

Translation and cultural adaptation of the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire for Brazilian families of children in literacy learning

Tradução e adaptação cultural do Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire para famílias brasileiras de crianças em alfabetização

Aline Roberta Aceituno da Costa¹ , Hugo Amilton Santos de Carvalho² , Jamilli Bermejo Raimundo¹ , Regina Tangerino de Souza Jacob² 

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To translate and culturally adapt the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire to Brazilian Portuguese, contributing to the collection of information about the home literacy environment and the reading and writing experiences of Brazilian children in their households. **Methods:** A methodological approach structured in three phases: (1) translation of the questionnaire by a bilingual translator, ensuring initial linguistic equivalence, (2) back-translation performed by another bilingual translator without access to the original version, allowing for the assessment of translation fidelity, and (3) blind content analysis by four bilingual professionals, followed by an in-person meeting of the expert committee to establish the semantic, idiomatic, experiential, and conceptual equivalence of the instrument. **Results:** A high level of agreement was observed between the translation and the back-translation. The necessary adjustments were made during the joint review stage, ensuring the cultural adaptation of the questionnaire to the Brazilian context. **Conclusion:** The instrument has been translated and culturally adapted and is now ready for the validation stage, which will assess its applicability, benefits, and limitations in Brazil.

Keywords: Surveys and questionnaires; Translation, reading and writing; Child; Family

RESUMO

Objetivo: traduzir e adaptar culturalmente o instrumento *Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire* para o português brasileiro, contribuindo para a coleta de informações sobre o ambiente de literacia familiar e as experiências de leitura e escrita vivenciadas por crianças brasileiras em suas residências. **Métodos:** abordagem metodológica estruturada em três fases: (1) tradução do questionário por um tradutor bilingue, garantindo a equivalência linguística inicial; (2) retrotradução realizada por um segundo tradutor bilingue sem acesso à versão original, permitindo a avaliação da fidelidade da tradução; (3) análise cega do conteúdo por quatro profissionais bilingues, seguida de uma reunião presencial do comitê de especialistas para estabelecer a equivalência semântica, idiomática, experiential e conceitual do instrumento. **Resultados:** foi constatada alta concordância entre a tradução e a retrotradução. Os ajustes necessários foram realizados na etapa de revisão conjunta, garantindo a adaptação cultural adequada do questionário ao contexto brasileiro. **Conclusão:** o instrumento foi traduzido e adaptado culturalmente, estando agora apto para a etapa de validação, que permitirá avaliar sua aplicabilidade, benefícios e limitações no Brasil.

Palavras-chave: Inquéritos e questionários; Tradução, leitura e escrita; Criança; Família

Study carried out at Faculdade de Odontologia de Bauru, Universidade de São Paulo – FOB-USP – Bauru (SP), Brasil.

¹Departamento de Fonoaudiologia, Faculdade de Odontologia de Bauru, Universidade de São Paulo – FOB-USP – Bauru (SP), Brasil.

²Programa de Pós-Graduação em Fonoaudiologia (Doutorado), Faculdade de Odontologia de Bauru, Universidade de São Paulo – FOB-USP – Bauru (SP), Brasil.

Conflict of interests: No.

Authors' contribution: ARAC participated in the design of the study, data collection, data analysis, and manuscript writing; HASC contributed to data analysis, text editing, and critical review; JBR participated in data collection and manuscript writing; RTSJ contributed to the study design, data analysis, and manuscript writing.

Data Availability Statement: Research data is available in the body of the article.

Funding: None.

Corresponding author: Aline Roberta Aceituno da Costa. E-mail: alineroberta@usp.br

Received: April 25, 2025; **Accepted:** September 09, 2025

Editor-in-Chief: Maria Cecília Martinelli Iorio.

Associate Editor: Stela Maris Aguiar Lemos.

INTRODUCTION

The development of oral and written language in childhood is strongly related to the interactions established in the environments in which the child grows up, especially in the family nucleus and at school, which represent the first contexts of contact with language and literate culture⁽¹⁻³⁾.

