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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the comprehensibility of the Spanish version of the 16PF, 4th edition in a sample of Latina women seeking adult education. The sample consisted of 15 monolingual Spanish-speaking Mexican women living in and around Forest Grove, Oregon. The women provided definitions to a list of words and phrases taken from the Spanish version of the 16PF. Results indicated that not all of the women understood every word or phrase as indicated by the meanings provided by each participant. These finding may indicate that the Spanish version of the 16PF is not appropriate or understood by every Spanish-speaking person.
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INTRODUCTION

The Spanish-speaking population is fast growing around the world. The Latino minority is now the largest minority in the United States (Chun, Kwon, Williams, & Yu, 2005). Many psychological measures have been translated to Spanish, some in several different Spanish dialects that correspond to a region of the world. For example, there are versions for Latin American dialects and versions of dialects from Spain. There is a need to verify the validity of these Spanish translations of measures to ensure fair testing for every population that is tested. Several tests such as the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Beck Depression Inventory have been researched regarding the validity of Spanish equivalents (Cruz Fuentes, Bello, Garcia, Macias, & Chávez Balderas, 2005; Ellis & Mead, 2000; Fuller & Malony, 1984; Levy & Padilla, 1982; Nogales & Hampel, 1977; Whitworth & Perry, 1990; Wiebe & Penley, 2005). Most research points to significant linguistic agreement between Spanish and English versions. Both cultural and linguistic aspects must be considered when assessing the validity and applicability of the measures. Without considering cultural aspects there is room for error of results. Constructs may not be measured as intended when the sample does not identify culturally with the test or does not understand cultural nuances of the items (Nogales & Hampel, 1977).

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) is a psychological test that measures sixteen facets of personality. It looks at bipolar dimensions of normal aspects of personality. It is available in 23 languages, including Spanish (America) and Spanish.
Little literature exists that assess the validity and appropriateness of the Spanish versions of the 16PF. No literature was found regarding whether cultural aspects were considered or assessed when creating and then utilizing the Spanish version of the test. No normative data exist on the comprehensibility or readability of the Spanish version. It has not been tested to verify that the test in comprehensible to people from various Spanish-speaking countries who speak different variations and dialects of Spanish. The author of the 16 PF, Cattell, makes no claims regarding which Spanish-speaking countries this test is appropriate for. Also, there are no cautions mentioned for using this test when the comprehensibility has not been studied. In an email query to customer service in February of 2007, The Institute for Personality and Ability Testing stated that they do not even have information about who translated this test into Spanish. The customer service representative stated that Cattell is the author of the English translation only.

The comprehensibility of the English version among various samples has been demonstrated in research (Buros, 1978; Cattell, 1970, 1976; Cattell, E. P., 2004; Rivera, 1996). No research has shown evidence that the comprehension of the Spanish translation of the 16 PF is comparable to the comprehensibility of the English version. It is important to have a culturally appropriate translation of any test to ensure comprehension and fair, ethical testing and results.

Many psychological measures have been translated into Spanish including the 16PF, Symptom Check List 90 (SCL-90), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Freiburg Personality Inventory (FPI), and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised
The present study will consider the translation of the 16PF exclusively; however it is important to look at how well translations of other measures have fared. One gains a more comprehensive list of problems and achievements by reviewing translations that span across the field of psychology. One can discover what things are lacking or need further assessment by looking across the gamut.

Cruz Fuentes, Bello, Garcia, Macías, & Chávez Balderas (2005) looked at the validity and reliability of the Spanish version of the Symptom Check List 90 (SCL 90). The SCL 90 examines a person’s current level of distress. The authors administered the test to a sample of 228 Spanish speaking Mexican natives and 30 Argentinean natives. Statistical analyses were performed on the data to assess the degree of construct validity and internal consistency. Seven of nine scales were found to have internal consistency while 56 of the 90 items showed moderate to high correlations with only one item showing a weak correlation (validity). Overall, scores were slightly higher for the Mexican sample than the Argentinean sample. The authors concluded that in this sample adequate internal consistency and validity were shown which may indicate the SCL 90 Spanish version being useful clinically and for research. The authors expressed caution regarding generalizability because of the lack of representation of the Spanish speaking population (a small sample of only Mexicans and Argentineans).

