

Self-report questionnaires in text format are not always accessible by all deaf adults and pose a threat to the reliability of test scores and the validity of the test score
interpretations. When translating and culturally adapting written measures to sign language researchers need to address linguistic and procedural challenges and accommodate the cultural differences between the deaf and hearing populations.
Cultural identification, language preference (sign vs spoken), parental hearing status (deaf vs hearing), degree of deafness, technological aid used, and type of schooling are some of the key characteristics that constitute deaf ontology. As a result, there is considerable diversity in terms of ways by which deaf people identify themselves, including deaf, Deaf, hard of hearing or cochlear implant users. The present review focuses on the communicative needs of those people who irrespective of how they self-identify use sign language as their primary/preferred method of communication and who, therefore, would prefer sign over text whilst completing self-reported questionnaires. These people have historically been experiencing inequalities in accessing appropriate education (Skyer, 2020), healthcare or employment (Grote & Izagaren, 2020) or simply general information (du Feu & Chovaz, 2014). Evidence suggests that, overall, deaf people experience a greater number of mental health problems (du Feu & Chovaz, 2014; Horne & Pennington, 2010) and have a poorer quality of life relative to the hearing population (Cieśla et al., 2016). Research has consistently demonstrated that the incidence of mental health problems in deaf people, such as depression, is higher than that of the hearing population (Sign Health, 2014) and that certain characteristics of specific severe and enduring mental health problems, such as schizophrenia, manifest themselves differently in deaf people than in hearing people (Chatzidamianos et al., 2018).

Despite this increased incidence or differently manifested mental health experiences, deaf people are historically confronted with significant struggles when trying to access mainstream mental health services owing to the multitude of communication barriers that

---

1 By convention Deaf (with a capital ‘D’ vs deaf with lower case ‘d’) often refers to those deaf people who identify themselves as belonging to the Deaf community and use their national (or regional variant) sign language as their primary method of communication (Levine, 2014). As the purpose of this paper is beyond the cultural identification of deaf people, we use the term deaf inclusively throughout to refer to those who self-identify as deaf, Deaf, hard of hearing or cochlear implant users and have sign language as their preferred method of communication. For information specifically on the debate between Deaf vs deaf cf. Friedner and Kusters (2020).
they face (Cabral et al., 2013). Mainstream healthcare professionals, who most likely are not proficient in sign language, tend to misunderstand the specific needs of deaf people during consultations, with deaf individuals feeling that they have received inadequate support from their doctor (Berry & Stewart, 2006; Lesch et al., 2019; Panzer et al., 2020). This, in turn, could ultimately risk patient safety. For instance, one in four deaf patients have been prescribed medication without a comprehensive overview of the drug and/or reported falling seriously ill by consuming a medicine intended for external application (Reeves & Kokoruwe, 2005). These shortcomings within the healthcare setting often exacerbate feelings of loneliness and misunderstanding which, in turn, contribute to poor mental health outcomes for the deaf population (Movallali et al., 2018). Importantly, the context within which these misunderstandings occur is one whereby deaf people experience a lack of understanding of psychotherapy (Neves et al., 2020) or do not trust health professionals (Pereira & Fortes, 2010) and, therefore, often report low satisfaction from mainstream services (Iezzoni et al., 2003).

In their discussion of how deaf people’s psychological needs could be met by hearing clinicians who are experts on deafness, Glickman and Gulati (2003) stressed the importance of ‘cross-cultural legitimacy’; a term originally proposed by Pollard, (1996: 393) to describe those hearing clinicians who can provide services in sign language and who have earned a deep understanding of the issues faced by the deaf community through consistent and cross-cultural interaction with deaf people. Indeed, deaf specialist services appear to result in better use of preventive services (McKee et al., 2011).

There are many communication barriers that deaf people face when consulting with healthcare professionals. For instance, many deaf signers find access to health provision difficult due to deficient communication strategies or challenges even when sign language interpretation services are provided (Chatzidamianos et al., 2019). Such barriers are not just
found in dialogic-based environments or interpreter-mediated consultations where healthcare professionals often misunderstand the specific needs of a deaf person, but also in communicative interchanges that require the use of written text. For instance, except for image-based, neuropsychological or interview-based assessments, most self-report psychometric measures are constructed in a written format, presenting a significant barrier to completion and subsequently impacting the identification and treatment of pertinent (mental) health conditions. This is because research has consistently demonstrated that deaf individuals often possess lower levels of both health literacy (Pollard & Barnett, 2009) and reading ability more widely compared to their hearing counterparts (Qi & Mitchell, 2012), thus posing the risk that written questionnaires do not accurately measure what they have been designed to assess. As a result, deaf people are frequently under-represented in (mental) health research, partly, owing to the paucity of standardized measures accessible to them, which, for instance, hinders the completion of epidemiological research to identify accurate data on the prevalence of mental health issues within the deaf population or the assessment of their needs (Chatzidamianos, 2015).

Self-report psychometric measures are frequently translated from one written language to another. The effective translation of such measures is critical in ensuring that the needs of deaf people are consistently met and that any observed differences of scores are not the result of a poorly translated measure (Maneesriwongul & Dixon, 2004). Whilst constructing a new self-report measure directly in sign language might be the most appropriate approach to ensure that the measure is sensitive to the target population, it is usually a laborious and expensive process (Hall et al., 2018). Instead, by drawing upon the multitude of measures readily available and translating and culturally adapting them, we would be in a better position to create rigorous and consistent measurements in the target language. The remaining sections highlight the difficulties associated with doing so.
Translating a self-report written measure into sign language is not without its challenges. Haug and Mann (2008) elucidate the difference between adaptation and translation in this regard. For example, adaptation captures the entirety of the process, whereby not only is the meaning of each item transmuted into the target language but the cultural differences between both are also captured satisfactorily. The linguistic heterogeneity of the deaf population (in itself a product of early language experiences/deprivation, schooling environment, the hearing status of immediate family members), the deaf specific cultural parameters and the specific linguistic nuances of sign language complicate the adaptation process considerably (Morere, 2013). The different communicative modalities between speech and sign then complicate the process further (Quer & Steinbach, 2019). Transliterating text into sign language, therefore, would not necessarily convey the intended meaning or capture the nuances of the Deaf culture effectively, and would almost certainly result in an incomprehensible sign language version. The primary aim of adaptation, in this respect, is to achieve cross-cultural and conceptual equivalence, not merely linguistic similarity. This is where adaptation can pose a variety of challenges that potentially risk the production of a measure in the target language with unacceptable validity of the test score interpretations.

A variety of methods to adapt written self-report measures have been posited as research has evolved. Since Brislin’s (1970) early work, more recent works are settling on the forward/backward translation method as the most rigorous and accurate (Andrade et al., 2018) which also complies with relevant guidelines specifically for assessments of health outcomes (Acquadro et al., 2012). In this approach, either an individual or a translation team is tasked with an initial translation of the source material, known as the forward translation. The initial translations are then reviewed by an expert panel to ascertain whether they have captured the intended meaning of the original instrument. Once these translations are
finalized, an independent back translation individual or team, without prior knowledge of the original instrument, translates the sign language versions back into the original language. The back-translation is compared to the original measure to corroborate whether the translation has been successful in retaining its intended meaning. This is often supplemented by cognitive interviews that are used to assess the acceptability of the newly translated scale by the target population and are conducted with target users on the final draft of the translated/adapted scale. Drennan (2003) argues that cognitive interviews are an efficient method that is frequently been used across health care research to pre-test questionnaires in the prototyping phase and to ensure high response rates during field testing. Field testing ensues to establish the internal consistency and reliability of the test scores of the new translated instrument. Cognitive interviews, also referred to as structured interviews or think-aloud protocols with selected test takers or cognitive labs, are also been proposed by the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association et al., 2014: p. 82; Standards thereafter) as a means to “identify irrelevant barriers to responding correctly that might limit the accessibility of the test content’ and to “evidence that the cognitive processes being followed by those taking the assessment are consistent with the construct to be measured” (cf. Standard 4.0, ibidem, p. 87).