The essential skills for the development of emergent literacy, understood as the set of knowledge, attitudes, and abilities that precede formal literacy, and emergent writing and reading, which refer to the skills directly related to the understanding and use of the alphabetic system, include phonological awareness, vocabulary, alphabetic knowledge, and the notion of writing. All of these skills develop during this period and depend, to a large extent, on the linguistic opportunities offered by the home environment^(1,4-6).

Studies on family writing and reading demonstrate that everyday practices, such as shared reading, exposure to books, and participation in language activities, favor the development of linguistic skills and predict literacy^(2,5-8). Evidence suggests that shared reading contributes significantly to vocabulary expansion and textual comprehension, while direct instruction from caregivers strengthens letter recognition and emergent writing⁽⁵⁾.

In Brazil, the National Literacy Policy (NLP)⁽⁷⁾, established by Decree No. 9.765/2019, reinforced the importance of active family participation in the process of acquiring written language, highlighting actions such as reading stories, handling written materials, and early encouragement of writing⁽⁹⁾. This approach highlights the need to better understand the role of Brazilian caregivers and develop strategies that support their practices in encouraging emerging writing and reading skills.

Despite the advances, there is a gap in the availability of culturally adapted instruments for the Brazilian context that deeply assess the dimensions of family writing and reading^(10,11), especially concerning phonological awareness — one of the metaphonological skills most associated with success in literacy^(6,8,12). The author⁽¹²⁾ highlights, for example, that early exposure to written words in the environment and metalinguistic experiences are decisive in this process, although they may vary according to the sociocultural context.

Aiming to investigate this dimension, a questionnaire⁽¹³⁾ for parents, which covers both the spontaneous behaviors of children and parental actions aimed at stimulating phonological skills, was developed. Subsequently, other authors⁽¹⁴⁾ expanded this instrument, adapting it for families of children with hearing impairments, and observed correlations between deficits in vocabulary, phonological awareness, and less engagement during reading, when compared to children with typical development.

Given the relevance of this evidence and the scarcity of instruments focusing on family practices related to emergent literacy available in Brazilian Portuguese, this study aimed to translate and culturally adapt the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire, in the version used in a previous publication⁽¹⁴⁾, contributing to its future validation and application in Brazilian families.

METHODS

As determined by Resolution 466/2012 of the National Health Council, this study did not require submission to the institution's Research Ethics Committee, as there was no direct collection of human personal data, information, or biological materials.

The structuring of this study involved a methodological approach based on the translation and cultural adaptation of the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire, using a methodology already consolidated in previous studies to ensure the equivalence of the instrument in the new linguistic and cultural context⁽¹⁵⁻¹⁹⁾. The translation of the instrument was performed by a bilingual professional, a native Portuguese speaker and fluent English speaker, with a degree in Portuguese–English language. The back-translation was conducted by another professional with the same profile, without prior knowledge of the instrument. Although international guidelines⁽¹⁷⁾ indicate, as common practice, that the back-translator be a native speaker of the instrument's source language, national studies recognize that this is not a unanimous requirement. According to a study⁽¹⁹⁾, back-translation can be carried out by bilingual professionals, fluent in the source language, as long as they are not familiar with the original content, maintaining the reliability of the meaning. This step was complemented by a careful analysis, carried out by a committee of experts, composed of two translators and two bilingual speech-language pathology and audiology therapists with clinical and academic experience in child language and educational speech-language pathology and audiology. All committee members had in-depth technical knowledge regarding child development, reading, and education, as well as training and fluency in the English language, which ensured rigorous conduct of the process of analyzing conceptual, semantic, and idiomatic equivalences, even in a non-multidisciplinary composition.

