Multilingual Interpretation in Science Centers and Museums

A landscape study performed by the Association of Science-Technology Centers, Inc. and the Exploratorium.
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Rationale
Science centers and museums have a greater urgency now more than ever to understand and respond to the needs of diverse communities, as society becomes more ethnically and linguistically intricate. As public institutions of learning and engagement we must continue to garner attention and respect from all citizens to remain active in, and relevant to, the community.

In order for these institutions to become more inclusive, additional studies aimed to enhance the understanding and advance the capacity to better serve a multitude of audiences must be conducted. Based on previous studies, the availability of multilingual offerings in museums and science centers is an area with little information, and one that needs further investigation. In fact, when conducting a literature review on this topic, the Exploratorium quickly learned that nothing comprehensive existed on the subject matter, reaffirming the great need for this information and research. With the Association of Science-Technology Centers (ASTC) as a collaborative partner, researchers co-developed a survey to learn more about multilingual offerings in museums and science centers in hopes to begin advancing the knowledge and awareness surrounding multilingual inclusiveness in these institutions.
Goals and Methods

The Multilingualism in Science Centers and Museums survey was developed jointly by the Exploratorium and ASTC in order to gain a baseline understanding of multilingual offerings in science centers and museums around the world. The survey focused on four areas of inquiry:

- What are the most prevalent languages and interpretive formats used when providing multilingual interpretation?
- What are the primary motivations for providing multilingual interpretation?
- What are the challenges in implementing multilingual approaches?
- What are the trends in implementing multilingual discourse across institutions with respect to budget size and feasibility?

The Multilingualism in Science Centers and Museums report is based on responses to two online surveys: a version tailored for institutions in the United States, and one tailored for international institutions. Each survey consisted of 21 questions for both U.S. and international museums. There were slight differences in the wording of questions in the international survey based on the variance of primary languages, where the U.S. survey’s default language was English. In recognition of the complex nature of the survey questions, invitations to complete the survey were sent to multiple individuals within each institution, including: directors of education, marketing, outreach, exhibits, and public programs. Survey invitations were both sent and collected in October 2009.

The U.S. version of the survey was disseminated to 701 individuals at 361 ASTC-member museums. The international version of the survey was disseminated to 167 individuals at 105 museums. Surveys were completed by 143 individuals representing 111 museums in the United States, and 38 individuals representing 33 museums internationally. The institutional response rate for both U.S. and international institutions was 31%. Individual response rates for U.S. and international respondents were 20% and 23%, respectively.

The numbers reported reflect the museums that completed the survey and not necessarily the field as a whole. The data represented in this report is based on individual responses, not institutional responses, and does reflect responses from multiple individuals from a single institution in some cases. Overall, institutional demographics of respondents to this survey generally align with responses reported in the 2009 ASTC Sourcebook of Science Center Statistics with respect to budget size and type of institution.

Where significant differences existed, responses from U.S.-based respondents and international respondents are listed separately.
Researchers

The *Multilingualism in Science Centers and Museums* survey was developed jointly by staff members Veronica Garcia-Luis and Hugh McDonald from The Exploratorium, and by Laura Huerta Migus from ASTC.

Migus administered the survey to U.S. and international ASTC-member institutions. Garcia-Luis analyzed and edited the data, with the assistance of Elizabeth Alexander and Debbie Siegel. Alexandra Chili of ASTC also edited the report and the narratives.
Operational Definitions

“Average” refers to the mean, where appropriate.

The number of respondents to a particular question is indicated by “n”; “nr” means not reported or no response; and “na” means not applicable.

“Interpretation” and “Interpretive Materials” refer to exhibit labels, informational signage, websites, public programs and events, and other methods of presenting content or interacting with visitors and audiences.

“Exhibit Labels” refer to printed and/or digital signage that is designed as part of an exhibition or exhibition component.

Budget categories used in this report are based on ASTC membership budget categories.
Highlights

Languages Offered
In U.S.-based institutions, the most prevalent language offered is English at 87%.

Only 10% of U.S.-based institutions offer most or all visitor information in more than one language. Of this 10%, the second most prevalent language is Spanish at 92%.

In comparison, 55% of international institutions offer most or all of their visitor information in more than one language. The most commonly offered language in international institutions is English (97%), with French (38%), and Chinese (22%), as the second and third most popular languages offered.

Interpretive Formats Used
Responding U.S. institutions offer multilingual interpretation primarily through multilingual exhibit labels (78%). Other common multilingual resources include marketing materials (47%), public programs (42%), and docents or volunteers (42%).

All responding international institutions provide multilingual exhibit labels. About three-quarters of international institutions also provide multilingual marketing materials (73%), and orientation materials (73%).