Whilst the adaptation process is often described at length in each respective study, there has been relatively little discussion concerning the specific challenges faced during the adaptation process from text to sign. A recent systematic review within the translation domain, however, proposed that forward-backwards translation is the best practice (Andrade et al., 2018). However, the review focused specifically on the methodologies used for the translation of health research instruments from text to sign by comparing different processes of different constellations of the translation teams: individualized translation processes; group translation; translations with adjustments by a monolingual and bilingual group; and mixed
translations. Understanding and anticipating the challenges to successful translation would facilitate efficient translation from text to sign and support increased efforts to adapt more clinical measures from text into sign language, thus improving access for what is, in effect, an often-underserved populace. Generating adaptation recommendations, based upon the existing literature, would contribute toward best practice in translation research. Whilst acknowledging that translation and adaptation are conceptually different (Herdman et al., 1997), we use the two terms interchangeably for simplicity purposes.

Present study
The present paper aimed to review the specific challenges and facilitators faced in previous efforts with the view to advance recommendations when translating/adapting written self-report measures into sign language(s). To gather all evidence and synthesize it effectively, a systematic review approach was selected because it allows the examination of the existing literature methodically and rigorously (Paul & Leibovici, 2014). The research question was: What specific challenges and facilitators are encountered when translating/adapting written self-report measures into sign language, and what steps are recommended to facilitate the process?

Method
This being a systematic literature review of peer-reviewed articles it did not require institutional ethics review. This review was conducted in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement 2020 (Page et al., 2020). The PRISMA statement includes a 27-item checklist that describes the actions and decisions recommended to ensure total transparency throughout the review process.

Inclusion criteria
Studies were included in the review if they: (a) described the translation/adaptation of a written self-report measure into a sign language, (b) were an original peer-reviewed journal article.
**Exclusion criteria**

Articles were excluded if they: (a) belonged to grey literature (e.g. blogs,) (b) described the translation of a different format of text other than self-report psychometric measures (e.g. interview) (c) were systematic literature reviews (d) adapted a self-report measure from one sign language to another [e.g. American Sign Language (ASL) to British Sign Language (BSL)] (e) produced a new self-report measure in sign language, without translation, within the study.

**Information Sources and Search strategy**

Search terms were carefully selected to ensure that all relevant literature was captured. The Boolean operators “AND” and “OR” were used to broaden the search and include various synonyms of keywords. Asterisks (*) were used to truncate keywords and include all variations of each word rather than increasing the search string. For example, the terms “translate” and “translation” are shortened to ‘translat*’. The search terms were as follows:

1. translat* OR adapt* OR accom* OR guid*
2. questionnaire* OR scale* OR measure*
3. “sign language”

Line one was designed to include all words that allude to the translation, or transformation, of one measure to another. We decided to include several synonyms on this line to cast a wider search net. The second line included keywords that would identify all papers discussing self-report questionnaires and, hopefully, omit the translation of other forms of written text such as a diagnostic interview or prose text. To avoid limiting results on a specific sign language and develop a synthesis from international data, the third line used the search term “sign language” (as opposed, for instance, to British Sign Language). Search terms were entered into EBSCO Research Databases with the following databases included: AMED, Cinahl, Medline, APA PsycInfo and APA PsycArticles. Each search was conducted
three times; one search by title, one by abstract and one by keywords. The PRISMA
flowchart (see Figure 1) illustrates how the research team identified records that were
considered relevant to the research question.

Selection Process

Initial search results were exported from EBSCO Research Databases into Covidence
(Veritas Health Innovation, n.d.); an online-based systematic review manager that facilitated
the organization and screening of records. Two of the papers’ authors were included as
reviewers in Covidence to conduct the initial screening. All records were screened by title
and abstract by two reviewers independently. There were 98 articles that both reviewers
agreed on including in the review, 103 where both reviewers agreed on excluding, 9 where
the first reviewer excluded and the second included. Finally, there were 17 articles that the
first reviewer included and the second did not. Interrater reliability analysis on these data
showed that there was a substantial agreement between the two reviewers (88.5%) as
indicated by the Cohen’s Kappa coefficient \( k = 0.77, p < 0.001 \) (Landis & Koch, 1977). After
the two reviewers completed their initial screening independently, they met to resolve any
conflicts prior to moving records into the full-text review stage. This was conducted to reduce
reviewer bias and encourage open discussion between the reviewers.

The full-text review stage was undertaken by one reviewer where papers were
assessed for their eligibility based upon the criteria established by all authors before the
search commencing. Each paper was accessed in its entirety via the university’s library
(where possible). Study authors were also contacted directly either via email or
ResearchGate. Each article included in the full-text review stage was scrutinized for
potentially relevant papers in its cited references (i.e. backward-searching). Similarly, each
article was forward searched to identify papers that had cited it (i.e. forward-searching). All
articles that were thought to be potentially useful were uploaded into Covidence for further
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scrutiny. Papers that met all inclusion criteria were then moved into the quality appraisal phase.

**Quality Appraisal**

The tool used to perform the quality appraisal was the Quality Assessment with Diverse Studies (QuADS) (Harrison et al., 2021), chosen for its substantial inter-rater reliability (k=0.66) (Landis & Koch, 1977), and face and content validity for application in systematic reviews with mixed, or multi-methods health services research (Harrison et al., 2021). The tool is an updated and reduced in length revised version of the Quality Assessment Tool for Scales of Diverse Designs (QATSDD) (Sirriyeh et al., 2012). It consists of 13 criteria that are scored on a 4-anchors Likert-type scale that ranges from 0 to 3. The appraisal does not result in a final total score for each paper. Instead, it follows a 7-step process (described in the tool’s instruction manual available on request by the original authors). To enhance the rigour and reliability of the scoring, using the QuADS, a sample of 15 randomly selected records were first reviewed independently by two reviewers, each blind to the scoring of the other. For those 15 papers, each reviewer produced a total of 195 scores (15 papers x 13 criteria per paper). An inter-rater analysis of these scores showed that there was a substantial agreement (81.44%) between the two reviewers as indicated by Cohen’s kappa coefficient $k = 0.728$, $p < 0.001$ (Landis & Koch, 1977). The remaining 15 papers were only reviewed by one of the reviewers. Further, in line with our over inclusive strategy, we also reviewed 3 opinion papers that met the inclusion criteria. As the QuADS is not suitable for opinion papers, these were appraised using the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Text and Opinion Papers (McArthur et al., 2015), which structures the appraisal of each paper upon 6 closed questions (possible answers: Yes, No, Unclear or Not/Applicable) (see Table 1).

[insert Table 1 here]
Data extraction and Coding

A data extraction form was developed. This was produced iteratively by all members of the research team. The review team consisted of two clinically trained academic psychologists (one with a background in experimental psycholinguistics and one with a background in socio-clinical psychology), a linguist, and a senior health researcher. We believe that the plurality of backgrounds of the team enhanced the review process and outcomes as its interdisciplinary nature allowed for multiple evidence-based ideas and viewpoints to be incorporated. Each member of the team contributed to the final design of the extraction form. The development of the form was based on the information reviewed in the context of the initial screening and the quality appraisal and the familiarity of the reviewers with the literature on deafness. The form was then piloted with 5 randomly selected studies to test its efficacy. Key data collection points were agreed upon prior to data extraction commencing. These collection points were informed by the review question and its a priori focus on the challenges and the facilitators. Amongst the data points collected was the design of the translation team. Understanding how research teams have previously approached the translation team design, the specific experience of the translation team members and their overall involvement with the signing community were all deemed to be pertinent to the research question.