Presentation of the intended material at the end of the study

The instrument adapted in this study, the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire, is intended for application to parents or guardians of children in early childhood education. The application must be carried out through a structured interview, conducted by a qualified professional or researcher, to favor the standardization of responses and understanding of the items. Responses are recorded on a dichotomous scale, with “yes” or “no” options corresponding, respectively, to the values 1 and 0. This coding allows data quantification and future statistical analysis, as per the original proposal of the instrument.

Material preparation

Initially, the original English version of the instrument, the focus of this study, the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire, was inserted into the online text editor Google Docs and divided into seven tables, corresponding to the categories of emergent writing and reading knowledge proposed by the instrument: Orientation Toward Literacy, Writing, Interaction with Books, Environmental Print, Phonological Awareness, Alphabet Knowledge, Facilitation of Literacy.

Additionally, three columns were added to the document: category name, category description, and questions to be applied to families.

During this step, a content analysis, which identified a repetition of the question “Does your child ask you to read to him/her?” in the Writing and Orientation Toward Literacy categories, was conducted. To avoid redundancy, the question was removed from the Writing category.

Authorization for translation and adaptation

To guarantee the ethical and legal use of the instrument, formal authorization was requested for the translation and adaptation of the questionnaire. Both the original author of the instrument and the researchers of the expanded instrument, who used a version of the questionnaire in their study on family literacy of children with hearing loss, granted permission for this study. Thus, the adaptation process respected the researchers’ copyright, ensuring that the Brazilian version of the instrument followed the applicable ethical principles.

Step 1: Translation

The questionnaire was translated by a bilingual translator with a degree in Portuguese-English language, whose native language was Brazilian Portuguese (T1). The translator worked in both languages and produced the first Portuguese version of the questionnaire.

Step 2: Back-translation

Then, the second bilingual translator (RT1), also a native speaker of Brazilian Portuguese and a graduate Portuguese-English language, carried out the back-translation into English. The objective of this step was to verify the semantic and conceptual equivalence of the translated version in relation to the original instrument.

Step 3: Equivalence criteria and committee of experts

The cultural adaptation process considered the four levels of equivalence recommended in the literature for translating psychometric instruments: semantic, conceptual, idiomatic, and experiential.

Semantic equivalence concerns the assessment of the fidelity of the sentence structure, colloquial or idiomatic expressions, and verification of the maintenance of the original meaning. Conceptual equivalence investigates whether the concepts measured in the original instrument are culturally applicable in the new context. Idiomatic equivalence is the identification of the relevance and cultural acceptability of questions in Brazil. Experiential equivalence verifies the similarity of format and instructions between the original and translated versions.

The review was conducted by a committee of experts, comprising a translator (T1), a back-translator (RT1), and two bilingual speech-language pathologists and audiologists with experience in the areas of child language and educational speech-language pathology and audiology.

Before the meeting, each committee member received an evaluation form containing three scoring categories, namely: (+1), which corresponded to an equivalent item; (0), which corresponded to a partially equivalent item; and (−1), which corresponded to a non-equivalent item. In cases where items received a score of 0 or −1, experts indicated which type of equivalence was not achieved (semantic, idiomatic, conceptual, or experiential).

The committee meeting aimed to review the disagreeing items and define the final version of the questionnaire, ensuring that the adaptation remained faithful to the original instrument, while considering the cultural specificities of Brazil.

RESULTS

The translation analysis revealed high agreement between experts and translators, reaching up to 100% agreement on most items, which ensured that the instrument maintained the intended semantic, idiomatic, experiential, and conceptual equivalences. The categories and questions for which there was disagreement are presented in Table 1. After the committee discussions, specific modifications were made, resulting in the final version of the questionnaire (Table 2).

In the “Orientation Toward Literacy” category, the title showed 50% equivalence between translation and back-translation, leading to the replacement of the term previously classified as partially equivalent (0). Of the five questions analyzed, two (3 - “Does your child show interest in reading materials?” and 5 - “Does your child ask you to write for him/her?”) were classified as partially equivalent (0) in 25% of the evaluations, but did not require changes, after review by the committee of experts.

