German Translation and Pre-testing of Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) and Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change (ERIC)

Verena Regauer (✉ verena.regauer@th-rosenheim.de)

Technische Hochschule Rosenheim <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6942-5790>

Eva Seckler

Technische Hochschule Rosenheim

Craig Campbell

University of Saskatchewan

Amanda Phillips

LMU München: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Thomas Rotter

Queen's University School of Nursing

Petra Bauer

Technische Hochschule Rosenheim

Martin Müller

Technische Hochschule Rosenheim

Research

Keywords: Implementation Science, Implementation strategies, Knowledge translation strategies, Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research, Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change

Posted Date: February 19th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-216445/v1>

License: (cc) (i) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Implementation frameworks may support local implementation strategies with a sound theoretical foundation. The *Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)* facilitates identification of contextual barriers and facilitators, and the *Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change (ERIC)* allows selecting adequate implementation strategies. Both instruments are already used in German-speaking countries; however, no standardised and validated translation is available thus far. The aim of this study was to translate the CFIR and ERIC framework into German, in order to increase the use of these frameworks and the adherence to evidence-based implementation efforts in German-speaking countries.

Methods: The translation of the original versions of the CFIR and ERIC framework was guided by the World Health Organisation's recommendations for the process of translating and adapting both conceptual frameworks. Accordingly, a four-step process was employed: First, forward translation from English into German was conducted by a research team of German native speakers with fluent knowledge of the English language. Second, a bilingual expert panel comprising one researcher with German as his mother tongue and expert command of the English language and one English language expert and university teacher reviewed the translation and discussed inconsistencies with the initial translators. Third, back-translation into English was conducted by an English native speaking researcher. The final version was pre-tested with 12 German researchers and clinicians who were involved in implementation projects using cognitive interviews.

Results: The translation and review process revealed some inconsistencies between the original version and the German translations. All issues could be solved by discussion. Central aspects of the items were confirmed in 60% to 70% of the items, and modifications were proposed in 30% of the items. Finally, we revised one CFIR-item heading after pre-testing. The final version was given consent by all involved parties.

Conclusions: Now, two validated and tested implementation frameworks to guide implementation efforts are available in the German language and can be used to improve adherence to and use of evidence-based implementation strategies into practice.

Contributions To The Literature

- To increase usage of and adherence to CFIR and ERIC implementation frameworks in German-speaking countries, these concepts are now available in German
- The conceptual frameworks can be used by clinicians, researchers, managers and organisations to increase adherence to evidence-based implementation activities, and to improve the transferability of this experience into local practice
- The frameworks were translated into German using a standardised WHO approach, including pre-testing with German health care professionals, researchers, and clinicians

Background

Many interventions in health care are considered to be effective, but efficacy in terms of achieving desired changes in patient-relevant health outcomes is critically dependent on successful implementation [1, 2]. Lack of information about a study's local context and poor reporting of implementation strategies employed may be accountable for the critical gap between implementation research and clinical practice [2, 3]. The use of implementation frameworks may help to increase adherence to evidence-based implementation strategies and to establish a consensus terminology for German-speaking implementation experts [4].

The *Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)* [1] provides a tool box of different constructs arranged across five domains that should be used in a range of settings. It can help to identify potential barriers and help facilitators to change, and can be used as theory-based constructs for developing effective implementation strategies [1]. The *Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change (ERIC)* systematically catalogued evidence-based implementation strategies via input from a wide range of stakeholders and structured them into different categories and definitions [5].

Moreover, a Cochrane review [6] concluded that tailored interventions addressing implementation barriers are more likely to improve professional practice than untailored interventions, e.g., clinical practice guidelines alone, while more research is needed on the causal mechanisms for successful implementation and how to address these determinants. Thus, a tool was built that linked the context assessment using CFIR and implementation strategies to be considered using ERIC, the *CFIR – ERIC – matching tool* (available under www.cfirguide.org) [7].

Both taxonomies are already used in various studies with a wide range of objectives, methods, and settings [8], including German-speaking countries [9]. However, no standardised and validated translation into German was available thus far.