Further, to accurately capture the challenges and facilitators to efficient translation/adaptation of text to sign in the included papers, the challenges and the facilitators were grouped under three broad categories: linguistic, procedural and cultural. These were designed to categorize elements of the multifaceted adaptation process previously described. A linguistic challenge/facilitator was conceptualized as a language-related process that blocked/enabled the accurate translation/adaptation of a concept between the two languages. A procedural challenge/facilitator was understood as a process followed that hindered/facilitated the logistical or practical element of translation, such as uses of
technology. Cultural challenges/facilitators captured those processes that were deemed (in)sensitive and/or (un)responsive to issues specifically relevant to the Deaf culture, deaf attitudes or communication amongst signers.

The team also decided that identifying recommendations for future action, along with any relevant technology mentioned, would contribute toward a best practice guide for translation/adaptation. Therefore, any framework or previous translation efforts cited as underpinning the research outputs’ approach to translation was also captured. Challenges and facilitator were coded in line with thematic coding in content analysis, whereby certain segments of text are identified, recorded and organised into categories, thereby creating a taxonomy or category scheme with different categories and subcategories (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Saldana, 2013). One of the reviewers read the results section of each paper line by line and coded them into the different categories (i.e. challenges or facilitators) and subcategories (i.e. procedural, linguistic, cultural).

Results

A total of 228 studies were identified through database searches, with manual reference searching (backward/forward-searching) producing a total of 40 additional studies. Duplicates were subsequently removed (N=55). A total of 213 records were screened by title and abstract with 147 studies excluded at this stage. Sixty-six articles were subjected to full-text eligibility against the review’s inclusion/exclusion criteria. Thirty-six studies were excluded for a variety of reasons (see Figure 1). Thirty studies were included for final data extraction (see Figure 1). Facilitators and challenges were subsequently extracted and inputted into the final data extraction sheet. For a detailed description of linguistic, procedural and cultural challenges and facilitators see Table 2.

[insert Figure 1 here]
Study characteristics

Out of the 30 studies, most studies were based in the USA, translating written English into ASL (n = 13). This was followed by studies conducted in the UK, translating from written English into BSL (n = 7). Three studies originated in Brazil and translated Portuguese into Libras and 2 were based in Australia, translating written English into Australian Sign Language. There was also a single study conducted in each of the following countries: Israel, Spain, Sweden, Norway and Austria, each of which translated from the country’s national written language to its national sign language.

Most of the reviewed studies utilized a forward-backwards translation approach (n = 27); the rest (n=3) (Bisol et al., 2008; Brauer, 1992; McKee et al., 2015) either did not explicitly state whether the forward-backwards approach was employed or referred only to the composition of the translation team. A closer look at the methodological approach to adaptation (see Table 2) showed that those authors2 (n=13) who applied an elaborate forward/backward approach that also consisted of focus groups or review panels/judges/committees with members of varied expertise and language backgrounds were in a better position to pre-empty potential pitfalls and report more nuanced challenges and facilitators of the translation/adaptation process compared to those3 (n=14) who reported following a forward/backward approach only or reported the translation of a scale from its written version to a sign language one (n=1) (Bisol et al., 2008), or did not specifically report the exact methodological approach to adaptation (n=2) (Brauer, 1992; McKee et al., 2015)4. Importantly, however, no study incorporated a cognitive interview component at the

---

2 Aanondsen et al., 2019; Andrade et al., 2019; Berke et al., 2019; Chaveiro et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2006; Montoya et al., 2004; Moore et al., 2013; Pardo-Guijarro et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2015; Rogers et al., 2013a, 2013b, 2014; Samady et al., 2008.

3 Berman et al., 2000; Brauer, 1993; Cornes et al., 2006; Cornes and Brown, 2012; Crowe, 2002; Fellinger et al., 2005; Glickman and Carey, 1993; Graybill et al., 2010; Levinger and Ronen, 2008; Rogers et al., 2016, 2018; Smith and Samar, 2016; Tweney and Hoemann, 1973; Wahlqvist et al., 2016.

4 For challenges and facilitators to translation/adaptation, Rogers et al. (2018) signposts readers to Rogers et al. (2013b).
prototyping phase of the translation/adaptation. A summary of the characteristics of the included studies can be found in the supplemental material.

**Challenges and Facilitators**

Overall, there were 79 challenges (49 linguistic, 12 procedural, 18 cultural) and 75 facilitators (22 linguistic, 30 procedural and 23 cultural), with some repetition across the studies.

**Linguistic challenges**

The most common linguistic challenge involved the need to replace specific written words that do not convey the same meaning in sign language with others that are conceptually/semantically similar. This could include terms with no sign equivalent (e.g. ‘quality of life’), problematic concepts when translated (e.g. time or duration), or idiomatic expressions (e.g. ‘feeling on edge’). Four authors identified the problematic use of personal pronouns. Three authors noted that the use of Likert scales posed additional linguistic challenges because severity anchors (e.g. true, certainly true, somewhat true, etc.) are typically conveyed in sign language using the appropriate/relevant facial expression. Indeed, what would be perceived as paralinguistic information in verbal communication (e.g. lowering eyebrows to signify specific emotions, concentration, disapproval or anger) could be a part of grammar such as a punctuation mark in sign language (e.g. a question mark).

**Procedural challenges**

Overall, there were 12 procedural challenges identified, with some being reported across studies. The most common procedural challenge related to technology and formatting issues. Certain issues appeared less frequently; for example, the recruitment of participants, time restrictions and editing and the use of free-text response. Examples of procedural challenges included: reiterating instructions for the measure before each item to retain the validity of the test score interpretation, signs that move perpendicular to the camera being hard to distinguish, and difficulties editing with certain technologies such as videotapes.
Cultural challenges
There were 18 cultural challenges, overall, with some being reported across studies. These challenges did not prevent successful translations. The authors of the reviewed papers highlighted them as issues that required attention. Examples of cultural challenges included: non-applicable items within measures that are not relevant for the deaf community (such as items relating to hearing), and the translation team potentially not reflecting the larger deaf community. Accurately considering and accommodating deaf peoples’ experiences into the translation process was the most commonly reported challenge. Varying levels of language knowledge was the second most common challenge. Ensuring the involvement of members of the deaf community was also considered a challenge to a successful translation. One author noted that, culturally, deaf people are not accustomed to completing surveys which posed a significant barrier more generally with completing self-report measures. One instance of signer-related issues was also reported where the notoriety of the signer within the deaf community was suggested as impeding completion.

Linguistic Facilitators
The most common linguistic facilitator was the importance of the translated/adapted version to avoid a mere linguistic transliteration of the original text but to focus on linguistic equivalences. One author suggested that for difficult category words, translation teams should contact the original authors of the scale to seek clarity on the intended meaning of the word. Other authors suggested that translation/adaptation efforts would be more effective when the team consists of native or near-native signers. This is, as other authors pointed out, because such signers would be in a position to capitalise on the sign language syntactic features such as referential indicators, facial expressions and topicalization with a range of inflectional endings to overcome complex written concepts. A recurrent linguistic facilitator included the presentation of a captioned video that presents both the signer communicating the test items and the captions of what they say and not of what the original text version of the measure
stated. Another reoccurring linguistic facilitator involved a (re)consideration of the use of pronouns from first person singular/plural to the second person equivalent as a means to ensure that respondents understand that items/questions are addressed to them and not the signer who appears on the screen. Two authors removed colloquialisms from the signed version and opted for a simple sentence structure without multiple clauses. One author emphasised the importance of the translated version to be psychologically equivalent specifically in relation to sensitive items.

_Procedural Facilitators_

The most frequently occurring procedural facilitators involved the need for clear instructions and procedures in the development phase and using internet hosting for the end product. Some authors discussed specific technical facilitators (e.g. use of a second monitor, empty text fields and ‘topic box’ fields) and the importance of providing a video replay facility. Facilitators that occurred once included the use of fewer multiple-choice as an option of responses, the addition of a video dictionary for difficult terms, and extensive pretesting to improve face validity. One author proposed that a 10-second interval between items would allow respondents to answer without having to replay each item. Finally, one author stressed the importance of signers wearing dark clothes and stand against a solid background so that the signing is clearer.