In the “Writing” category, the judges identified 50% of non-equivalent items (−1) in the category description (Ability and Interest in Writing Letters). However, it was decided to maintain the original content. Of the four questions, the first (“Does your child write letters?”) received semantic questions from two judges, but remained unchanged after committee discussion.

For the category “Interaction with Books”, the description obtained 75% equivalence, while questions 1, 3, and 5 were classified as not equivalent (−1) or partially equivalent (0). Question 1, which presented 25% non-equivalence (−1) and 50% partial equivalence (0), was reformulated to: “Does your child point to or talk about pictures in an independent way when you read stories?”. Question 5, with 50% partial equivalence (0), was adjusted to “Does your child complete words or phrases in familiar stories when you read together?”. Question 3 remained unchanged, with the initial non-equivalence of 25%.

The description of the category “Elements Related to Writing in the Environment” presented 75% of non-equivalent items (−1), requiring modification to “Reaction to Elements Related to Writing Printed in the Environment”. In the questions, question 2 was reformulated to “Does your child recognize some words by their shape?”, while question 1 was maintained after discussion in the committee, despite having been classified as 50% non-equivalent (−1).

In the “Alphabet Knowledge” category, the pre-final description was considered inadequate by 50% of the evaluators and adjusted. Among the questions, question 2, which received 75% non-equivalence (−1), was reformulated to “Does your child try to assign sounds to the letters of the alphabet?”, while question 3 was changed to “Can your child identify some letters of the alphabet?”.

Table 1. Discrepancies found in the translation process and final expressions after consensus

CATEGORY	TRANSLATION THAT GAVE RISE TO DISCREPANCY	NUMBER AND TYPE OF DIVERGENCE	CHANGE AFTER CONSENSUS MEETING
Orientation Toward Literacy	A. Title: Disposition for Literacy	A. 50% (0) Semantic/diomatic	A. Change "orientation to" to "disposition to"
	B. Question 3: Does your child show interest in reading materials?	B. 25% (0) Semantic	B. No change (doubt about keeping the word "materials"; used in English)
Writing	C. Question 5: Does your child ask you to write for him/her?	C. 25% (0) Semantic Conceptual	C. No change (use of the word requests or asks)
	A. Description: Ability and Interest in Writing Letters	A. 50% (-1) Semantic	A. A. No change (doubt about whether the term letters would refer to "alphabet letters" or "letters")
Interaction with Books	B. Question 1: Does your child write letters?	B. 50% (0) Semantic	B. A. No change (doubt about whether the term letters would refer to "alphabet letters" or "letters")
	A. Description: Engagement with books while reading	A. 25% Semantic	A. No change
Elements Related to Writing in the Environment	B. Question 1: Does your child point to or talk about pictures in an independent way when you read stories?	B. 25% (0); 75% (-1) Semantic	B Change "independently" to "in an independent way"
	C. Question 3: Does your child pretend to read the story in the book?	C. 25% (-1) Semantic Idiomatic	C. No change (doubt between "Pretend to read" and "pretend that read"
	D. Question 5: Does your child complete words or phrases in familiar stories when you read together?	D. 50% (0) Semantic	D. Change "complement" to "complete"
	A. Description: Reaction to Elements Related to Writing Printed in the Environment	A. 75% (-1) Semantic Experiential	A. Change "writing elements" to: "elements related to writing in the environment"
Alphabet Knowledge and Phonological Skills	B. Question 1: Does your child identify words in the environment?	B. 50% (-1) Semantic	B. No change (doubt between the use of "observes" and "identifies"
	C. Question 2: Does your child recognize some words by their shape?	C. 50% (-1) Semantic	C. Change "discovers" to "recognizes"
	A. Description: Skills to identify letters/sounds	A. 50% (-1) Semantic	A. Change "perceive" with "identify"
Literacy Facilitators	B. Question 2: Does your child try to assign sounds to the letters of the alphabet?	B. 75% (-1) Semantic	B. Change "associate" to "assign sounds to"
	C. Question 3: Does your child identify some letters of the alphabet?	C. 25% (-1) Semantic Idiomatic	C. Change "detect" with "identify"
	A. Question 2: Do you try to teach the names or sounds of the letters of the alphabet when you read?	A. 75% (-1) Semantic	A. Change "when reading" to "when you read"