The aim of this study was to develop a German translation of both CFIR and ERIC in order to increase adherence to evidence-based implementation activities in German-speaking countries.

Methods

Study design

We followed the translation process suggested by the *World Health Organisation (WHO)* [10] that comprises forward translation, expert panel discussion, back-translation, and pre-testing (see Fig. 1).

Forward translation

The research team, all familiar with the content of CFIR and ERIC and German native speakers with fluent knowledge of the English language, translated the original English version into German. The aim was to

find conceptually equivalent wordings and phrases, but also to provide a coherent structure as opposed to the original frameworks published in English.

Expert panel and back-translation

First, a small (unilingual) expert panel with a German-speaking researcher, who already had translated and used a German version of CFIR, and members of the research team was established. Differences between the result of the forward translation of CFIR and the older version were discussed and led to the revision of some items.

Second, a bilingual expert panel discussed both the translation of CFIR and ERIC. The expert panel, which consisted of a collaborating Canadian researcher (TR) with German as his mother tongue and expert command of the English language and one English language expert and university teacher (CC), revised the German translation. They recommended changes of distinct phrases. Inconsistencies were discussed among the research team and the bilingual experts.

The work of the expert panels led to a first German version of CFIR and ERIC.

Back-translation

Back-translation of the instruments into English was conducted by an independent English native-speaking researcher (AP) living and working in Germany for several years. As recommended by the WHO method, the back-translator had no specific knowledge of the instruments. Inconsistencies between the back-translation and the original versions were discussed among the research team using dictionaries and several online translators. This resulted in the second version of the German translation that went into pre-testing with potential users of the tools.

Pre-testing

Research team

VR and ES conducted the individual, semi-structured interviews with experts working in implementation and/or health care research and who could potentially use the translated instruments. The interviewers knew some of the participants personally. No bias or assumptions are to be reported from the interviewers.

Recruitment and design

We conducted individual semi-structured interviews. Potential participants, in particular health care researchers were recruited from universities and research institutes in German-speaking countries and were approached via E-mail. Considering a total number of 112 items and an estimated interview time of

about 20 minutes each, we predefined a sample size of 12 participants with the aim to discuss every item in at least one interview. Items of each instrument were randomised to the number of participants using a computer-generated sequence number (Random Sequence Generator, available at: <https://www.random.org/sequences/>). All participants gave written informed consent and filled in a short sociodemographic questionnaire prior to the interview.

Data collection and analysis

Since there was no established strategy for pre-testing or validating of these instruments, we had to develop our own strategy. This contains cognitive interviews that involve a “think-aloud-probing” procedure, in which interviewers instruct participants to verbalise thoughts while answering the posed questions [11]. In parts, we relied on the key stages of cognitive interviewing according to Willis et al. [12]. This full strategy comprised five steps.

Step 1: To warm up with the item during the interview, the interviewees were asked to describe the given definition in their own words.

Step 2: Interviewees were asked to formulate a heading that describes the content best after reading the detailed definitions. The aim of this step was to generate information about the perceived central focus of those items.

Step 3: Then, the translated heading in German was compared with the interviewee-suggested heading and discussed afterwards.

Step 4: To rate this comparison, a traffic light system was used to rate whether our translated heading was perceived as appropriate. In this rating system, “green” means “approved”, “yellow” “partially approved”, and “red” “rejected”. Additionally, text notes were made about why the participants rate “yellow” or “red”.

Step 5: Items rated “green” were immediately considered to be accepted. In the case of “yellow”, the proposed modifications were recorded and discussed within the research team and adapted if the considered modifications were rated to be meaningful. In the case of “red”, the item was re-tested in a second interview. When the item was then rated as “green”, it was considered approved. In any other case, we revised the item as recommended by the two interviews and amended the heading with our initial translation in brackets.