_Cultural Facilitators_

Finally, the cultural facilitator that featured the most frequently was the pre-existing knowledge/awareness of the Deaf culture and experience in working within the Deaf community. Diversity was a key construct across many cultural facilitators. Specifically, the diverse constitution of the translation team was perceived to be integral to effective translation/adaptation. Also, in recognition of the diverse nature of the Deaf community, authors perceived switching signers in the video version of the scale to facilitate the development of a scale that is sensitive to issues such as gender, age, educational background
and language ability. Two authors described that focus groups at the development phase helped with ensuring that the end product was culturally equivalent.

A comprehensive list of all challenges and facilitators can be found in Table 2.

[insert Table 2 here]

**Discussion**

Ensuring access to appropriate measurement tools for the deaf population worldwide is of critical importance, owing to the specific health inequalities this population faces. Despite this stark need, routine translation of measures developed for use with the deaf population is not occurring in a concerted, regulated or urgent manner. This leaves a substantive portion of deaf people bereft of equal access to (mental) health services pertinent to maintaining and fostering positive mental wellbeing (Chatzidamianos & Fletcher, 2019).

This review aimed to identify the specific challenges and facilitators to an efficient and accurate translation/adaptation of self-report measures from text to sign. Understanding the nuances of the translation/adaptation process that potentially impact future efforts would encourage more frequent attempts and arguably, improve accessibility for a typically underserved populace. The review identified and organised a plethora of potential issues faced.

**Linguistic Challenges and Facilitators**

The results demonstrated that the most commonly reported challenges and facilitators were linguistic. Of these, attempting to equate a word or phrase from its written format into sign language was often found to be the most difficult. Rather than a straightforward exact transliteration, it is paramount that the meaning of the word within that culture is effectively conveyed. For example, the term “God” when written in English can refer to any number of religious figures across religions. However, “God” in ASL is signed differently dependent on the religion in question (Samady et al., 2008). Terms such as this, with various signs in sign language, can be challenging to translate for a range of deaf audiences without risking
alienating or even offending specific subgroups within the deaf population. Consultations with members of the deaf community aiming to identify an equivalent term that is inclusive and can capture the intended meaning periphrastically can potentially provide a viable solution. Translation teams could also consider the generation of multiple versions of the same sentence with different versions of a given term that is produced depending on specific sociodemographic information. Such an approach, however, increases the complexity of the measure and associated costs and could require the collection of data (e.g. religious background) that might not be directly related to the study itself and, as per research data governance, they should not be collected. In some instances, no equivalent sign exists for a particular written phrase or word. The commonly utilized collocation ‘quality of life’, a critical component in the translation of the WHOQOL (The World Health Organisation’s Quality of Life Questionnaire; WHOQOL Group, 1998), does not exist in Libras, for example (Chaveiro et al., 2013). The pre-existing knowledge of the absence of this phrase in Libras helped the team prioritizing their efforts. Thoroughly investigating the questionnaire in question and considering particular words or phrases prior to translation commencing could help to expedite the process.

The structure, content and grammar used in questionnaires are different to that of prose text. For example, the use of pronouns in self-report scales posed a unique challenge to translation efforts. As is typical with a questionnaire, the respondent reads the instructions that preface the measure and responds to the subsequent statements in relation to their personal situation. Each item often relies on the use of “I” as a point of reference for the respondent to apply the statement to the way that they feel whilst completing the measure as it is read. Translating these items into sign language and changing the medium in which they are presented to the respondent, changes the focus of each statement and thus provides an area of contention. If a signer were to transliterate each item and retain the use of the pronoun
“I” as it is in the original version of the questionnaire, it could cause the respondent to become more susceptible to attributing the statement to that signer rather than what was actually required: namely, responding in a manner conducive to themselves (Rogers, Young, Lovell, & Evans, 2013). Ensuring that pronouns are translated appropriately is critical to preserving the items’ initial meaning and protecting the validity of the questionnaire’s score interpretations when presented in sign language. Rogers et al. (2015) suggested the use of the inclusion of “YOU WHAT?” at the end of each item to communicate that the statement is a question directed to the responder of the questionnaire.

Similarly, the linguistic structures that certain questionnaires deploy can prove more difficult than others. Fellinger et al. (2005) observed how translating the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) (Derogatis & Spencer, 1982) was a lot less challenging than translating the WHOQOL (WHOQOL Group, 1998). The BSI, in its original written format, has a simpler linguistic structure to the WHOQOL allowing for a more straightforward interpreting process. Based on this finding, it is reasonable to suggest that the linguistic complexity of a measure be thoroughly considered before being selected for translation. Should a simpler, psychometrically sound version exist, the research team should evaluate whether this could be translated instead. A straightforward approach to assess the language accessibility of the original version is through the readability statistics of the text version. Not only would this streamline the process from a procedural perspective, but also allow for a more accessible measure for the deaf population to be generated. Generating the readability score of any text is possible by activating specific settings of frequently used word processors or via specialized software. In fact, researchers should consider using the readability scores of texts of any text-based scale regardless of whether it is to be linguistically/culturally adapted to sign language or is indeed intended for use in written format.

5 By convention, in sign language glossing SMALL CAPS are used to represent signs.
Another linguistic barrier commonly found when presenting items to respondents related to the prefacing instructions and response anchors. A written self-report measure tends to follow a similar structure consisting of the title of the measure, instructions on how to respond and the individual items. For example, if responses range from 1 to 5, the prefacing information might state that 1 signifies “strongly disagree” whereas 5 signifies “strongly agree”. As this information is written, it can be relied on as a constant referral point should the respondent need a reminder of the appropriate responses. As the written form is adapted into a visual format, the ability to refer back to both the prefacing instructions and scale anchoring becomes more problematic. This presents new problems for both the respondent and research team as it makes it more difficult to streamline the process of completing the measure in its visual format. For the respondent, retaining the response options in their memory whilst responding to each item introduces a new cognitive task and could potentially impact their ability to complete the measure appropriately (Berman et al., 2000). One workaround, in this case, relates to elements of each item, such as time scales, frames and instructions to be reinforced throughout the testing phase to mitigate the risk of falsely recalling potential responses (Roberts et al., 2015). Additionally, each item when converted into a video could have a ‘replay’ function so that the respondent can watch the item again if desired (Cornes et al., 2006).

**Procedural Challenges and Facilitators**

Procedurally, the most common issue was the use or type of technology and associated format errors that can occur. Each study utilized a different medium to accommodate the new measure, ranging from internet-based hosting (e.g. Rogers et al., 2014) to videotape (e.g. Brauer, 1992, 1993; Crowe, 2002; Glickman & Carey, 1993; Jones et al., 2006; Tweney & Hoemann, 1973). Relying on the use of a videotape appeared to be the most problematic approach to changing modality. As described by Jones et al. (2006), recording the items on videotape limited the editing options that the research team had available to
them. Attempting to edit the videotapes was both time-consuming and difficult owing to a lack of flexibility. Technical errors or malfunctions also hampered translation efforts in other scenarios (Tweney & Hoemann, 1973). Certain items were omitted from the final videotape, with this being attributed to the malfunction of equipment. The studies that have employed the use of videotape were conducted over 10 years ago and reflect a time when the use of internet-based hosting services was either not readily available or not regularly employed. With the Internet of Things and the use of Information Communication Technology (ICT) now dominating most research activities (Chatzidamianos & Parker, 2020), internet-based services are becoming more popular for hosting self-report measures in various formats and, in effect, this challenge may be less relevant now. Indeed, given the highly dispersed nature of the deaf population, hosting the new measure on the internet has been identified as a facilitator for the translation process (Rogers et al., 2014). Researchers should be mindful, however, that if a self-report measure is administered exclusively online it could limit its reach to only those who are ICT literate leaving parts of the deaf population who experience the digital divide unaccounted for (Yeratziotis & Van Greunen, 2013). Researchers should, therefore, adopt inclusive measures that are both human and technology-oriented and through which they could reach out to the grassroots of the deaf community via formal collaborations with deaf organizations, local deaf clubs, deaf schools etc.