Subtittle: % = percentage

Table 2. Translation and final adaptation of the Home Literacy Practice Questionnaire into Brazilian Portuguese - Questionário de Práticas Familiar de Letramento

CATEGORIA E DESCRIÇÃO	QUESTÕES
Categoria Disposição para alfabetização Descrição: Interesse em livros/leitura	Questões (5) 1.O seu filho/a pede para você ler para ele/ela? 2.Como você avaliaria o interesse do seu filho/a pelos livros? 3.O seu filho/a demonstra interesse em ler? 4.O seu filho/a pede ajuda para ler as palavras? 5.O seu filho/a pede para você escrever para ele/ela?
Categoria – Escrita Descrição: Habilidade e interesse em escrever letras	Questões (4) 1.O seu filho/a escreve letras? 2.O seu filho/a desenha? 3.O seu filho/a pergunta para você como soletrar palavras? 4.O seu filho/a escreve palavras?
Categoria - Consciência Fonológica Descrição: Percebendo e produzindo rima	Questões (3) 1.O seu filho/a tenta brincar com jogos de rima com você ou com outros? 2.O seu filho/a produz rima sem ajuda? 3.O seu filho/a percebe e fala quando escuta palavras que rimam?
Categoria - Interação com livros Descrição: Envolvimento com livros durante a leitura	Questões (5) 1. O seu filho/a aponta ou fala sobre figuras, de maneira independente, quando você lê histórias? 2.O seu filho/a faz perguntas sobre os personagens ou cenários durante a leitura das histórias? 3.O seu filho/a finge ler a história no livro? 4.O seu filho/a inventa histórias e as conta? 5.O seu filho/a completa palavras ou frases de histórias familiares quando vocês leem juntos?
Categoria - Elementos relacionados à escrita no ambiente Descrição: Reação aos elementos relacionados à escrita impressos no ambiente	Questões (2) 1.O seu filho/a identifica palavras no ambiente? 2.O seu filho/a reconhece algumas palavras pelo formato?
Categoria - Conhecimento do alfabeto Descrição: Habilidades para identificar letras/sons	Questões (3) 1.O seu filho/a nomeia as letras do alfabeto? 2.O seu filho/a tenta atribuir sons para as letras do alfabeto? 3.O seu filho/a consegue identificar algumas letras do alfabeto?
Categoria - Facilitadores da alfabetização Descrição: Ações dos pais para promover a alfabetização	Questões (4) 1.Com qual frequência você lê para o seu filho/a? 2.Você tenta ensinar os nomes ou sons das letras do alfabeto quando você lê? 3.Você aponta para placas ou palavras, como nome de restaurantes ou placas de rua, para o seu filho/a? 4.Você brinca de jogos de rima com o seu filho/a?

Finally, in the “Literacy Facilitators” category, the only adjustment needed was in question 2, due to 75% non-equivalence (−1). The final formulation adopted was “Do you try to teach the names or sounds of the letters of the alphabet when you read?”

These modifications guaranteed the linguistic and cultural adequacy of the questionnaire for the Brazilian context, ensuring that the proposed equivalences were respected in the cultural adaptation process.

DISCUSSION

The cultural adaptation of the Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire revealed the need for semantic, idiomatic, conceptual, and experiential adjustments in several categories of the instrument. The modifications made ensured that the translated questionnaire reflected the cultural and linguistic reality of Brazil, ensuring its equivalence with the original version. The results indicated that, although the general structure of the instrument was preserved, specific terms and concepts required adjustments to ensure clarity and applicability in the Brazilian context.