Motivation for Multilingual Offerings
For both U.S. and international respondents, an institutional mandate to make most or all exhibits or programs accessible to a range of audiences is the most common reason they offer visitor information in more than one language (56% and 77%, respectively).

U.S.-based respondents cite targeted outreach to underserved audiences by specific departments (40%), and creation of exhibits or programs for specific groups (29%), as the next most common motivators.

International respondents cite government or legal mandates (50%), preservation of the heritage or culture of local peoples (20%), and targeted outreach to underserved audiences by specific departments (20%), as the next most common motivators.

Challenges in Implementing Multilingual Strategies
Finding and identifying sufficient monetary and staff resources is the biggest challenge in developing and implementing multilingual labels for both U.S. and international respondents (70% and 71%, respectively).

Creating effective and appropriate translations is the second biggest challenge for both U.S. and international respondents (33% and 54%, respectively).
Making multilingual labels a priority, or establishing buy-in from the rest of the institution or department is the third biggest challenge for U.S. respondents (25%), while ensuring effective label design is the third biggest challenge for international respondents (43%).
Practices and Motivations
Pervasiveness of Multilingual Support in Science Centers and Museums

Most U.S. science center and museum respondents (87%) indicated that their institutions present visitor information mainly in English, though approximately half of these respondents indicate the presence of some level of multilingual support. In comparison, the majority of international respondents (55%) indicated that their institutions provide most or all visitor information in more than one language. Only 10% of U.S. respondents indicated a similar level of multilingual support for visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1a: Level of Multilingual Support by Budget Size – U.S. Respondents, n= 143</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information in English only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information mostly in English, some information in other languages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most or all visitor information in more than one language.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1b: Level of Multilingual Support by Budget Size – International Respondents, n= 38</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information in one language only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information mostly in primary language, some information in other languages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most or all visitor information in more than one language.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivations for Multilingual Support

For US institutions, an institutional mandate to make most or all exhibits or programs accessible to a range of audiences is the most common reason they offer visitor information in more than one language (56%). Specific departments targeting outreach to underserved audiences is the next most common reason for US institutions (40%), and creation of exhibits or programs for specific groups is the third most common reason (29%).

For international institutions, an institutional mandate to make exhibits or programs accessible is also the most common reason they offer information in more than one language (77%). Government or legal mandates are the next most common reason for international institutions (50%), and preservation of the heritage or culture of local peoples and departments targeting outreach to underserved audiences are tied for the third most common reason (20%).

Figure 2: Motivations for Multilingual Support, n= 78 U.S. and 30 International
Languages Offered

Science centers and museums offer visitors various forms of interpretation, including exhibit labels, programs and events, informational signage, and much more. Respondents were asked to list up to eight languages offered in exhibit labels, programs, signage, or other interpretive devices. Nearly all respondents indicated that information in English is available to visitors in their institutions, regardless of geography. Of the U.S. institutions that provide information in languages other than English, the most common second language offered is Spanish. Information in English is readily available according to international respondents (97%), with French (38%) and Chinese (22%) as the second and third most popular languages.

Other languages less frequently cited, but also offered by responding institutions include: Korean, Japanese, Hmong, Russian, Polish, Finnish, and Navajo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>U.S. Respondents</th>
<th>International Respondents</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience with Multilingual Support

Overall, international institutions indicate longer experience in offering multilingual interpretation than U.S. institutions, with the majority of international respondents reporting more than a decade of experience in this area compared with less than one-third of U.S. respondents.

**Figure 4a: Experience Offering Multilingual Support - U.S. Respondents, n=78**

**Figure 4b: Experience Offering Multilingual Support - International Respondents, n=30**

**Figure 4c: Length of Time Multilingual Interpretation Offered by Budget Size, n=108**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Multilingual Interpretation Offered

Respondents were asked to identify all multilingual strategies used in their institutions. All respondents cited multilingual exhibit labels (78% U.S. and 100% international respondents, respectively) as the most common platform for providing multilingual support. Other common platforms for multilingual support in the U.S. include marketing materials (47%), public programs (42%), use of docents or volunteers (42%), and orientation materials (33%). For international institutions about a quarter of museums provide multilingual marketing and orientation materials (73%). Reported implementation of strategies does not appear to be dependent on budget size, with even small institutions indicating implementation of more than one strategy.