Moving beyond the procedure of the translation/adaptation itself, a procedural issue emerged from the characteristics of the included papers. Specifically, those studies that followed an elaborate forward/backward translation/adaptation were better positioned to identify and address possible linguistic, procedural and cultural issues compared to those that only followed a backward/forward approach or a translation of the written text to sign language or did not explicitly described the methodological approach to translation/adaptation. Notably, no study utilised cognitive interviews. Taken together, these
two points are significant for those embarking on translating/adapting written scales from written text to sign language. The established benefits of conducting cognitive interviews (Drennan, 2003; Standards, 2014) together with the benefits of iterative scale development procedures with input from the target population and multidisciplinary teams are expected to enhance the quality of the end product.

Cultural Challenges and Facilitators

Cultural barriers were reported frequently within the sample of studies. The way people think and behave is culturally informed. As such, concepts, phrases and statements included in the written version of a measure may not necessarily resonate with how deaf people experience the world. One of the most pervasive challenges encountered is related to the limited spoken language skills and general knowledge that some deaf respondents possessed. This is often attributed to the language deprivation that deaf people might have experienced in early life (Glickman, 2007; Glickman & Hall, 2018; Hall, 2017; Hall et al., 2017). Such challenges may lead to problems whilst field-testing instruments with participants, as some deaf individuals might struggle to understand elements of the questionnaire (Roberts et al., 2015). Related to this is the deaf community’s general inexperience with surveys. As most measures and even more broad mainstream surveys tend to be published in a written format, deaf individuals often have no prior experience of having completed anything similar. This was particularly pertinent in deaf youth when asked about their overall limited life and survey experience (Berman et al., 2000). These issues are the by-product of the inequalities experienced by deaf people living in a world designed for hearing individuals and relate to more systemic societal challenges that are beyond the scope of this paper and cannot be immediately rectified. It is the responsibility of those developing and/or using written self-report measures with deaf people, however, to be mindful of the social challenges this particular population experiences and how these could invalidate the results.
The inclusion of items that do not directly apply to the deaf population, for instance, is one of the challenges identified in the construction of questionnaires. In one instance, the study authors opted against direct translations of items that referred to “hearing” or “talking” as they believed that deaf respondents would be deterred from responding accurately or completing the measure at all; instead, they chose to translate such concepts as “perceive through the ears” or INFORM DISCUSS (Montoya et al., 2004). Similarly, the Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation Outcome Measures (Evans et al., 2000) specifically asks respondents about times when they have “talked” to others and felt that it was “too much”. The authors note that deaf people might respond differently depending on how they understand ‘talk’ (Rogers, Young, Lovell, & Evans, 2013). For example, a deaf person may “strongly agree” if they perceive ‘talk’ to relate to communication in spoken language and, conversely, “strongly disagree” if perceived to relate to communication in sign language. To transliterate items like this would potentially lead to ambiguity in the new version of the measure and result in unintentional response errors in consequence. Contacting the original author of the measure for advice could aid the clarification of items that may otherwise be difficult to interpret in the target population (Montoya et al., 2004). Researchers should consider designing the self-report measure in such a way that allows access to the scale in both sign language and text (through closed captions, for instance). Aside from this, the research team could make a collaborative decision regarding which interpretation is most appropriate for the target measure and the population in question. Although none of the papers included in this review incorporated cognitive interviews at the prototyping phase of the translation/adaptation, in line with the Standards (2014) cognitive interviews should be used as they facilitate the identification of culturally informed challenges that can reduce the accessibility of the questionnaire content.
The sign language community are both small and tight-knit (Leigh et al., 2020). Identifying and recruiting appropriate individuals to sign the translated items can cause a potential conflict of interest because of the likelihood that respondents may recognize the signer who features on the screen. It is also likely that they may be well-acquainted with this individual and this, in turn, may influence the individual’s response. Whether the signer is perceived as an “insider” or “outsider” in terms of their involvement with the deaf community could impact how the individual responds (Rogers, Young, Lovell, & Evans, 2013). Whilst this is a consideration for those translating for the deaf community, it is a barrier that is difficult to avoid entirely. Wahlqvist et al. (2016) found that the signer employed in one study contributed toward a high response rate because of their reputation and familiarity within the Deaf community. This should, therefore, remain a consideration throughout the translation process. The research team may consider consulting with participants before field testing to understand the degree to which they are familiar with the signer. The research team could seek to evaluate the specific benefits and drawbacks of identifying a well-known signer for the translation videos and the impact it could have on subsequent recruitment and truthfulness of responses.

**Recommendations**

In line with the above, a summary of key linguistic, procedural and cultural recommendations can be found in Table 3. An independent peer debriefer who is a bilingual deaf mental health professional has reviewed the results and recommendations of the review and has provided feedback that enabled the final refinement of the recommendations.

[insert Table 3 here]

**Limitations**

There are a few limitations in the current review. First, despite the equal weighting in the research question, the review identified slightly more challenges (n=79) than facilitators (n=75), a fact that became apparent during the quality appraisal process. As all processes
were designed to identify both challenges and facilitators equally, the uneven result can be attributed to the available data in the included papers. In a qualitative research project that explored the involvement of relatives in bipolar disorder, Chatzidamianos et al. (2015) attributed a similar tendency by their research participants to the possible effects of ‘negative bias’ (Ito et al., 1998). As negative bias was not the focus of the present review, no conclusive argument can be formed to account for the disproportionate reporting of challenges, and negative bias could be one of the possible tentative explanations.

Second, despite the diverse background and experience of the authors, not all sources of bias can be ruled out, as the authors pre-existing understanding of what constitutes a challenge/facilitator to the successful translation/adaptation would have a priori influenced the development of the data extraction sheet and the coding of the data and in effect the recommendations that derived from that. To that effect, the involvement of the independent bilingual deaf mental health professional who reviewed and commented on the results and recommendations, however, should have increased the objectivity by which the data are being reported.

Third, several cultural challenges are too deep-rooted in society to be mitigatable immediately. A prime example of this is the barrier alluding to deaf individuals’ experiences with survey research or lack thereof. Paradoxically, deaf people’s experiences of self-report measures will only improve once more research is focused on developing more accessible resources for this population. Challenges such as this will progressively become less prominent as research continues.

Fourth, the review does not establish a comparison of the challenges and facilitators depending on the psychological construct/phenomenon that each measure explored. By tabulating the constructs/phenomena and the number of corresponding challenges/facilitators, we attempted to address that issue, but the comparison was not meaningful for several
reasons: (a) the challenges/facilitators identified were not related to the construct itself, but to the written text being used to capture it (the issue relates to the equivalences that can(not) be achieved), the translation process or the cultural influences on the adaptation process, (b) reporting that the largest number of facilitators was, for instance, related to ‘health risk behaviours’ and the largest number of challenges concerned the ‘diagnosis of mental health’ adds little (if indeed anything) to the overall point of the work. This could be the by-product of the constructs that happened to have been translated as opposed to the constructs themselves. Had there been a comprehensive list of self-report measures of different diagnoses, for example, the comparison would have been more meaningful, (c) some authors, e.g. Fellinger, et al. (2005), referred to 3 constructs in the same paper simultaneously, which makes it impossible to allocate the specific challenges/facilitators to that vs the other construct and allocating them across all that were explored would have been an oversimplification.

Fifth, the coding of challenges and facilitators was performed by only one member of the review team which did not allow inter-rater reliability analysis. However, the relevance of such an analysis in qualitative synthesis, in general, is not clear and its role has been challenged in the past (Armstrong, 1997).