Interviews were conducted by phone. Researchers had a short interview guide, and questions were allocated by the randomised items per interviewee. The interview guide was pilot tested with two persons and adapted prior to the interviews. No repeated interviews were carried out. All interviews were guided and audio-recorded by one experienced research associate (VR, ES). Field notes were made during the interviews. Audio-records were neither transcribed nor coded. Field notes were used to categorise items, and percentages of ratings per interview were calculated. Total percentages were calculated using mean values of percentages for each tool.

CFIR-ERIC-Matching Tool

We translated the short instructions of the tool into German and contacted the authors. We inserted the final versions of CFIR and ERIC into the matching tool and checked its function.

Results

Process

Our initial forward translation of each instrument (see **Additional file 1**) was revised by the expert panel. Recommendations for changes and our decisions for or against changes are described in **Additional file 2**. All issues could be solved by discussion. Then, these first versions were translated back into the original language (see **Additional file 3**). Then we compared the original English version to the back-translated version, and synonyms were identified.

Cognitive interviews

Characteristics of participants

We contacted 12 individuals, all of whom agreed to participate. Mean age of the participants was 36 years, and most of the participants were female (n = 10; 83%). All participants had at least a master's degree, and most were working as research associates (n = 10; 83%) and had experience in implementation of health care interventions (see **Table 1**). The interviews lasted between 9 and 36 minutes.

Findings

In brief, the similar central focus of our German translations of CFIR and ERIC compared to the English original was confirmed in most items.

Among the CFIR items (see **Table 2**), two items (5%) were rejected in the first round and presented in a second interview. Of these, one item was again rejected, and one was partially approved. In total, 27 items (69%) were approved in the first round. Modifications were proposed for 11 (28%) items. Only one item (3%) had to be revised after pre-testing. Recommendations for modifications can be seen in **Additional file 4**.

Among the ERIC items (see **Table 3**), two items were rejected in the first round and accepted in the second round. In summary, 47 items (64%) were approved. No item had to be revised. Modifications were proposed for 26 items (36%). Recommendations for modifications can be seen in **Additional file 4**.

Final version

After pre-testing, we revised the rejected item, but kept our pre-tested translation in brackets (see **Additional file 5**). The final versions were agreed upon by all parties involved in the translation process. A

German version of CFIR-ERIC-Matching tool is now available (see **Additional file 6**).

Discussion

Main findings

A German version of two conceptual frameworks for shaping implementation activities in health care, CFIR and ERIC, as well as the corresponding matching tool, are now available.

A rigorous translation and pre-testing process guided us through the WHO translation process to a final version of each framework. The pre-testing process proved to be feasible.

In our initial forward translation, we aimed to keep the original linguistic structure as far as possible. In the expert panel, we discussed alternative translations to items which appeared to be in “Denglish” jargon (a variety of German containing a high proportion of English words), but accepted English words which are common in German (e.g., CFIR, headings 2 and 3, “Äußeres/Inneres Setting”; ERIC, item 35, “Champions identifizieren und vorbereiten”).

Faced with the high number of items, the bilingual expert panels were quite time-consuming. Both ERIC and CFIR documents were very detailed, including health care-specific vocabulary, and nuances that required careful translation, all of which led to taking a lot of time. We recommended a considerable number of changes to the early translation.

Regarding back-translation of the instruments, we predominantly found synonyms to the English original. Linguistic differences were accepted when the linguistic meaning was maintained. Close attention was given to maintaining the meaning of phrases and the health care-specific vocabulary when performing the back-translation and avoiding word-for-word direct translation back to English. This remained a difficult task, as the back-translator had no previous knowledge of the original English version instruments.

We were not able to identify and use an established strategy for pre-testing or validating these frameworks. Thus, we developed an own strategy to generate information about the central focus and comparisons with the suggested translation. A checklist in form of a traffic light system to test the usefulness of the translated heading was successful.

Our initial pilot-tests prior to the interviews revealed that rating CFIR barriers together with ERIC strategies is too complex and confusing due to the different concepts. Thus, we decided not to ask our participants to assess items from two different frameworks in the same interview.

Since both frameworks comprise generic constructs or compilations for implementation of any intervention/innovation across health care, items can appear abstract. In our interviews, we provided an example of implementing an electronic assessment system in a general practice or physiotherapy practice to support participants contextualising implementation items.