Figure 5a: Multilingual Interpretation Strategies Offered, n=78 U.S. and 30 International

Figure 5b: Multilingual Interpretation Strategies by Budget Size, n=108

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit labels</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation/wayfinding signage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public programs or events</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docents or volunteers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Materials</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities to Interact with Multilingual Staff or Speakers

U.S. and international institutions offer various opportunities to interact with multilingual staff or speakers. Both U.S. and international respondents indicated that they mostly offer multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators for visitors to interact with multilingual speakers (74% and 83%, respectively). The next most common opportunities offered by U.S. institutions are multilingual speakers or special events (28%), followed by multilingual lectures or classes (25%). For international institutions, multilingual speakers or special events and multilingual lectures or classes tied for second most offered interaction with multilingual staff or speakers (52%).

Figure 6a: Multilingual Staff Opportunities n=69 U.S. and 29 International

Despite prior predictions, budget size did not appear to drastically affect the number of types of opportunities offered by U.S. and international institutions. The most offered opportunity by U.S. and international institutions is bi- or multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators.
### Figure 6b: Interactions with Multilingual Staff or Speakers by Budget Size—U.S. Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual speakers or special events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual lectures or classes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual ongoing or repeating programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not offer bi- or multilingual opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6c: Interactions with Multilingual Staff or Speakers by Budget Size—International Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual speakers or special events</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual lectures or classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi- or multilingual ongoing or repeating programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not offer bi- or multilingual opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research and Evaluation of Multilingual Interpretation Strategies

Among institutions that do implement multilingual interpretation strategies, most (73%) do not formally evaluate or perform research on these strategies. Of strategies that are evaluated, the most commonly evaluated strategies are exhibit labels (18%), public programs (11%), and marketing materials (8%). Similarly, a large portion of international institutions (67%) do not evaluate their multilingual offerings. Of the international institutions that do evaluate their multilingual strategies, most evaluate exhibit labels (27%), public programs (23%), and marketing materials (23%).

It is notable that budget does seem to affect whether or not institutions evaluate or research multilingual interpretation in their institutions, but budget is not a certain predictor of evaluation ability.
Development of Materials

When discussing the development of materials, about two thirds of U.S. institutions (67%), report that they develop multilingual information by translating materials from English (in a variety of ways). A smaller percentage of institutions (22%) reported developing materials in English and a second language concurrently.

U.S. institutions use a variety of methods and individuals to develop and/or translate multilingual materials. Often, U.S. institutions utilize multiple methods in their development process. The most commonly used strategies include in-house paid staff members; outside translation services or agencies; and public figures and groups, including community leaders, professors, and language or cultural groups.

*A table is presented here showing the development of multilingual materials by budget size for U.S. institutions.*

A larger percent of international institutions (90%) develop multilingual information by translating materials from a primary language than U.S. institutions. Additionally, a smaller percent of international institutions develop materials in two (or more) languages concurrently (14%).

International institutions also report using fewer types of individuals to develop and/or translate materials. The primary strategies identified by international respondents are use of outside translation services or agencies, or in-house paid staff.

*A table is presented here showing the development of multilingual materials by budget size for international institutions.*
Multilingual Exhibit Labels
Representation of Multiple Languages in Multilingual Exhibit Labels

Of respondents that offer multilingual labels, the majority indicate that the most common exhibit label format used provides complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels, in both U.S. (50%) and international institutions (77%).

**Figure 9a: Multilingual Exhibit Labels- U.S. Institutions, n=65**

- Complete text in all languages on identical labels: 33
- Primary language and shortened non-primary language on labels: 11
- Primary language on label, other languages in other format: 6
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets: 5
- Some or all text on computers or monitors: 3
- Other: 7

**Figure 9b: Multilingual Exhibit Labels-International Institutions, n=29**

- Complete text in all languages on identical labels: 22
- Primary language and shortened non-primary language on labels: 2
- Primary language on label, other languages in other format: 1
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets: 3
- Some or all text on computers or monitors: 1
- Other: 0
Formatting Multilingual Exhibit Labels

U.S. and international institutions more commonly use multiple exhibit label formats than one format for all exhibit labels (68% and 75%, respectively).

Figures 10a & b: Multiple Exhibit Label Formats, n=45 U.S. and 21 International

When analyzing in terms of budget, both U.S. and international institutions use multiple exhibit label formats regardless of budget size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10c: Exhibit Label Formats by Budget Size- U.S. Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One format for all exhibit labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple exhibit label formats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10d: Exhibit Label Formats by Budget Size- International Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One format for all exhibit labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple exhibit label formats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For respondents indicating use of multiple exhibit label formats, a variety of formats are used across budget size.