Regarding linguistic modifications and equivalences, there was a need for semantic and idiomatic modifications, in agreement with previous studies on cultural adaptation of psychological and educational instruments^(7,18). According to these authors, one of the main challenges in translating instruments is to ensure not only literal equivalence, but also conceptual adequacy, so that the instrument maintains its validity in the new sociocultural context.

In the Orientation Toward Literacy category, for example, it was decided to replace the original term for “Disposition for Literacy” to use a more precise terminology aligned with the meaning of the construct evaluated. Studies indicate that children’s involvement in reading and writing practices in the family environment is a strong predictor of academic success^(3,20). Therefore, the adaptation of this term aimed to preserve the original meaning of the questionnaire and, at the same time, ensure its understanding by Brazilian respondents.

Furthermore, the reformulation of items in the “Interaction with Books” category, such as modifying the question “Does your child complement words or phrases from familiar stories when you read together?” to “Does your child complete words or phrases in familiar stories when you read together?”, exemplifies an adjustment that maintains the essence of the original question, but with greater clarity for Brazilian parents. The child’s active participation in shared reading contributes significantly to the development of vocabulary and phonological awareness^(5,8,12), reinforcing the importance of preserving this item in the adapted questionnaire.

Concerning elements related to the literacy environment, changes in the category “Elements Related to Writing in the Environment” reflected the need to consider the cultural specificities of exposure to written language in Brazil. The modification of the original term to “Reaction to Elements Related to Writing Printed in the Environment” followed guidelines outlined in a study⁽¹²⁾, which argues that a child’s frequent contact with written words in the environment is one of the first factors that influence emergent literacy. In Brazil, this contact can vary significantly depending on the socioeconomic context, reinforcing the importance of using a term that more comprehensively represents this experience.

As for the item “Alphabet Knowledge and Phonological Skills”, it can be pointed out as relevant the need to modify the question “Does your child associate sounds to letters?” to “Does your child try to assign sounds to the letters of the alphabet?”. Studies highlight that the association between letters and sounds is one of the most important components of the literacy process⁽²¹⁻²⁴⁾. Thus, the adaptation of this item sought to ensure that parents correctly understand the issue, facilitating the identification of behaviors that are precursors to literacy in the child.

The presence of similar adjustments in instruments adapted to different languages has been documented in the literature. Authors⁽³⁾ highlight, for example, that, in family literacy contexts, parents’ perception of the child’s knowledge of letters and sounds can be influenced by the way the question is formulated. Thus, rewriting this question in the translated questionnaire contributes to a more accurate assessment of emerging alphabetic knowledge.

The last category analyzed, “Literacy Facilitators in the Family Environment,” showed the least need for adjustments. The only significant change was the reformulation of the question “Do you try to teach your child the names or sounds of the letters?” to “Do you try to teach the names or sounds of the letters of the alphabet when you read?”. The quality of interaction between parents and children during shared reading is more decisive for the development of literacy than the simple presence of reading materials in the home environment⁽²⁵⁾. In this sense, this change in wording aimed to emphasize the relationship between explicit literacy teaching and joint reading, ensuring that the question more accurately captures this behavior in the Brazilian context.

The aforementioned question, along with seven others that directly address aspects related to phonological awareness, represents one of the main differences in this study. This set of items is especially relevant given the scarcity, in the national scientific literature, of validated instruments that investigate family literacy practices with a focus on this fundamental component of literacy.

A relevant national study⁽²⁶⁾ proposed the construction of a questionnaire aimed at investigating family literacy practices in Brazil, including, among other aspects, a question directly related to phonological awareness skills: “Have you ever shown your son/daughter what the sounds of words and letters are like?”. The presence of this question highlights the recognition of the importance of this construct in the context of emerging literacy in Brazil.

This scenario reinforces the relevance of the present study, by introducing a tool culturally adapted to the Brazilian context, which expands the investigation on family stimulation of phonological awareness skills. This adaptation therefore contributes to expanding the repertoire of tools available in the country, with potential for future intercultural comparisons and clinical, educational, and research uses, in addition to providing support for public policies aimed at promoting family literacy. The scarcity of instruments with this specific focus in the national literature justifies the need for studies like this.