Sixth, the specific challenges and facilitators identified here could be dependent on the study design of each paper, an analysis we did not conduct. For instance, mixed designs might lend themselves more naturally to a more appropriate design to identify facilitators and identify and address challenges within the same study (e.g. qualitative data could provide clarity, checking for divergence, convergence, corroboration, explanation, elaboration, etc.). However, given that the present review focused on what hinders/enables the translation/adaptation procedures of self-report measures from text to sign and not on what research design produces more/fewer facilitators/challenges and of what type such an
analysis was beyond the scope of this review. What we did instead was to compare different methodological approaches to the translation/adaptation through which we were able to identify the approach that can enhance future translation/adaptation endeavours.

Finally, in the context of this review, it was not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of our recommendations. We hope that these recommendations will support future translation/adaptation efforts within which an evaluation of the recommendations could be performed.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, adapting measures from a written format into sign language can be both time-consuming and challenging. This review has identified and synthesized recurrent problems that presented themselves during this process, along with suitable mitigating actions, in the hope that it will aid future adaptation efforts and thus subsequent accessibility for both clinicians and the academic community. Improved resources for the deaf population would undoubtedly contribute toward more comprehensive support and bridge the current gap in the measurement of psychological constructs in deaf people with implications on service planning and delivery.
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Translating/adapting text-based self-report measure to sign language


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Is the source of the opinion clearly identified?</th>
<th>Does the source of opinion have standing in the area of expertise?</th>
<th>Are the interests of the relevant population the central focus of the opinion?</th>
<th>Is the stated opinion the result of an analytical process, and is there logic in the opinion expressed?</th>
<th>Is there reference to the extant literature?</th>
<th>Is there any incongruence with the literature/sources logically defended?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graybill et al., 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Montoya et al., 2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans, 2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2

**Linguistic, Procedural, Cultural Challenges and Facilitators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Methodological approach to adaptation</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Challenges to translation</th>
<th>Challenges to translation</th>
<th>Challenges to translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aanonsen et al., 2018</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Present both the written and SL version to participants in a combined online fashion</td>
<td>Prosocial behavior items non-significant, meaning further review would be required</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> Two bilingual deaf native NSL users with university degrees in teaching</td>
<td><strong>Review panel:</strong> Forward translators, clinical psychologist, colleague with graduate degree in medicine specialising in child psychiatry &amp; a consultant with a Master’s degree in language &amp; fluent in NSL</td>
<td><strong>Focus group:</strong> Teachers from local deaf school (Deaf, hearing &amp; CODA)</td>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> Two hearing SL interpreters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Preparation of V2:</strong> “…three research professors with The minimum degree of master”</td>
<td><strong>Review judges:</strong> 5 judges, PhD researchers, fluent in LIBRAS, among deaf &amp; hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrade et al., 2019</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>“…judges suggested the inclusion of reflective signs at the beginning of some questions added to the replacement of the pronouns translated to the third person “you” and “yours”, for “me” and “my”.</td>
<td>Use of pronouns such as “I” and “you” were misleading and changed Old signs or significant linguistic variations were replaced, or two signs were used.</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> “based on the criteria: bilingual or bicultural men &amp; women, deaf community participants, certified interpreters, LIBRAS teachers, deaf people or health professional – 5 translators, deaf &amp; hearing”</td>
<td><strong>Preparation of V2:</strong> “…three research professors with The minimum degree of master”</td>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> “A certified hearing, &amp; a deaf professor of LIBRAS, certified”</td>
<td><strong>Review judges:</strong> 5 judges, PhD researchers, fluent in LIBRAS, among deaf &amp; hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Berke et al., 2019</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Use of “DO-DO” sign was not understood and sign for “ACTIVITY” was used instead</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td><strong>ASL-SUS Forward translation:</strong> Fluent native signer who was also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a doctoral student of computing, fluent native signer masters student in computing, faculty member with PhD in computing & learnt ASL in adult life. First backward translation: 9 advanced students who studied ASL interpreting. 3 students reported having deaf family members, 1 self-reported as CODA & the remaining students had a range of experience with ASL between 3-8 years.

**Second backward translation:** 10 new advanced students studying ASL interpreting ASL-NPS. Same team as ASL-SUS, but with a new deaf masters student owing to the previous student graduating.

**First backward translation:** Focus group; 2 professional certified ASL interpreters & 2 deaf students.

**Second backward translation:** 12 students from Bachelor’s degree program for ASL interpreting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Berman et al., 2000 USA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Forward-backward only</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> Project director, deaf consultant (native signer), deaf interpreter who primarily communicates using ASL.</td>
<td>Reduce the number of multiple-choice questions where appropriate.</td>
<td>Difficulty when using responses such as “strongly agree, somewhat agree” as problematic in ASL, meaning responses had to be converted into “yes/no”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> Bilingual individual who was unfamiliar with written English measures</td>
<td>Support of researchers and members of the community. Researchers had to mark precise times to enable easier editing.</td>
<td>Where written English would display all responses together, responses must be signed sequentially and then retained in memory by respondent. Media consultants could not distinguish where questions/responses started &amp; stopped when editing.</td>
<td>Basic concept of “survey” or “survey research” may be unfamiliar to deaf youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bisol et al., 2008 Brazil</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Forward only</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong> One male &amp; one female deaf teacher who were both fluent signers, assisted by an</td>
<td>Focus groups completed prior to study to understand best method for participants.</td>
<td>Not reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign language skills were not verified by research team, which could explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brauer</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brauer</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First stage (forward): 3 deaf bilinguals: PhD psychologist familiar with MMPI, M.A. linguist &amp; an RA with MA in counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second stage (backward): 3 non-Deaf individuals unfamiliar with the MMPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison: 2 deaf bilingual professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of second person pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Items should be culturally, conceptual and psychological equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate the signed version with Pidgin Signed English to reach the majority of the literate deaf population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chaveiro et al., 2013</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Forward translation: revision by bilingual team, re-evaluation of second back translation: 4 children of deaf parents, without hearing impairment, fluent in Libras; checked by project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First-back translation: syntactic/semantic analysis, second-back translation: interpreter (not involved in project team) Focus groups: 3 focus groups: deaf individuals (n = 9) 2. Family members of deaf individuals (n = 6) 3. Libras interpreters (n = 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision by monolingual: 2 deaf individuals with Libras as L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cornes &amp; Brown</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forward translation: First named author (fluent in Auslan) &amp; accredited Auslan interpreter (also native SL user)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Backward translation: 2 professionals who were native SL users, one deaf &amp; one hearing &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation process repeated until linguistic equivalency had been achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Items revised to reflect differing educational backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Translation Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cornes et al., 2006</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
<td>Facility to replay the video if the participant desires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Crowe 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fellinger et al., 2005</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glickman &amp; Carey 1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Graybill et al., 2010</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Forward-backward only</td>
<td>Ability to switch between several signers useful so respondent has a choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strive to translate the meaning rather than a transliteration of the written English.
Consider the translations for the widest range of deaf persons e.g. age, gender, education, etc.
Avoid improving source material even when logic in the statement does not appear clear and directly applicable in SL.
Inclusion of video dictionary for specialist terms.
Signers should follow a video ASL script – not an ASL gloss or written English – to maintain accuracy.
Time and effort must be expended on the translation team, with bilingualism and cultural experience critical.
Research team should record all progress in the same target language e.g. ASL.
Fluency in a language does not mean that the signer will be comfortable signing directly from a script.
Presence of TWG coach at all recordings to ensure accurate reading and adherence to script.
“suicide” that cannot be used generally in ASL.
Some questions were segregated e.g. “How old were you when you smoked your first whole cigarette?” – this presumes the individual has smoked before, therefore the embedded meaning was disentangled.
Transformation of “I” and “my” to “YOU” and “YOUR” to maximize dialogic nature.
Amendment of some responses as in written English surveys, responses are presented simultaneously whereas ASL video means sequential, restricting participant from skimming potential responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>Jones et al., 2006 USA</th>
<th><strong>Elaborate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal investigator:</strong> Hearing, familiar with SL &amp; considerable experience of deaf community</td>
<td>Use of both individual and group reviews as regional variations in sign &amp; colloquialisms considered. Feedback from deaf reviewers ensured videotape was not condescending to deaf community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-investigator:</strong> Fluent in SL &amp; experience in both research &amp; practice with deaf persons</td>
<td>As ASL is dynamic, same signer may alter the translation of an item slightly each time – “gloss” was created to maintain consistency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deaf actor:</strong> Deaf man in the community who was known for fluency/clarity in SL &amp; facility with English</td>
<td>Use of videotape limiting, as editing was time-consuming and lacked flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation team:</strong> Bilingual adults, some with SL as first language, some with English as the first language. Consultants who reflected cultural and linguistic</td>
<td>Difficulties in recruiting enough bilingual people to take both versions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting on VT and transition between items was distracting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deaf consultants felt repetitive nature of answer format was inappropriate – actor signed responses after every item – they felt this was insulting and deaf respondents would remember directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16 | Levinger & Ronen 2008 Israel | **Forward-backward only**  
**Forward translation:** “Skilled sign language translator” – hearing person renowned in the deaf community  
**Backward translation:** 4 deaf judges: 2 female deaf judges with hearing parents, 2 male deaf judges with deaf parents; all use sign as primary language | Participants “overwhelmingly” selected written language over a signed video  
Selecting a well-respected, well-known translator helped the measures to be “clear”  
Two of the judges were members of the same deaf community recruited from – fostered reliable communication | Not reported | Not reported | Authors suggest that translators notoriety in the deaf community could actually work the opposite way and could have impeded their selection of questionnaire type |
| 17 | McKee et al., 2015 USA | **Not reported**  
Make the final ASL version available with English captions, audio and a signing video for a variety of audiences. | Not reported | Not reported | Not reported |
| 18 | Montoya et al., 2004 USA | **Elaborate**  
**Translation team members:** Bilingual, bicultural researchers, interpreters & mental health clinicians  
**Review committee:** 2 other study authors, a psychiatrist, masters-level mental health clinician & researcher with experience of working with deaf patients Both teams had a certified deaf interpreter, study author and certified hearing interpreter | Offer the questionnaire in a number of languages and modalities, e.g. ASL, signed English, captioned in written English  
Offer options for the participant to replay where desired  
Avoiding complex sentences with multiple clauses  
Divide references to time into shorter units  
Use two translation teams with a wide scope of skills and experience  
Use of a “topic box” as a standalone video segment indicating nature of question  
Empty text field allowed respondents to give reasonings behind their answer, but didn’t pressure/force them into responding if they were not comfortable with their English Skills  
Use a second monitor to combat issues of signs which move along the z-axis to evaluate accuracy | Concepts such as time, duration, English idioms were all difficult to translate e.g. “feeling on edge” also phrases used commonly in English culture such as “hearing voices”  
Difference in terms used in deaf culture e.g. issues translating “panic attack” was cumbersome  
Challenges of different intellect and regional variations in common words in ASL e.g. “hospital” in Eastern part of New York is unique to the area  
English category words not directly translatable, with same scope, into ASL e.g. “have you ever hit your husband/wife?” – ASL translation more literal in terms of SLAP, PUNCH, PUSH, STRIKE  
Facial expressions, speed of sign, etc. all impact upon the signs subsequent meaning  
Time within time periods extremely difficult to convey e.g. “two-week period in your entire lifetime” | Signs that move perpendicular to the signer, moving toward the camera, were difficult to perceive accurately Some members of team apprehensive about free text response and impact on respondents’ attitude | Translating items that explicitly ask about “hearing” were not translated directly, as it was thought this would put off respondents and they may avoid responding |
Contact original authors to understand their intended meaning when finding difficult translating category words.