**Figure 11a: Multiple Exhibit Label Formats by Budget Size - U.S. Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format Description</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete text in all languages on identical mounts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language text and shortened non-primary text on mounted labels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all text on computer screens or monitors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio exhibit labels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all text in handouts or booklets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only one format</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11b: Multiple Exhibit Label Formats by Budget Size - International Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format Description</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete text in all languages on identical mounts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language text and shortened non-primary text on mounted labels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all text on computer screens or monitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio exhibit labels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all text in handouts or booklets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only one format</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Used on Exhibit Labels

The majority of all respondents (63% U.S., 79% International) use complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels. U.S. institutions report using texts in handouts or booklets (28%), as well as primary language text and shortened non-primary language text on mounted labels (27%). A higher percent of international institutions (29%) use computer screens and monitors than U.S. institutions (16%) in exhibit labeling.

Figure 12a: Information Used on Exhibit Labels,  \( n=110 \) U.S. and 47 International
Top Challenges in Developing and Translating Multilingual Labels

The most common challenge identified by respondents in developing and translating exhibit labels is finding and identifying sufficient monetary and staff resources for developing and implementing multilingual labels (70%). Creating effective and appropriate translations is the second biggest challenge for both U.S. and international respondents (33% and 54%, respectively). For U.S. respondents, making multilingual labels a priority, or establishing buy-in from the rest of the institution or department, is the third biggest challenge (25%), while ensuring effective label design is the third biggest challenge for international respondents (43%).

Figure 13a: Top Challenges in Developing and Translating Multilingual Labels, n= 109 U.S. and 50 International
Institutional Practices
Departments that Develop and Implement Multilingual Strategies

Education and exhibits departments play a pivotal role in the development and implementation of multilingual information in both U.S. and international institutions, with the education department (71%) being most generally used by U.S. institutions and the exhibits department (76%) being most often used by international institutions for multilingual information creation. However, both departments are highly involved in both U.S. and international institutions. Following in third for U.S. institutions is the public programs department (41%), while international institutions' third most involved department is the marketing department (65%).

Figure 14a: Departments Involved in Multilingual Interpretation
Budget Devotion to Multilingual Information

U.S. and international institutions generally spend less than 10% of their department’s budget on developing multilingual information for visitors. A larger portion of U.S. institutions (29%) do not devote any of their budget towards multilingual information than international institutions (7%). More international institutions (18%) set aside at least 10%-20% of their budget towards the development of multilingual information than U.S. institutions (3%).

Figures 15a & b: Percentage of Annual Budget Devoted to Multilingual Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 15c: Percent of Annual Budget Devoted to Multilingual Information by Budget Size- U.S. Respondents</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% - 30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 15d: Percent of Annual Budget Devoted to Multilingual Information by Budget Size- International Respondents</th>
<th>&lt;$1 million</th>
<th>$1-3 million</th>
<th>$3-5 million</th>
<th>&gt; $5 million</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% - 40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% - 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from Local Community Members

Half of international institutions surveyed obtain feedback from members of the community (50%), but less than half of U.S. institutions obtain feedback (42%).

Of these institutions that obtain feedback from members of their local communities, they obtain it in various ways:

- Surveys
- Focus groups
- Visitor feedback through cards or comments
- Advisory groups
- Members of the public
Institutional Strategic Planning

Developing bi- or multilingual interpretation is part of institutional thinking for the large majority of U.S. institutions (73%). A larger percentage of international institutions focus on having multilingual interpretation as part of their institutional thinking (93%), than U.S. institutions.
Hiring and Recruiting Multilingual Staff

Only one U.S. institution reported not employing multilingual staff. The most common way for U.S. institutions to hire and recruit multilingual resources is to hire permanent multilingual staff members (56%).

All international institutions report that they hire and recruit multilingual resources, mostly by hiring external translators (77%). They also hire multilingual staff (70%) and contract multilingual staff for specific projects (50%). A larger percent of international institutions (77%) report that they hire more external translators than U.S. institutions (40%).

Figure 16a: Hiring and Recruiting Multilingual Staff
Benefits to Offering Multilingual Information

Increasing accessibility for visitors is the most commonly reported benefit of providing multilingual labels for US institutions (60%). Outreach, by attracting a wider and more diverse section of visitors (39%), and targeting and reaching a specific audience (25%) are also important benefits for U.S. institutions.

Accessibility is also the most important benefit for international institutions (54%), but increasing market size (29%) is also important to international institutions. Government mandates or internal policies, and improving the institution’s community involvement are other benefits that U.S. and international institutions distinguish as most important.

Figure 17a: Benefits of Multilingual Interpretation
Challenges in Offering Multilingual Information

U.S. institutions indicated that cost and funding are the most challenging issue in offering multilingual information, although international institutions reported that staffing is the biggest challenge in multilingual information development. The second largest challenge for U.S. institutions is staffing, and translation is the second biggest challenge for international institutions. Other challenges for U.S. and international institutions include deciding which and how many languages to use and a perceived lack of an audience for multilingual information visiting their institution or in their community.