Wiebe and Penley (2005) compared the English and Spanish versions of the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) in a sample of 894 undergraduate college students. They
compared factor analyses of scores from the English version and the Spanish version, both of which were completed by the same 355 bilingual participants. No significant effect for language was found between the bilingual participants’ scores on each test. These results are consistent with the cross-language equivalence of the two versions of the test.

The Spanish versions of the MMPI, the Myers Briggs, and the FPI have been studied for their reliability and validity. Fuller and Malony (1984) compared the English and Spanish forms of the MMPI with a sample of 18 bilingual adolescent Hispanic women. Both versions of the test were administered to each participant and no significant interaction effects were found between order of administration and form of test. Scores on five scales were significantly higher for the Spanish version than the English pointing to some possible inequality between the versions. The authors were led to the conclusion that the Spanish translation of the MMPI could “not be used interchangeably with the English form” (p. 130) and “contest the ready use of the ... translation” (p. 131). However, results should be considered carefully due to the small sample size of a very specific group of people. For this reason, results are not generalizable to the greater population.

The results of the Myers-Briggs test fared better. The Spanish translation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G, another comprehensive personality measure, was compared to the English form in a study by Levy and Padilla (1982). The study was a preliminary assessment of the reliability of the development of a Spanish version of the test. Scores from 65 bilingual Puerto Rican college students on both versions of the test were compared against one another and compared to scores on the English version alone.
The correlation (.79-.89) between the versions taken by the 65 Puerto Rican college students was comparable to the test-retest reliability of the English version (.78-.83). Results indicated that both versions are consistent in a group of bilinguals. However, results are difficult to generalize due to the small sample size. A study on the FPI did not show such promising results.

Nogales and Hampel (1977) compared the Spanish and German versions of the FPI, a German measure of personality, using the original German normative data and new data analyzed from the Spanish version. The different versions were compared by item and scale analysis and consideration was taken on how item and content loaded of certain variables such as sex and age. The authors determined that in order to fit better with a Latino/Hispanic population, the original personality factors needed to be condensed from 9 factors to 5 factors. The results indicate that the original personality factors may not be appropriate or understandable to a Spanish-speaking population.

Another study (Rodriguez, Torres, Herrans, Rodriguez Aponte, & Llamos, 1994) tested whether the Spanish translation of the WISC-R was appropriate for a sample of Puerto Ricans. They tested whether participants understood the instructions and if the test was appropriate for their cognitive level and cultural experience. One hundred six-year-olds from low SES were selected from various schools in Puerto Rico. Participants were read the instructions and then asked to explain, in their own words, what the instructions were for each part of the test. Four criteria had to be met to show that a child understood the questions. Two criteria had to be met to show the children did not understand. After it was clear that the children understood, the investigators administered the test. Over 30% of the children did not understand the instructions for two of the subtests. The authors
posited that no inferences can be made about a child’s ability on this translated test until criteria for comprehension are met. Criteria for two subtests were not met and, thus, the language may need to be modified before the test can justifiably be administered.

A study by Whitworth and Perry (1990) looked at the differences between Anglo and Mexican Americans on the 16PF. They studied 546 participants in three different language groups: Anglos that spoke English, Mexican Americans that spoke English and Mexican Americans that spoke Spanish. An important finding was that the Mexican Americans that spoke Spanish had higher scores pointing to negative personality traits than the Mexican Americans that spoke English. This indicates a possible bias of the Spanish version leading to more negative outcomes. Although it may be due to cultural differences, it points to a possible weakness of the Spanish translation of the 16PF in assessing Spanish speaking populations accurately.

Ellis and Mead (2000) also studied the Spanish translation of the 16PF in a sample of English speaking Anglo and Hispanic Americans as well as Spanish speaking Hispanic Americans and Mexican nationals. The authors used the Differential Functioning of Items and Tests (DFIT) to examine the equivalence of the Spanish version in comparison to the English version after administration of both versions. DFIT examines to degree to which the translation differs from the previous version and whether it is equal to the previous version or if meaning and understanding was lost in translation. There were significant differences in translation found for English versus Spanish versions for all groups and pairings. The largest difference was both Anglo and Hispanic (English speaking) versus the Mexican and Hispanic Spanish speaking. The second largest effect was between Anglos and Hispanic English speaking participants.
Past research has shown that language plays a role in test performance. Research has shown differences in test scores between Spanish-speaking and English-speaking participants on several different psychological measures. Research has found that bilingual participants score differently when they take the English version of the 16PF as compared to the Spanish version. These findings stress the importance of having a translated measure that fairly and validly tests a person's ability or personality traits. These translated measures need to be equal in content and meaning to their English counterparts. A translated measure in Spanish must reflect the language and culture of a diverse population that comes from many different countries and speaks many different dialects of the language. Thus far, there has been no normalizing research done on the readability or comprehension of the Spanish version of the 16PF, 4th edition. The present study will intend to begin the research on the readability and comprehensibility of the 16PF, 4th edition.

