

## **Using the ICECAP capability measures in non UK/English-speaking contexts**

The ICECAP measures were developed through qualitative research with the UK general population. As a result, both the concepts covered by the ICECAP measures and the language used is appropriate for the UK, but may require adaptation for other contexts.

### **Non-English speaking contexts**

1. Before embarking on a translation, researchers should formally consider whether the attributes (items) of the measure have face/content validity for the new setting/context in which the measure will be used. This may, for example involve some piloting work to establish that the attributes cover the key domains of wellbeing for the relevant population. If this is not the case our recommendation would be that primary qualitative work is conducted to generate appropriate attributes.

2. If the measure does have face/content validity, the measure should be translated using forward-backward translation. These two steps should be conducted by two different bilingual individuals.

3. Other validity studies should be undertaken. This may include, for example: (i) the use of bilingual individuals to complete measures in both languages; (ii) the use of think-aloud approaches to identify any problems with language or meaning; (iii) the use of quantitative studies comparing the measure with other indicators.

4. The back translation should be forwarded to the central ICECAP team for checking of appropriate equivalence of meaning.

5. Following approval, the translated version should be placed on the ICECAP website in due course for use by other researchers.

6. In terms of scoring the measure, a judgement must be made as to whether to apply the UK index values (representing the average value of the capability states to UK citizens), or develop a bespoke set of index values.

### **English speaking contexts**

7. In English speaking contexts outside the UK, it is still important to check that the attributes have face/content validity and that the terminology used in the measure is appropriate. In addition to some piloting work to check that the attributes are conceptually relevant, researchers may also wish to consider piloting the terminology used in the questionnaire. In particular researchers may wish to pay attention to respondents' understandings of the capability terminology and the ordering of the levels.

8. Where attributes or terminology are not seen as relevant we would recommend conducting primary qualitative research to generate an appropriate descriptive system for the local context. Steps 3 to 5, outlined above, should then also be carried out.

9. Even if no changes are made to the descriptive system for the measure, a judgement must be made as to whether to apply the UK index values (representing the average value of the attributes to UK citizens), or develop a bespoke set of index values.

## **REFERENCES WHICH MAY BE OF USE**

### ***Development and scoring of ICECAP measures***

Grewal I, Lewis J, Flynn T, et al. Developing attributes for a generic quality of life measure for older people: preferences or capabilities? *Social Science and Medicine* 2006;62:1891-901.

Coast J, Flynn T, Natarajan L, et al. Valuing the ICECAP capability index for older people. *Social Science and Medicine* 2008;67(5):874-82.

Al-Janabi H, Flynn T, Coast J. Development of a self-report measure of capability wellbeing for adults: the ICECAP-A. *Quality of Life Research* 2012; 21(1):167-176.

### ***Validation and application of ICECAP measures***

Coast J, Peters T, Natarajan L, et al. An assessment of the construct validity of the descriptive system for the ICECAP capability measure for older people. *Quality of Life Research* 2008;17:967-76.

Flynn T, Chan P, Coast J, Peters T. Assessing quality of life among British older people using the ICEPOP CAPability (ICECAP-O) measure. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* 2011;9(5):317-29

Makai P, Brouwer W, Koopmanschap M, Nieboer A. Capabilities and quality of life in Dutch psycho-geriatric nursing homes: an exploratory study using a proxy version of the ICECAP-O. *Quality of Life Research* 2012; 21(5):801-812.

Al-Janabi H, Peters T, Brazier J, Bryan S, Flynn T, Clemens S et al. An investigation of the construct validity of the ICECAP-A capability measure. *Quality of Life Research* 2013; In press.

### ***Assessing face and content validity of outcome measures***

Brod M, Tesler L, Christensen T. Qualitative research and content validity: developing best practices based on science and experience. *Quality of Life Research* 2009;18:1263-78.

Stevens K. Developing a descriptive system for a new preference-based measure of health-related quality of life for children. *Quality of Life Research* 2009;18:1105-13.

### ***Developing capability lists***

Alkire S. *Valuing freedoms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Robeyns I. Selecting capabilities for quality of life measurement. *Social Indicators Research* 2005;74:191-215.

### ***Transferring index values***

Knies S, Evers S, Candel M, et al. Utilities of the EQ-5D: transferable or not? *Pharmacoeconomics* 2009;27(9):767-79.