Figure 18a: Challenges in Offering Multilingual Interpretation
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APPENDIX A - Participating Institutions (U.S. & International)

A.C. Gilbert's Discovery Village
Adler Planetarium
Adventure Science Center
Anniston Museum of Natural History
Arizona Science Center
Austin Children's Museum
Bell Museum of Natural History
Bermuda Underwater Exploration Institute (BUEI)
Birch Aquarium at Scripps
Bishop Museum
Bloomfield Science Museum Jerusalem
BNL Science Learning Center
Boonshoft Museum of Discovery
Bruce Museum
California Academy of Sciences
California Science Center
Canadian Museum of Nature
Carnegie Science Center
Centro de Ciencias EXPLORA
Charlotte County Historical Center
Children's Discovery Museum of San Jose
Children's Museum of Houston
Clay Center for the Arts and Sciences of West Virginia
Coastal Discovery Museum
Connecticut Science Center
COSI
Da Vinci Discovery Center of Science and Technology
Dallas Museum of Nature & Science
Delaware Museum of Natural History
Denver Museum of Nature & Science
Discovery Place, Inc.
Discovery Science Center
Discovery World at Pier Wisconsin
EdVenture Children's Museum
Emerald Coast Science Center
Exhibit Museum of Natural History
Explora
EXPLORA, Centro de Ciencias y Arte
Exploratorium
Explorit Science Center
Fernbank Science Center
Four Corners School of Outdoor Education
Friends of the WNC Nature Center
Glasgow Science Centre
Guangdong Science Center
Gujarat Council of Science City
Gulf Coast Exploreum Science Center
Hands On! Regional Museum
Heureka, the Finnish Science Centre
Huntington Botanical Gardens
Impression 5 Science Center
Insights El Paso Science Museum
International Wildlife Museum
Kingman Museum
Kopernik Observatory & Science Education Center
Lakeview Museum of Arts and Sciences
Las Cruces Museum of Natural History
Lawrence Hall of Science
Liberty Science Center
Life Science Centre
Loggerhead Marinelife Center
Long Island Children's Museum
Louisiana Art and Science Museum
Louisville Science Center
Macao Science Center
Madison Children's Museum
Maryland Science Center
Mayborn Planetarium & Space Theater
McAuliffe-Shepard Discovery Center
McDonald Observatory Visitor's Center
Miami Science Museum
Montréal Science Centre
Morehead Planetarium and Science Center
Museo Tridentino di Scienze Naturali
Museum of Discovery & Science, Inc.
Museum of Life and Science
Museum of Nature & Science
Museum of Science & History of Jacksonville, Inc.
Museum of Science and Industry
Museum of the Earth at the Paleontological Research Institution
National Ag Science Center
National Center for Atmospheric Research/UCAR
National Science Museum Project of Yemen
National Watch & Clock Museum
New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science
New York Hall of Science
NOESIS - Thessaloniki Science Center & Technology Museum
North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences
North Museum of Natural History and Science
Omaha Children's Museum
Ontario Science Centre
Oregon Museum of Science and Industry
Orlando Science Center
Pacific Science Center
Petrosains, The Discovery Centre
Phaeno
Pusat Peragaan Iptek - Science & Technology Center of Indonesia
QUESTACON, The National Science and Technology Centre
Reuben H. Fleet Science Center
Rochester Museum & Science Center
Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History
Saskatchewan Science Centre, Inc.
Science Centre Singapore
Science Discovery Museum
Science East
Science Museum of Minnesota
Science Museum of Virginia
Science North
Science Projects
Science Spectrum
Science Timmins
Science World British Columbia
Sciencenter
Sci-Port: Louisiana's Science Center
SciWorks, The Science Center and Environmental Park of Forsyth County
Shanghai Science & Technology Museum
Sol del Niño, Science and Technology Center
South Florida Museum and Bishop Planetarium
Spartanburg Science Center
Staten Island Children's Museum
Technique
Technopolis, the Flemish Science Centre
Tekniska Museet
TELUS World of Science - Calgary
Thanksgiving Point Institute
The Children's Museum of Science and Technology
The Discovery Center for Science and Technology
The Discovery Science Place
The Field Museum of Natural History
The Florida Air Museum at Sun 'n Fun
The Franklin Institute
The Health Adventure, Inc.
The Health Museum
The National Geographic Museum at Explorers Hall
The Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo
The Rocky Mount Children's Museum & Science Center
The Science Center
The Works: Ohio Center for History, Art and Technology
University of Kansas Natural History Museum
Utah Museum of Natural History
Virginia Air & Space Center
Virginia Discovery Museum
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
APPENDIX B – Survey Instrument, U.S. Version
Multilingualism in U.S. Science Centers 2009

Considerable anecdotal data exist on how science centers and other institutions implement multilingual approaches, but very little data on the pervasiveness of these approaches, and even less on best practices. This survey was created by the Exploratorium and ASTC, in support of the ASTC Equity & Diversity initiative and in response to requests from the field, to collect empirical information on how and why science centers and other institutions create multilingual interpretive materials and experiences.