This study will investigate how appropriate the translated measure may be for monolingual Spanish speaking female adults of Guatemalan and Mexican descent and will give the first data on this population for the Spanish translation of the fourth edition of the 16PF. Grammar and psychometric properties are important to test but are beyond the scope of this study. Qualitative methodology from previous studies (Abrahams, 1999; Wallis & Birt, 2003) was adapted for this study.

Abrahams (1999) studied differences in scores on the 16PF between English-speaking and Native Afrikaans-speaking participants. The author wanted to determine the influence that native language has on test scores and comprehension. There were 983 white, native English-speaking and 81 black, native Afrikaans-speaking psychology
students in South Africa. The 16PF English version was administered to all participants and scores were calculated. The qualitative part of the study tested how well each participant understood vocabulary from the test. Participants were asked to provide synonyms to a list of 136 nouns and adjectives taken from the 16PF. Significant differences were found between groups, with the native English-speakers providing more correct synonyms. However, it should be noted that both groups had difficulty providing correct synonyms. This problem was corrected for in a replicate study.

Wallis and Birt (2003) replicated the study by Abrahams (1999) and changed the scoring procedure for assessing correct synonyms. The authors again studied native and non-native English-speaking psychology students in South Africa. Participants provided synonyms to the same list of vocabulary words as in the study by Abrahams. After applying the same methodology they found the same results. However, after adopting less rigid methodology they found different results. In the more relaxed methodology the authors used a wider range of dictionaries and thesauruses to identify correct synonyms and allowed participants to use the word in a sentence to show understanding. The native English-speakers still provided more correct synonyms. However, both groups correctly identified more synonyms than results showed previously, showing that they understood more than was thought.

The previous studies were testing the English version of the 16PF in native and non-native English-speaking samples and this study will test the Spanish version in native Spanish-speakers only. Also, the previous studies only used a list of vocabulary words and this study will include a list of vocabulary words and phrases extracted from the Spanish version of the 16PF. Participants will not be administered the test. They will
provide definitions for the words and phrases. It is hypothesized that the participants will correctly define more vocabulary words than phrases for each version of the test, thus providing evidence that they understand the language overall, but may have missed some cultural nuances found in phrases.
METHOD

Participants

A sample of 40 female native Spanish speakers from the organization, Adelante Mujeres, in Forest Grove, Oregon were selected for the study. Adelante Mujeres, translated as ‘forward women,’ is an organization that helps native, monolingual Spanish speaking women gain their General Equivalency Diplomas (GED). Forest Grove is a rural town, 30 miles outside of Portland, of over 19,300 residents and home to Pacific University. The participants consisted of females between the ages of 20 and 50 and of Mexican and Guatemalan descent.

Materials

The 16PF-Spanish version is a personality measure that measures 16 normal factors of personality. The test was originally developed in English and is translated in 23 languages. The investigator developed a list of vocabulary words and phrases from the 16PF-Spanish version Form A, 4th edition in questionnaire form for the participants to define. The questionnaire also included two demographic questions: age and country of origin/ethnicity. The questionnaire was adapted from previous studies by Abrahams (1999) and Wallis and Birt (2003).

Procedure

The investigator visited the women in October, 2006 to inform them of the study and ask for their participation. The investigator informed them, briefly, of the study and its purpose and explained that it would take place in April, 2007. Informed consent was
explained and obtained directly prior to the investigation. All instructions were given in Spanish by the investigator whom is fluent but not a native speaker of Spanish. The investigator administered a questionnaire listing vocabulary words and phrases selected from the 16PF-Spanish version. The participants were instructed to give their own definition or meaning for each of the words and phrases. Attached was a separate questionnaire containing demographic questions of age and ethnicity/country of origin. There was no incentive for participation other than desire to further investigation. Data collection occurred one time and lasted approximately 30 minutes. It should be noted that the investigator worked for the organization in the 2005-2006 academic year and was previously acquainted with some of the women. Following the investigation of participants, the investigator checked the definitions given with the help of her clinical supervisor, Lucrecia Suarez, a native Spanish speaker.
RESULTS