The translation and pre-testing process also revealed that even headings in the original version did not comprise the whole content of the detailed definition.

Limitations

During the translation, expert panel and back-translation process, several issues were discussed and kept in the original English language to provide a clear and correct message.

In total, 4 of 112 items were discussed in a second interview. This might indicate selection bias in terms of our interview participants (e.g., allocating an item to “yellow” (partly approved) rather than to “red” (rejected) because participants wanted to be perceived as nice). Since we predominantly tested one item per interviewee, a different sample of participants might have rejected more items. Our sample comprised different researchers and academics experienced in specific terms like “evidence” or “validity”. A pre-test with a different sample of non-academic individuals might have led to different results. Since both frameworks are designed to be used within health care with a high number of professionals, this might not be relevant. It should be noted that patients might need more guidance in terms of using the conceptual frameworks.

Future applications of the translated German version of CFIR and ERIC should monitor and report problems and limitations and may lead to further revisions.

Conclusions

Both translated frameworks can now be used within implementation research in German-speaking countries. This might improve adherence to evidence-based implementation into practice in German-speaking countries. We recommend a patient version of the translated implementation frameworks, which use a lay language (not exceeding German 6th class middle school writing).

Abbreviations

CFIR: Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research

ERIC: Expert Recommendations for Implementation Change

WHO: World Health Organisation

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethics approval and consent: Both implementation frameworks (CFIR and ERIC) have been published in the literature, and are publicly available. The Ethical Committee of the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich has approved the study protocol under the number 20-801. Moreover, all interviewed participants

are close collaborators of the senior author and gave their written informed consent to participate in the interviews.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its additional information files.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This study is part of the project “Development and feasibility-testing of multi-disciplinary care pathways to improve mobility and participation of older people with vertigo, dizziness and balance disorders” (MobilE-PHY) within the Munich Network Health Care Research (MobilE-NET) and is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (grant number 01GY1603C).

Authors' contributions

VR, ES, PB and MM translated the original documents into the German language. TR conducted the bilingual expert panel with CC and recommended changes, which were discussed with VR, ES, PB and MM. AP translated the German version back into English language and compared it with VR to the original and discussed differences with VR, ES, PB and MM. VR and ES conducted and analysed the cognitive interviews. VR drafted this manuscript. All co-authors critically revised this draft and contributed to the final writing of the paper. AP, a native English speaker reviewed the manuscript for clarity. MM is the principal investigator and holds the senior authorship. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Helga Breimaier for providing her unpublished German translation of CFIR for consideration of our initial German translation. We thank all our participants of the cognitive interviews for their participation and Thomas Waltz for helping us in formatting the matching tool.

References

1. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Sci.* 2009;4:50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50.
2. Pfadenhauer LM, Gerhardus A, Mozygemba K, Lysdahl KB, Booth A, Hofmann B, et al. Making sense of complexity in context and implementation: the Context and Implementation of Complex Interventions (CICI) framework. *Implementation Sci.* 2017;12:21. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0552-5.
3. Waters E, Hall BJ, Armstrong R, Doyle J, Pettman TL, Silva-Sanigorski A de. Essential components of public health evidence reviews: capturing intervention complexity, implementation, economics and equity. *J Public Health (Oxf).* 2011;33:462–5. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdr064.
4. Nilsen P. Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Sci.* 2015;10:53. doi:10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0.
5. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, Damschroder LJ, Smith JL, Matthieu MM, et al. A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. *Implementation Sci.* 2015;10:21. doi:10.1186/s13012-015-0209-1.
6. Baker R, Camosso-Stefinovic J, Gillies C, Shaw EJ, Cheater F, Flottorp S, et al. Tailored interventions to address determinants of practice. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015:CD005470. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD005470.pub3.
7. Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Fernández ME, Abadie B, Damschroder LJ. Choosing implementation strategies to address contextual barriers: diversity in recommendations and future directions. *Implementation Sci.* 2019;14:42. doi:10.1186/s13012-019-0892-4.
8. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, Birken SA, Abadie B, Damschroder L. A systematic review of the use of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research. *Implementation Sci.* 2016;11:72. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0437-z.
9. Breimaier HE, Heckemann B, Halfens RJG, Lohrmann C. The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR): a useful theoretical framework for guiding and evaluating a guideline implementation process in a hospital-based nursing practice. *BMC Nurs.* 2015;14:43. doi:10.1186/s12912-015-0088-4.
10. World Health Organization. Process of translation and adaptation of instruments. www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/translation/en/. Accessed 26 Mar 2020.
11. Beatty PC, Willis GB. Research Synthesis: The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 2007;71:287–311. doi:10.1093/poq/nfm006.
12. Willis GB. The Practice of Cross-Cultural Cognitive Interviewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 2015;79:359–95. doi:10.1093/poq/nfu092.