For the purposes of this survey, "interpretation" and "interpretive materials" refer to exhibit labels, informational signage, web sites, public programs and events, and other methods of presenting content or interacting with visitors and audiences.

Individual responses to this survey are confidential. A report summarizing general themes and trends will be made available to ASTC members via the ASTC web site. We thank you for taking the time to respond to these questions and for your contribution to the science center field.

This survey will be open October 12-23, 2009. If you have any questions before, during or after completing this survey, please contact Laura Huerta Miguéz at (202) 783-7200 ext. 139 or by email at lhuertamigu@astc.org.

**Which of the following best describes your institution?**

- Aquarium
- Arboretum/Botanic Garden
- Art Museum
- Children’s/Youth Museum
- General Museum
- Historic House/Site
- History Museum/Historical Society
- Natural History/Anthropology
- Nature Center
- Planetarium
- Science/Technology Center/Museum
- Specialized Museum
- Zoo

- Other (please specify) ________________________________

**Which of the following best describes the way your institution presents exhibits, programs, signs, or other information to your visitors and other audiences?**

- We provide visitor information in English only.
- We provide most visitor information in English, but some information in other languages.
- We provide most or all visitor information in more than one language.

- Other (please specify) ________________________________
### Multilingualism in U.S. Science Centers 2009

**In what languages does your institution provide exhibit labels, programs or events, informational signage, or other interpretive devices for visitors? (Please check all that apply.)**

- [ ] English
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] Chinese
- [ ] French
- [ ] German
- [ ] Italian
- [ ] Polish
- [ ] Tagalog
- [ ] Korean
- [ ] Vietnamese
- [ ] Braille
- [ ] ASL (American Sign Language)
- [ ] Other (please specify)

**If your institution provides ANY exhibit signage, public programs, or other visitor information in more than one language, what are your primary reasons for doing so? Please select your TOP THREE (3) ANSWERS.**

- [ ] Government or legal mandate to provide information in more than one language
- [ ] Institutional mandate to make most or all exhibits, programs, or events accessible to a range of audiences
- [ ] Creation of exhibits or programs for specific language or cultural groups
- [ ] Presentation of the heritage or culture of local or indigenous peoples
- [ ] Departments targeted Outreach to underserved audiences, not institution wide
- [ ] Other (please specify)

**What kind of bi- or multilingual information does your institution provide for visitors? (Please check all or multilingual that apply.)**

- [ ] Exhibit labels or signs
- [ ] Orientation/wayfinding signage
- [ ] Public programs or events
- [ ] Docents/volunteers
- [ ] Tours
- [ ] Website
- [ ] Marketing materials
- [ ] Other (please specify)
How long has your institution been providing bi- or multilingual interpretation?

- 0-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10 or more years

Does your institution formally evaluate or conduct research on ANY of the following bi- or multilingual information or interpretive devices? (Please check all that apply.)

- We do not evaluate or conduct research on bi- or multilingual visitor information.
- Exhibit labels or signs
- Orientation/wayfinding signage
- Public programs or events
- Docents/volunteers
- Tours
- Website
- Marketing materials
- Other (please specify)

If your institution offers ANY visitor information in more than one language, please describe how you develop and translate these materials.
If your institution offers bi- or multilingual exhibit labels, what is the primary or most common format in which those labels are presented? (Please check only one answer.)

- Complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels
- Primary language text and shortened non-primary language text on mounted labels
- Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)
- Some or all text on computer screens or monitors
- Audio exhibit labels
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets
- Other (please specify)

Regarding exhibit labels, does your institution use a single format for all exhibit labels or several formats that vary between labels?

- One format for all exhibit labels
- Multiple exhibit label formats

What format(s) does your institution use for exhibit labels? (Please check all that apply.)

- Complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels
- Primary language text and shortened non-primary language text on mounted labels
- Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)
- Some or all text on computer screens or monitors
- Audio exhibit labels
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets
- We use only one format for all exhibit labels.
- Other (please specify)

What are the three (3) biggest challenges your institution faces in developing and implementing bi- or multilingual exhibit labels?