After all definitions were checked by the investigator and then cross-checked by a clinical supervisor it was found that not all 15 women gave correct definitions for all words and phrases. The definitions were deemed correct if they were found in the dictionary or if they conveyed an appropriate meaning, as deemed appropriate by the investigator and the supervisor. The majority of women provided concrete examples to convey their understanding of a word or phrase. For example to describe “segundo plano” or “background” one woman gave the example of a husband who is now in the background and of less importance because there are children—“no le tomamos importancia por ejemplo a un esposo cuando vienen los hijos.” Moreover, many women personified each definition, relating it to what a person does or who a person is, rather than giving a generic definition. For example, for the word “anticuada” or “antiquated” the participants often said it was when a person dressed from the past or had old thinking—“una persona con costumbres de antes” (a person with old ways of doing things).

Due to the fact that many of the words or phrases have more than one meaning, many definitions were not indicative of the meanings that were intended in the test. This will be explained further in the discussion section. Words and phrases that were given correct definitions but not the intended ones in the 16PF were “vago (vague/vagrant)” “pompa (pomp),” “zigzag,” “término medio (in between),” “un segundo plano (background),” and “escribir garabatos (doodle/write illegibly).” The 16PF translation intends the meaning of these words and phrases to be vague, pomp, zigzag, in between,
background, and doodle respectively. However, the majority of the participants gave
correct definitions of vagrant, water pump/posterior, sewing machine mark, unfinished,
of less importance or on a different plane of existence, and write illegibly or marks of
children, respectively. Out of 600 possible answers, there were 376 correct definitions
given, 183 incorrect definitions, and 41 correct definitions that did not contain the
intended meaning/understanding on the 16PF test. Figures 1 represents these numbers.
Appendix A contains a list of answers for each participant of each word and phrase and
whether they were 1) correct, 2) incorrect or 3) correct with a different meaning than
intended in the 16PF. There were six words and one phrase that all participants correctly
defined-latoso, vanidosa, comités, patrón, precavido, contrariedades, and obra de caridad.
One word and two phrases received mostly correct answers that had a meaning different
from that in the test-vago, segundo plano, and escribir garabatos. There was one word
that no participant provided a correct definition for-tendencioso. It is important to note
that this word was not listed in the Spanish dictionary used for this study. Other phrases
that most participants failed to give a correct definition for included “observaciones
agudas” and “sentido de orientación.”
Figure 1

Definitions

1 = Correct  2 = Incorrect  3 = Correct, but not the test meaning
DISCUSSION

Research reviewed earlier in this thesis (Cruz Fuentes, Bello, Garcia, Macías, & Chávez Balderas, 2005; Ellis & Mead, 2000; Fuller & Malony, 1984; Levy & Padilla, 1982; Nogales & Hampel, 1977; Whitworth & Perry, 1990; Wiebe & Penley, 2005) demonstrated that Spanish-speaking participants score differently than their English-speaking counterparts. It is unknown if these differences occur because of differences in culture or if the translations are not completely understood by the participants and are, therefore, yielding scores that do not accurately portray the individuals. Some of the researchers compared test performance in groups of bilingual individuals who took the test in both Spanish and English. They found that the results differed between the two translations. This may be explained by a translation that is not accurate or not culturally appropriate for the sample.

Results and Implications

This study was designed to examine whether a group of Mexican immigrant women seeking adult education could understand words and phrases taken from the Spanish version of the 16PF. Participants provided definitions of a list of words and phrases to indicate that they understood each meaning. The results indicate that the women did not understand all of the words and phrases because no woman provided correct definitions for every word and phrase. Also, some definitions given were technically correct but did not reflect the same meaning as in the original English version of the test. This may signify that the women only knew the meaning they gave or it may
suggest that they know both meanings but only chose to write one meaning. There were six words and one phrase that all women correctly defined and one word that no woman correctly defined. The fact that these women incorrectly defined many words and phrases warns of a flaw in the Spanish translation of the 16PF, 4th edition.

Participants were not able to correctly define every word and phrase and the definitions given, in totality, were inconsistent for many words and phrases. These results clearly show that some Spanish-speaking individuals will misunderstand substantial portions of this test. Such misunderstanding may account for some of the differences between Spanish speakers and English speakers on the 16PF and those among bilingual individuals on the two versions of the test that has been shown in research. Misunderstanding may cause the results of the 16PF to show an inaccurate personality profile because a participant endorsed a certain trait or interest, thus scoring in a more positive or negative direction and rendering the results unusable or inapplicable.