Capitalize upon ASL syntactic features such as referential indicators & topicalization to overcome complex English concepts.

Translating items that were complex in written English produces equivalent complex ASL version.

Distinguishing between related but different psychological states e.g. “restless”, “edgy” and “jumpy” – scrutinizing English differences meant signing them along a continuum.

Open-ended questions were challenging as there is no stipulation as to which unit the respondent should use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Elaborate</th>
<th>Forward translation</th>
<th>Backward translation</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Clarification of first translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Moore et al., 2013</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Forward translation: 3 bilingual translators</td>
<td>Backward translation: 3 bilingual translators blind to original versions</td>
<td>Review: “Expert panel”</td>
<td>Focus groups: Five deaf young people (young person version) Five deaf adults (adult version) 20All use BSL as their first language “…equal numbers of clinical psychologists &amp; those experienced in translation work across the teams”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation teams with varying ages essential given different questionnaire versions</td>
<td>Having deaf translators on BOTH forward and backward teams owing to differing cultures Balance of academic and lay persons on each team Number of versions recorded with different signers to avoid potential transference issues Important to film the focus groups to capture full extent of discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst important to have service users involved, it may be that those involved here had a wider and more complex vocabulary than the average deaf person Many deaf people grow up using different methods of communication: those fluent in SL were comfortable with translations, whereas those who also use oral English found them difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pardo-Guijarro et al., 2013</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Forward translation: 3 bilingual deaf adults, working alongside an LSE interpreter</td>
<td>Backward translation: Another LSE interpreter &amp; post-linguially deaf bilingual person (not previously involved)</td>
<td>Clarification of first translation: Items reassessed by a bilingual deaf person &amp; discussed with interpreted involved in forward translation</td>
<td>A specific web tool was designed to host the questionnaire to ensure that it was fully accessible Preserved same structure from written to LSE to improve compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A specific web tool was designed to host the questionnaire to ensure that it was fully accessible Preserved same structure from written to LSE to improve compatibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Forward translation</td>
<td>Backward translation</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Roberts et al., 2015 UK</td>
<td><strong>Second back translation:</strong> Two additional translators: one was deaf &amp; one with moderate hearing loss; both were bilingual</td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> 3 bilingual translators</td>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> 3 bilingual translators blind to original versions</td>
<td><strong>Review:</strong> “Expert panel”</td>
<td><strong>Focus groups:</strong> Five deaf young people (young person version) Five deaf adults (adult version) All use BSL as their first language “…equal numbers of clinical psychologists &amp; those experienced in translation work across the teams”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rogers, Young, Lovell, Campbell, et al., 2013 UK</td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> All members of the deaf community; 3 woman, 2 men and included one deaf qualified BSL/English interpreter, 1 deaf clinical psychologist, 1</td>
<td><strong>Internet hosting allowed research team to reach a highly dispersed population and ensured a fixed translation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not reported</strong></td>
<td><strong>Not reported</strong></td>
<td><strong>Two components of depression in analysis – suggests that depression may have two distinct facets in the deaf population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans, 2013 UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elaborate</strong></td>
<td>Hosting measures online helps to reach a heavily dispersed population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> 5 deaf people who were bilingual in BSL &amp; Engls. Main author (Rogers) &amp; one of the creators of MH instruments met with the translation team to clarify meanings &amp; produce the 2nd draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> 2 individuals not previously involved in the study alongside 5 BSL users being invited to complete the measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backward translation:</strong> 2 deaf individuals (not previously involved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructions of CORE-OM refer to “statements” – this made no sense as respondents were not reading statements but watching a signer for each item. Frequency anchors were changed e.g. “not at all” to “NEVER” owing to modality – each sign was visually distinct (digitally). Use of the pronoun “I” could be misleading in that respondents may interpret this as what the signer is feeling. Anxiety in English can encompass a range of symptoms/feelings but different signs in BSL under different contexts. The intensity of facial expressions made clarifying the exact sentence difficult e.g. “I have felt OK about myself”. Visually motivated signs difficult to clarify – e.g. “physical violence” – showing punching could lead the participant to think of specifics rather than physical violence more generally. Specific signs only work in specific contexts. For example, “WRONG” can indicate “fault”, so in the item “I have felt able to cope when things go wrong”, “WRONG” was not appropriate. Confirmation/negation in BSL difficult as BSL does not follow “Subject, Verb, Object” observed in written English – BSL uses multiple and simultaneous channels. Not all English words can be directly translated into BSL, often referred to