1. 
2. 
3. 
Multilingualism in U.S. Science Centers 2009

Does your institution offer visitors opportunities to hear or interact with bi- or multilingual staff or other speakers? If so, what kinds of opportunities? (Please check all that apply.)

- [ ] Bi- or multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators
- [ ] Bi- or multilingual lectures or classes
- [ ] Bi- or multilingual ongoing or repeating programs
- [ ] Bi- or multilingual speakers or special events
- [ ] We do not offer bi- or multilingual programs, events, or speakers.
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Which departments at your institution are responsible for developing and implementing bi- or multilingual interpretation for visitors? (Please check all that apply.)

- [ ] Education
- [ ] Exhibits
- [ ] Public programs
- [ ] Marketing
- [ ] Outreach
- [ ] Other (please specify)

If your institution offers any visitor information in more than one language, do you obtain feedback from members of your local community as part of the development or evaluation process?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If you answered ‘Yes’ above, please describe how audience feedback is obtained.

Is developing bi- or multilingual interpretation part of your institutional thinking or strategic plan?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
If you answered 'Yes' above, please briefly describe why/how multilingual interpretation is part of your institutional thinking or strategic planning.

---

Which of the following recruiting, hiring, or staffing practices does your institution use? (Please check all that apply.)

- Hiring regular or permanent bi- or multilingual staff
- Contracting or employing bi- or multilingual staff for specific projects
- Using bi- or multilingual volunteers for specific projects or events
- Hiring external translators to translate text for exhibits or programs
- We do not employ or use bi- or multilingual staff or contractors for any purpose.
- Other (please specify)

---

Approximately what percentage of your department’s annual budget is devoted to the development of bi- or multilingual information for visitors? (Please make your best guess.)

- None
- Less than 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

What are the most important benefits overall to your institution of offering bi- or multilingual information for visitors?

---

What are your institution’s most important challenges overall in offering bi- or multilingual information for visitors?
Any additional comments or important questions about developing or implementing bi- or multilingual information for visitors you’d like to share?

We’d like to learn more about how institutions like yours may think about and use bi- and multilingual information for their audiences. May we contact you to discuss this further?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Thank you again for taking the time to respond to this survey. Your answers will only be used for research purposes, and responses will not be connected with identifying information. If you have questions about this survey, please contact Laura Huerta Migus, ASTC Director of Equity & Diversity at (202) 783-7200 ext. 139 or lhueriamigus@astc.org.
APPENDIX C – Survey Instrument, International Version
Multilingualism in Science Centers 2009 - Global

Considerable anecdotal data exist on how science centers and other institutions implement multilingual approaches, but very little data on the pervasiveness of these approaches, and even less on best practices. This survey was created by the Exploratorium and ASTC, in support of the ASTC Equity & Diversity Initiative and in response to requests from the field, to collect empirical information on how and why science centers and other institutions create multilingual interpretive materials and experiences.

For the purposes of this survey, "interpretation" and "interpretive materials" refer to exhibit labels, informational signage, web sites, public programs and events, and other methods of presenting content or interacting with visitors and audiences.

Individual responses to this survey are confidential. A report summarizing general themes and trends will be made available to ASTC members via the ASTC web site. We thank you for taking the time to respond to these questions and for your contribution to the science center field.

This survey will be open October 12 - 23, 2009. If you have any questions before, during or after completing this survey, please contact Laura Huerta Migus at (202) 783-7200 ext.139 or by email at lhuetamigus@astc.org.

*Which of the following best describes your institution?

- Aquarium
- Arboretum/Botanic Garden
- Art Museum
- Children's/Youth Museum
- General Museum
- Historic House/Site
- History Museum/Historical Society
- Other (please specify)

*Which of the following best describes the way your institution presents exhibits, programs, signs, or other information to your visitors and other audiences?

- We provide visitor information in one language only.
- We provide most visitor information in one primary language, but some information in other languages.
- We provide most or all visitor information in more than one language.

Other (please specify)

If you offer visitor information in more than one language, please list the PRIMARY language used in your institution.
**Multilingualism in Science Centers 2009 - Global**

*Please list the languages in which your institution provides exhibit labels, programs or events, informational signage, or other interpretive devices for visitors.*

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 

If your institution provides ANY exhibit signage, public programs, or other visitor information in more than one language, what are your primary reasons for doing so? Please select your TOP THREE (3) ANSWERS.