The findings also highlighted the importance of conducting the cultural adaptation steps with methodological rigor, respecting conceptual, semantic, and contextual nuances. The adjustments made in this study reiterate the need for a cultural adaptation process that goes beyond simple literal translation.

It is in this sense that the reflection emerges on the fact that, although the committee of experts was composed of two speech-language pathology and audiology therapists with clinical and academic experience in child language and educational speech-language pathology and audiology therapy, which proved to be relevant for the cultural adaptation step, it is recognized that a multidisciplinary composition could broaden the perspectives in the analysis of equivalences. It is suggested that this limitation be addressed in future studies by presenting the questionnaire for content analysis and validation by a committee of professionals from various areas: speech-language pathology and audiology therapists, psychologists, pediatricians, and early childhood teachers.

All these analyses are important because, as pointed out in a study⁽¹⁸⁾, instruments originally developed in one language can present significant challenges when applied to new populations, requiring refinements to ensure conceptual equivalence and content validity, which confirms the methodology of this study.

Subsequent proposals could investigate the criterion validity of the instrument by comparing the results of parental responses with direct measures of children's emergent literacy skills. Furthermore, future applications of the questionnaire could assess how different socioeconomic profiles influence parental responses, providing a more in-depth analysis of family literacy practices in Brazil.

Thus, this study represents only the first step in validating the instrument. Further research is essential to test its statistical reliability and criterion validity, especially by applying the questionnaire to representative samples of the Brazilian population. Conducting psychometric analyses will help to verify the stability and accuracy of the instrument over time. Furthermore, studies should explore methods of scoring and standardizing questionnaire responses to establish reference values that allow for the classification of children's family literacy and identify whether they correspond to what is expected for an environment conducive to the development of reading and writing.

Finally, it is recommended that subsequent studies investigate how socioeconomic and cultural factors, the presence of neurodevelopmental disorders and different types of disabilities influence family literacy practices, allowing the results obtained with the questionnaire to support educational interventions and public policies aimed at promoting literacy in childhood. With these complementary steps, it is hoped that the "Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire" can become a widely used tool in research and programs to encourage reading and writing in the family environment in Brazil.

CONCLUSION

The Home Literacy Practices Questionnaire was translated into Brazilian Portuguese and adapted to the cultural and linguistic specificities of Brazil, following methodological criteria to avoid mere literal translation and ensure the semantic, idiomatic, conceptual, and experiential equivalence of the instrument.

The translated and adapted questionnaire, which received the equivalent name of Questionário de Práticas Familiares de Letramento, preserves its function of investigating the child's involvement with reading and writing practices in the home environment, being a relevant resource for studies on emergent literacy and children's language development.