Tables

Table 1 Characteristics of interview participants

	n = 12
Age (years), Mean $\pm$ SD	36.3 $\pm$ 7.5
Sex, female / %	10 / 83
Educational level, n / %	
Master's degree	7 / 58
Doctoral degree	5 / 42
Professional position, n / %	
Research associate	10 / 83
Other, namely:	
Substitute professorship	1 / 8
Head of nursing development	1 / 8
Experience in implementation research, n / %	
< 2 years	4 / 33
$\geq$ 2–4 years	3 / 25
$\geq$ 5–9 years	3 / 25
$\geq$ 10 years	2 / 17

SD = Standard deviation

Table 2 Results of pre-testing CFIR

Items										approved (n / %)	partially approved	rejected
1. Round: Randomised items (n = 39)												
37	38	11	15	5	13	23	9	26	4	5 / 50%	4 / 40%	1 / 10%
14	34	18	24	12	1	31	21	10	8	9 / 90%	0 / 0%	1 / 10%
7	39	33	28	16	19	22	25	32	35	9 / 90%	1 / 10%	0 / 0%
29	2	3	17	27	36	6	20	30	-	4 / 44%	5 / 56%	0 / 0%
Sub-total 1:										27 / 69%	10 / 26%	2 / 5%
2. Round: Added items (n = 2)												
10	37									0 / 0%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%
Sub-total 2:										0 / 0%	1 / 50%	1 / 50%
Final (n = 39)										27 / 69%	11 / 28%	1 / 3%
Total:										27 / 69%	11 / 28%	1 / 3%

Green = approved; Yellow = partially approved; Red = rejected

Table 3 Results of pre-testing ERIC

Items										approved (n / %)	partially approved	rejected	
1. Round: Randomised items (n = 73)													
44	61	77	107	62	63	51	68	101	60	7 / 70%	3 / 30%	0 / 0%	
58	108	42	100	80	76	97	95	45	103	6 / 60%	4 / 40%	0 / 0%	
84	93	91	90	46	105	89	54	87	72	7 / 70%	2 / 20%	1 / 10%	
83	57	98	109	81	71	111	79	96	41	5 / 50%	5 / 50%	0 / 0%	
74	88	53	106	70	67	40	59	82	48	6 / 60%	4 / 40%	0 / 0%	
104	52	78	92	43	75	64	86	102	55	6 / 60%	4 / 40%	0 / 0%	
49	66	69	94	73	85	110	99	56	65	6 / 60%	3 / 30%	1 / 10%	
47	50	112	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 / 62%	1 / 33%	0 / 0%	
Sub-total 1:										45 / 62%	26 / 36%	2 / 3%	
2. Round: Added items (n = 2)													
72	69									2 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
Sub-total 2:										2 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
Final (n = 73)										Total:	47 / 64%	26 / 36%	0 / 0%

Green colour = approved; Yellow = partially approved; Red = rejected

Figures

Figure 1

Title: Flowchart describing the WHO translation and pre-testing process [10] Legend: R=Randomisation

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile1.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile2.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile3.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile4.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile5.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile6.xlsm](#)