- [ ] Government or legal mandate to provide information in more than one language
- [ ] Institutional mandate to make most or all exhibits, programs, or events accessible to a range of audiences
- [ ] Creation of exhibits or programs for specific language or cultural groups
- [ ] Preservation of the heritage or culture of local or indigenous peoples
- [ ] Departments targeted Outreach to underserved audiences, not institution wide
- [ ] Other (please specify)

What kind of bi- or multilingual information does your institution provide for visitors? (Please check all that apply.)

- [ ] Exhibit labels or signs
- [ ] Orientation/wayfinding signage
- [ ] Public programs or events
- [ ] Docents/volunteers
- [ ] Tours
- [ ] Website
- [ ] Marketing materials
- [ ] Other (please specify)
How long has your institution been providing bi- or multilingual interpretation?

- 0-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-9 years
- 10 or more years

Does your institution formally evaluate or conduct research on ANY of the following bi- or multilingual information or interpretive devices? (Please check all that apply.)

- [ ] We do not evaluate or conduct research on bi- or multilingual visitor information.
- [ ] Exhibit labels or signs
- [ ] Orientation/wayfinding signage
- [ ] Public programs or events
- [ ] Docents/volunteers
- [ ] Tours
- [ ] Website
- [ ] Marketing materials
- [ ] Other (please specify)

If your institution offers ANY visitor information in more than one language, please describe how you develop and translate these materials.
If your institution offers bi- or multilingual exhibit labels, what is the primary or most common format in which those labels are presented? (Please check only one answer.)

- Complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels
- Primary language text and shortened non-primary language text on mounted labels
- Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)
- Some or all text on computer screens or monitors
- Audio exhibit labels
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets
- Other (please specify)

Regarding exhibit labels, does your institution use a single format for all exhibit labels or several formats that vary between labels?

- One format for all exhibit labels.
- Multiple exhibit label formats.

What format(s) does your institution use for exhibit labels? (Please check all that apply.)

- Complete text in all languages on identical mounted labels
- Primary language text and shortened non-primary language text on mounted labels
- Primary language text on mounted label, other languages in another format (laminated card, handout, etc.)
- Some or all text on computer screens or monitors
- Audio exhibit labels
- Some or all text in handouts or booklets
- We use only one format for all exhibit labels.
- Other (please specify)

What are the three (3) biggest challenges your institution faces in developing and implementing bi- or multilingual exhibit labels?

1. 
2. 
3. 

1. 
2. 
3. 
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Does your institution offer visitors opportunities to hear or interact with bi- or multilingual staff or other speakers? If so, what kinds of opportunities? (Please check all that apply.)

- Bi- or multilingual docents, volunteers, explainers, or demonstrators
- Bi- or multilingual lectures or classes
- Bi- or multilingual ongoing or repeating programs
- Bi- or multilingual speakers or special events
- We do not offer bi- or multilingual programs, events, or speakers.
- Other (please specify)

Which departments at your institution are responsible for developing and implementing bi- or multilingual interpretation for visitors? (Please check all that apply.)

- Education
- Exhibits
- Public programs
- Marketing
- Outreach
- Other (please specify)

If your institution offers any visitor information in more than one language, do you obtain feedback from members of your local community as part of the development or evaluation process?

- Yes
- No

If you answered 'Yes' above, please describe how this feedback is obtained.

Is developing bi- or multilingual interpretation part of your institutional thinking or strategic plan?

- Yes
- No
Multilingualism in Science Centers 2009 - Global

If you answered 'Yes' above, please briefly describe how/why multilingual interpretation is included in institutional thinking or strategic planning.

Which of the following recruiting, hiring, or staffing practices does your institution use? (Please check all that apply.)

- Hiring regular or permanent bi- or multilingual staff
- Contracting or employing bi- or multilingual staff for specific projects or events
- Using bi- or multilingual volunteers for specific projects or events
- Hiring external translators to translate text for exhibits or programs
- We do not employ or use bi- or multilingual staff or contractors for any purpose.
- Other (please specify)

Approximately what percentage of your department's annual budget is devoted to the development of bi- or multilingual information for visitors? (Please make your best guess.)

- None
- Less than 10%
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

What are the most important benefits overall to your institution of offering bi- or multilingual information for visitors?

What are your institution's most important challenges overall in offering bi- or multilingual information for visitors?
Are there any additional comments or important questions about developing or implementing bi- or multilingual information for visitors you’d like to share?

We'd like to learn more about how institutions like yours may think about and use bi- and multilingual information for their audiences. May we contact you to discuss this further?

- Yes
- No

Thank you again for taking the time to respond to this survey. Your answers will only be used for research purposes, and responses will not be connected with identifying information. If you have questions about this survey, please contact Laura Huerta Miguéz, ASTC Director of Equity & Diversity at (202) 783-7200 ext. 139 or lhuetamigu@astc.org.
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