It is not understood why the participants did not understand all of the words and phrases. One of the words was misspelled in the original test and was copied the same for the questionnaire. This may account for some of the participants incorrectly defining the word. However, some participants did show they understood the word. Another possible explanation for the lack of understanding may be the translation of the test. As stated previously, the translator of the test is unknown, making it difficult to know how and when the test was translated. One hypothesis is that the translation was too literal, translating verbatim.

Literal translations often involve a dictionary and therefore replace the English word with a word that may not be widely used by any Spanish-speaking persons. Literal
translations may also assume that the rules of the language apply to every word; however, some words may never be conjugated a certain way because that is not how the people speak. Literal translations are also problematic because they do not account for cultural nuances or subtleties. An expression in English may not mean anything in Spanish when literally translated. For example, “miedo escénico” literally translates to stage fright, but this is not an expression in Spanish. Problems also occur when an English word is assumed to exist in every other language. For example, “zigzag” is not commonplace in the Spanish language and although some people may understand it, that is not the word they would choose to describe a line that goes from side to side. For this reason many participants did not understand the word. It is difficult to find a universal translation, especially when there are so many dialects of Spanish. Country-specific translations, although more time consuming, may be more appropriate and provide more accurate results. Based on these considerations, and the results of the study, extreme caution is warranted in using the Spanish translation of the 16PF.

Limitations

Although this study sought to begin research on the understandability of the Spanish version of the 16PF, several limitations may have confounded the results. The most obvious limitations were those that can affect almost every study and that prove to be the most difficult to prevent—randomization and generalizability. The sample was not randomly selected and represented a very small percentage of Spanish-speaking people in the world—Mexican female adult immigrants living in Oregon and seeking further education.
Sometimes it is important to focus on homogeneous groups when evaluating understanding in order to eliminate statistical flaws like outlier scores and heterogeneity. A heterogeneous sample is more representative of the population but studies with this kind of sample are more likely to obtain more error in results and scores based on chance (Thomas & Hersen, 2003). Outlier scores may skew all other scores and represent the minority of participants’ scores. This may be observed when a participant provides correct definitions to every word and therefore skews the average of scores in a positive direction. This may also be evidenced by a person defining many words incorrectly and negatively skewing results. In more homogeneous samples, such as that found in this study, there is less room for error or skewed scores. However, a sample that would be representative of the Spanish-speaking community (Mexican, Guatemalan, Spanish, etc.) as a whole would be a large, heterogeneous group with equal representation of country, class, culture, dialect, and gender. This would be an ideal sample to test the generalizability of the measure.

Another limitation of this study was that all of the participants were immigrants from Mexico and come from a low-socioeconomic status with a limited educational background (no high school diploma). These qualities may have contributed to the incorrect definitions of some words; this is valuable information to attend to because the 16PF is intended for evaluation of people from an array of educational levels and socioeconomic statuses. As well, there was a wide range of ages (i.e., 20 to 50 years old), however it is not representative of every adult or every adult that would be taking the 16PF. These shortcomings make it more difficult to generalize findings.
There were several flaws in the methodology and materials used in this study. One important limitation to the study was the fact that the words and some of the phrases were taken out of the context of the actual test or the specific questions in the test. This may have led to confusion of meaning and, consequently, to more incorrect definitions and definitions that did not reflect the meaning intended in the 16PF test. Correct definitions that did not reflect the intended meaning of the 16PF test included the instances when participants provided a meaning that was correct but the meaning of the word or phrase in the context of the test was different. This was another limitation of this study that could have been prevented with more explicit instructions (e.g., asking participants to provide every definition they knew). For this reason, it is unclear whether participants would have understood the word in the context of the test or if they knew only the meaning they provided. It may have been helpful for the participants to take the actual Spanish version of the 16PF before giving definitions in order for them to get a sense of the context. However, this could contaminate results and show that the participants had learned the meanings by taking the test but had not previously known them.