Statement of “OVER THE PAST WEEK” was included at the start of each BSL video as more difficult to present owing to video format rather than written, where participant can refer back to this statement constantly. Some items are not culturally appropriate for the deaf community e.g. “Talking to people has felt too much for me” – if perceived as concerning spoken English, a deaf person may strongly agree but alternatively, strongly disagree if perceived as communication via sign. Sign language communities are small – it is possible that the signer on the video is known to those who complete the outcome measures. The notion of whether this person is an “insider” or “outsider” may impact on results.
as “false friends” e.g. warmth, which when translated into BSL, would allude to physical heat
Abstract English, such as the use of the word “it” – this was omitted in some items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rogers et al., 2014 UK</th>
<th><strong>Elaborate</strong></th>
<th>Forward translation: All members of the deaf community: 3 woman, 2 men and included one deaf qualified BSL/English interpreter, 1 deaf clinical psychologist, 1 deaf mental health support worker and 2 lay deaf people</th>
<th>Internet hosting allows for greater uptake, as the deaf community is dispersed across the UK</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
<th>Not reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rogers et al., 2016 UK</td>
<td><strong>Elaborate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> Two native deaf BSL users who were experienced translators &amp; fluent in written English</td>
<td>Emphasize more strongly that a question is asking about the severity of a problem for today only Use of online platform allows reach to highly dispersed deaf community</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Difficulty in repetition of level descriptors – written language allows comparison e.g. “slight”, whereas modality means that this is a different task A few deaf people explained that “MOBILITY” to them encompassed use of public transport rather than physical ability</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rogers et al., 2018 UK</td>
<td><strong>Elaborate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forward translation:</strong> 2 deaf native BSL users who were bilingually fluent &amp; both registered interpreters</td>
<td>Not reported in this paper – references Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans (2013)</td>
<td>Not reported in this paper – references Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans (2013)</td>
<td>Not reported in this paper – references Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans (2013)</td>
<td>Not reported in this paper – references Rogers, Young, Lovell, &amp; Evans (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Samady 2008 USA</td>
<td><strong>Elaborate</strong></td>
<td>3 native signers, 2 interpreters</td>
<td>Signer in videos should remove colloquialisms from sign, wear dark clothing and stand against a solid background 10 second interval between questions allows respondents to answer without stopping/restarting after each item Focus group facilitates diversity</td>
<td>Difficulty translating “accident” as sign derived from “WRONG” – “NO CONTROL” used instead No sign for “meant to be” – idiom for “TRUE BUSINESS” used Difficulty signing “God” as this has different signs for different religions</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Method requires highly proficient bilingual people from deaf community with above-average degree and education – which may not be representative of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community (d) shared experiences from having a hearing loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Forward-backward</th>
<th>Forward translation</th>
<th>Backward translation</th>
<th>Production of ASL gloss</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Samar</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5 bilingual ASL/English experts and community members to translate by consensus</td>
<td><strong>Forward-backward only</strong></td>
<td>Extensive pretesting of all written measures to improve face validity Vary signers by age, race and gender to provide diverse choice of signers</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deaf people prefer to share information through dialogic interactions – novel approaches may be considered in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tweney &amp; Hoemann</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 independent bilingual community members</td>
<td><strong>Forward-backward only</strong></td>
<td>Sentences were purposely selected to be as difficult as possible, with a range of inflectional endings</td>
<td>If translators limit their coding, it could lead to biased translations e.g. limiting to English sentence structure</td>
<td>Some errors were made in translation owing to missing elements on the videotape, however, this was attributed to equipment malfunction</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wahlqvist et al., 2016</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional SSL interpreter skilled in interpreting for persons with deafblindness Research team &amp; interpreter discussed translations</td>
<td><strong>Forward-backward only</strong></td>
<td>Member of research team known to many respondents, contributing toward high response rate</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3**

*Key linguistic, procedural and cultural recommendations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The linguistic structures of certain questionnaires can prove more difficult than others. | • Consider adapting a simpler, psychometrically sound version of the questionnaire.  
• Take into consideration the readability scores of the text version in addition to the reliability of test scores and the validity of test scores interpretations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Procedural</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cultural</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different technologies pose different barriers due to technology specific technical errors and malfunctions or limitations related to changing modality.</td>
<td>The inequalities that many deaf people have historically experienced have often hindered the prospect of reaching their full potential leading to limited spoken language skills (cf. language deprivation) and experience with surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use internet-based services to host the translated questionnaires.</td>
<td>• Be mindful of the wider context within which deaf people navigate the hearing world and how this could invalidate the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies to account for the digital divide in the deaf population.</td>
<td>• Consider the cultural nuances of both languages (original and target).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality videos.</td>
<td>• Invest in capacity building of specific deaf individuals to develop the expertise required to support translation/adaptation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strive for good lighting, high quality video capture, an unobstructed view of the signer’s facial expressions/signs.</td>
<td>• Develop and foster a work ethos that is routed on mutual respect and aims to develop the capacity for a shared cross-cultural and interdisciplinary expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Film against a background with a solid color.</td>
<td>• Consider the cultural nuances of both languages (original and target).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-empty potential pitfalls that result from the methodological approach to adaptation</td>
<td>• Invest in capacity building of specific deaf individuals to develop the expertise required to support translation/adaptation efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opt for an elaborate approach to adaptation (and not just a forward-backward approach) in line with relevant translation/adaptation guidelines and the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014).</td>
<td>• Develop and foster a work ethos that is routed on mutual respect and aims to develop the capacity for a shared cross-cultural and interdisciplinary expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the individual(s) who features in the signed version of the measure.</td>
<td>• Consider the pros and cons of employing a well-known signer and the impact this could have on responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the pros and cons of employing a well-known signer and the impact this could have on responses.</td>
<td>• Consider alternative signers to account for diversity (linguistic and otherwise – e.g. gender, ethnicity, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider alternative signers to account for diversity (linguistic and otherwise – e.g. gender, ethnicity, etc.).</td>
<td>• Make decisions in consultation with representatives from the deaf community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact the original author of the measure for advice and clarification on certain items.</td>
<td>• Consider developing the measure in both sign language and text (through close deaf-friendly captions, for example). Be mindful that the captions do not represent the original version of the measure but capture what the signer communicates in the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact the original author of the measure for advice and clarification on certain items.</td>
<td>• Conduct a pilot testing with feedback on the near final draft of the measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider developing the measure in both sign language and text (through close deaf-friendly captions, for example). Be mindful that the captions do not represent the original version of the measure but capture what the signer communicates in the video.</td>
<td>• Employ cognitive interviews to refine the end product, in line with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a pilot testing with feedback on the near final draft of the measure.</td>
<td>• Be mindful of the wider context within which deaf people navigate the hearing world and how this could invalidate the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ cognitive interviews to refine the end product, in line with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014).</td>
<td>• Consider the cultural nuances of both languages (original and target).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be mindful of the wider context within which deaf people navigate the hearing world and how this could invalidate the results.</td>
<td>• Invest in capacity building of specific deaf individuals to develop the expertise required to support translation/adaptation efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 1.**

*Systematic review PRISMA flowchart screening process. Adapted from Liberati et al. (2009)*

- **Identification**
  - Records identified via database searching: n=228
  - Records identified via manual & forward/backward searching: n=40

- **Screening**
  - Records after duplicates removed: n=55
  - Records excluded: n=147

- **Eligibility**
  - Records screened: n=213
  - Full-text review for eligibility: n=66

- **Included**
  - Studies included in the review: n=30

- Full text articles excluded, with reasons:
  - Wrong paper type (n=17)
  - Not self-report measure (n=7)
  - Translated from one sign language to another (n=3)
  - Translation method not explicitly discussed (n=3)
  - New measure development (n=2)
  - Not relevant (n=2)
  - Not focused in sign language (n=1)
  - Irrelevant outcomes (n=1)
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