REFERENCES

1. Palinha KDM, Mota MMPE. O papel da Home Literacy e da Educação Infantil no desenvolvimento dos precursores da alfabetização. *Estud Pesqui Psicol.* 2019;19(3):704-17. <https://doi.org/10.12957/epp.2019.46911>.
2. Sénéchal M, LeFevre JA. Parental involvement in the development of children's reading skill: a five-year longitudinal study. *Child Dev.* 2002;73(2):445-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00417>. PMID:11949902.
3. Sénéchal M, LeFevre JA. Continuity and change in the home literacy environment as predictors of growth in vocabulary and reading. *Child Dev.* 2014;85(4):1552-68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12222>. PMID:24467656.
4. Hamilton LG, Hayiou-Thomas ME, Hulme C, Snowling MJ. The home literacy environment as a predictor of the early literacy development of children at family-risk of dyslexia. *Sci Stud Read.* 2016;20(5):401-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2016.1213266>. PMID:28250707.
5. Sénéchal M, LeFevre JA, Thomas EM, Daley KE. Differential effects of home literacy experiences on the development of oral and written language. *Read Res Q.* 1998;33(1):96-116. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.33.1.5>.
6. Mota MMP. Home literacy and literacy: a systematic literature review. *Psicol Argumento.* 2014;32:109-15.
7. Brasil. Decreto nº 9.765, de 11 de abril de 2019. Institui a Política Nacional de Alfabetização. *Diário Oficial da União; Brasília; 11 abr 2019.*
8. Cardoso CV, Mota MMP. Home-Literacy e os precursores da alfabetização. *Estud Pesqui Psicol.* 2015;15(2):708-24. <https://doi.org/10.12957/epp.2015.17667>.
9. Silva WR, Delfino JS. Letramentos familiares na política brasileira de alfabetização. *Rev Bras Alfabetiz.* 2021;(14):148-69. <https://doi.org/10.47249/rba2021450>.
10. Buvanewari B, Padakannaya P. Development of a home literacy environment questionnaire for Tamil-speaking kindergarten children. *Lang Test Asia.* 2017;7(1):14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-017-0047-y>.
11. Portela DN. Adaptação transcultural do Questionário de Ambiente de Literacia Familiar (Home Literacy Environment Questionnaire) [dissertação]. São João del-Rei: Universidade Federal de São João del-Rei; 2023.
12. Chaney C. Language development, metalinguistic awareness and emergent literacy skills of 3-year-old children in relation to social class. *Appl Psycholinguist.* 1994;15(3):371-94. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400004501>.
13. Boudreau D. Use of a parent questionnaire in emergent and early literacy assessment of preschool children. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch.* 2005;36(1):33-47. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2005/004\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2005/004)). PMID:15801506.
14. Reynolds G, Werfel KL. Home literacy environment and emergent skills in preschool children with hearing loss. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ.* 2020;25(1):68-79. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enz025>. PMID:31424544.
15. Herdman M, Fox-Rushby J, Badia X. A model of equivalence in the cultural adaptation of HRQL instruments: the universalist approach. *Qual Life Res.* 1998;7(4):323-35. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008846618880>. PMID:9610216.

16. Sousa VD, Rojjanasrirat W. Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: a clear and user-friendly guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2011;17(2):268-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x>. PMID:20874835.
17. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz B. Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine.* 2000;25(24):3186-91. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>. PMID:11124735.
18. Hambleton RK, Merenda PF, Spielberger CD. *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2005.
19. Borsa JC, Damásio BF, Bandeira DR. Adaptação e validação de instrumentos psicológicos entre culturas: algumas considerações. *Paidéia.* 2012;22(53):423-32.
20. Mol SE, Bus AG. To read or not to read: a meta-analysis of print exposure from infancy to early adulthood. *Psychol Bull.* 2011;137(2):267-96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021890>. PMID:21219054.
21. Castles A, Rastle K, Nation K. Ending the reading wars: reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychol Sci Public Interest.* 2018;19(1):5-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>. PMID:29890888.
22. Melby-Lervåg M, Lyster SAH, Hulme C. Phonological skills and their role in learning to read: a meta-analytic review. *Psychol Bull.* 2012;138(2):322-52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026744>. PMID:22250824.
23. Cardoso-Martins C, Mesquita YR, Ehri LC. Letter names and phonological awareness help children to learn letter-sound relations. *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2011;109:25-38. PMID:21316064.
24. Rehfeld L, Pennington BF, Raskind W, Berninger VW. Phonemic awareness instruction in struggling readers: a meta-analysis. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch.* 2022;53(2):765-83.
25. Bus AG, Van Ijzendoorn MH, Pellegrini AD. Joint book reading makes for success in learning to read: a meta-analysis on intergenerational transmission of literacy. *Rev Educ Res.* 1995;65(1):1-21. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065001001>.
26. Borges MT, Azoni CAS. A literacia familiar no desenvolvimento de habilidades linguísticas e metalinguísticas de pré-escolares. *Rev CEFAC.* 2021;23(4):e2521. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0216/20212342521>.