This study investigated the fourth edition of the 16PF, however there is a fifth edition that is available only through on-line administration. This study chose to use the fourth edition which is a paper version only because many Spanish-speaking immigrants in America do not have access to and/or have little familiarity with computers and would most likely be taking the paper version of the test. Also, many mental health organizations serving the Latino population do not have computers available for testing (Macias, 2003). However, because this study did not use the fifth edition of the 16PF, it is
unknown if the translation would have been more understandable to the sample in this study. It is not known if or how the translation in the fifth edition differs from the fourth edition. These are important considerations to take for future research on the comprehensibility of the 16PF for Spanish-speaking peoples.

Another factor that may have impacted results was that some participants complained that there were too many words and phrases. For this reason, they may have rushed and not thought through their answers or they may have left more words/phrases blank because they did not want to take the time to answer them due to fatigue. Another possible explanation is that the complaints by participants reflected the difficulty of the task for individuals who were not proficient readers. Suggestions for improvements in methods and materials are outlined below.

Future Research

There is a lack of research investigating the Spanish version of the 16PF, and no normative data has been established for the understanding or linguistic comprehension of the translation. The focus of future research in this area should first establish normative data for the comprehension of the test among different Spanish-speaking countries. These country-specific samples should include participants representing different socioeconomic statuses and levels of education as well as equal representation of gender and age. Norms will provide information on the quality of any Spanish translation and the appropriateness of application to any and all Spanish-speakers.

The translator of the test has not been documented or cited. Also, the way in which it was translated was not documented. If a flaw is found in the translation of the test, this is important knowledge to have in order to understand what to change in the
next translation. Changes can be made to create a more sound, universal translation or a more culture-specific and country-specific translation. It is important to understand what was done in the past in order to improve upon that process and product.

Suggestions for future studies include utilizing bilingual participants, putting words/phrases in context, administering the Spanish 16PF, comparing English and Spanish speakers, and recruiting larger samples. Bilingual participants may provide researchers with greater insight into differences in test results, as well as comprehension, without adding confounding variables that accompany comparisons between different people. Bilingual participants may communicate his or her understanding of each version of the test (English and Spanish) and describe when he or she had a difficult time understanding. These descriptions may be compared to actual test scores on the 16PF. If he or she had trouble understanding the Spanish version more than the English version and then scored in a more negative direction on the test, this may lead investigators to equate misunderstanding to a difference in test scores.

Comparing definitions provided by English- and Spanish-speakers to each version of the test may provide insight into the cultural appropriateness and/or the linguistic accurateness of each item/question. If English-speakers understand every item, but Spanish-speakers do not it points to a flaw in the translation. The items may not reflect the culture of the person, grammatically correct Spanish, or how that person speaks and knows Spanish. If there is a discrepancy it would be important to ask participants how they understood the item. If no discrepancy is observed and misunderstanding is shown by both samples, this may be the norm for most people taking the test and may signify that it does not affect test scores. It may also mean that both versions are not appropriate
and that some misunderstanding does affect test scores. Another explanation may be that the methodology is flawed and the criteria for what constitutes a correct definition may be too rigid or too lax.

It is difficult to construct a study that includes every aspect necessary or that covers every possibility. Research on this topic should strive for the inclusion/consideration of the context of the 16PF and for the representation of people from different Spanish-speaking countries. This study only provided a small look at a sample of Mexican women who did have some trouble providing correct definitions to words and phrases taken from the Spanish version of the 16PF. It raises the questions of whether this translation is appropriate for all Spanish-speakers and what that means for clinical use of the measure. This study was intended as a starting point for the extensive research that is necessary with this translation.
REFERENCES


### Results for Each Word and Phrase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Different Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarcástica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanidosa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticuada</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalifiada</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Idealistas”</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un guardabosque</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latoso</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendencioso</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obseno</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perturba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comités</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrariedades</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enérgico</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precavido</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La pompa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Different Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocompasión</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zigzag</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meticulosidad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrón</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Término medio</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observaciones agudas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un segundo plano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una idea se mantiene rodando en mi mente</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desarrollar sus afectos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudadanos “sólidos”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un estado de tensión</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trato con empeño</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentido de orientación</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Devolverles el golpe” 14 correct, 1 incorrect

El “miedo escénico” 5 correct, 10 incorrect

Se lo digo 8 correct, 7 incorrect

Escribir garabatos 2 correct, 4 incorrect, 9 different meaning

Criminales liberados bajo palabra 4 correct, 11 incorrect

Siempre hago hincapié 6 correct, 9 incorrect

Hable mal de mí a mis espaldas 14 correct, 1 incorrect

Hacer las cosas a mi modo 14 correct, 2 incorrect

Una obra de caridad 15 correct