

# Testing and adjusting translations of quasi-circumplex instruments

Andrew Mitchell<sup>a,\*</sup>, Francesco Aletta<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*University College London, Institute for Environmental Design and Engineering, Central House, 14 Upper Woburn Place, London, WC1H 0NN*

---

## Abstract

Circumplex models are a powerful tool in psychology, often used to visualize and interpret complex multivariate data. In order to enable its use across many contexts, cultures, and languages, its necessary to validate the structure of the circumplex items. The goal of validated translations is to ensure that the circumplex structure is maintained across translations, allowing for cross-cultural comparisons. The structure of the circumplex is key to determining where external variables are located. Given differing angles and communalities, the external variable can occupy different locations within the circumplex. Revealing and validating the true structure of a particular circumplex model. We therefore propose a four-step procedure which can confirm the quasi-circumplex structure of a circumplex instrument, derive angle corrections, and test the congruence between the theoretical circumplex and the translated instruments. We apply this procedure to the Soundscape Circumplex Model (SCM), a quasi-circumplex model which describes the perception of ambient sound environments. We test the circumplex structure of the SCM in 10 languages, and show that the circumplex structure is maintained across most languages. We then use the corrected angles to locate the circumplex scales within each language, and show that the circumplex scales are located in the same positions across all languages. This procedure can be used to test and adjust translations of quasi-circumplex instruments, allowing for direct comparison of data across languages.

---

## 1. Introduction

In this analysis, we aim to test the circumplex structure of various soundscape survey translations. The circumplex model is a powerful tool in psychology, often used to visualize and interpret complex multivariate data. In order to enable its use across many contexts, cultures, and languages, its necessary to validate the structure of the circumplex items. The goal of validated translations is to ensure that the circumplex structure is maintained across translations, allowing for cross-cultural comparisons.

Circumplex models have been used to describe a wide range of psychological phenomena, including personality traits (Wiggins, 1979), values (Schwartz, 1992), affects (Russell, 1980), and identity formation modes (Cieciuch and Topolewska, 2016). The circumplex model is a special case of a more general class of models, the circular models, where scales are arranged in a circular order. The circumplex model is a special case of the circular model where the scales are equally spaced and have equal communality.

The concept of the psychometric circumplex model, first introduced by Guttman in 1954, revolves around the idea of a circular relationship among variables. This means that the correlations between these variables follow a pattern that increases and decreases in a way that resembles a cosine wave, as explained by Grassi, Luccio, & di Blas in 2010 and Yik & Russell in 2004.

---

\*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `andrew.mitchell.18@ucl.ac.uk` (Andrew Mitchell), `f.aletta@ucl.ac.uk` (Francesco Aletta)

Guttman made a distinction between two types of models: the quasi-circumplex model and the circulant model. The quasi-circumplex model represents a loosely ordered circular arrangement of variables without any specific constraints on the distances between them. On the other hand, the circulant model, as proposed by Guttman, enforces an equal spacing constraint, meaning that the distances between the variables in the circular arrangement are kept equal. *[cite this]*

### 1.1. Defining the circumplex model

The concept of the psychometric circumplex model, first introduced by Guttman (1954), revolves around the idea of a circular relationship among variables. This circular relationship can be seen by identifying certain correlation patterns within the correlation matrix among variables, when appropriately ordered (Browne, 1992). In the case of the circular structure, the strength of the correlation coefficients in the matrix decreases as you move away from the diagonal, and then increases again as you move towards the opposite diagonal. This pattern of correlations can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Theoretical pattern of the correlation matrix corresponding to a circular structure.  $\rho_1 > \rho_2 > \rho_3 > \rho_4$  (Guttman and Pincus, 2000).

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8
V1	1							
V2	$\rho_1$	1						
V3	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1					
V4	$\rho_3$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1				
V5	$\rho_4$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1			
V6	$\rho_3$	$\rho_4$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1		
V7	$\rho_2$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_4$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1	
V8	$\rho_1$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_4$	$\rho_3$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_1$	1

This pattern of the correlation matrix indicates that the variables are ordered in a circular fashion, with the strongest correlations between adjacent variables, and the weakest correlations between variables that are furthest apart. It also means that the correlations between these variables follow a pattern that increases and decreases in a way that resembles a cosine wave, as explained by Yik and Russell (2004) and Grassi et al. (2010).

Circumplex models have emerged as valuable tools in the field of psychology, providing a graphical representation of psychological spaces in a circular or circular-like format. The central premise of a circumplex involves the systematic arrangement of variables around the circumference of a circle, offering a comprehensive illustration of relationships between different dimensions.

The variables in a circumplex typically represent some form of psychological construct, such as personality traits, values, or affects. These variables are measured using a set of scales in a questionnaire survey, with respondents responding along a Likert scale or some other form of rating scale. Often these scales are in fact combinations of multiple questions, or items, which are combined into a single scale.

Browne further expanded on the circumplex model in 1992 and 1995 by differentiating between equal spacing and equal communality (or radii) constraints. Browne described four variations of circumplex models, which include three types of quasi-circumplex models and one circulant model. These variations include the unconstrained or loosely ordered quasi-circumplex, the equal spacing quasi-circumplex, the equal communality quasi-circumplex, and the circulant model that maintains both equal spacing and equal communality.

The key characteristic of a circumplex is the even spacing of variables around the circle, creating a structured and organized representation. The circular arrangement is intended to capture the nuanced interconnections between variables and provide a visual framework for understanding their relationships.

In certain instances, the rigidity of a circumplex may be relaxed, leading to the concept of a quasi-circumplex. The term “quasi” implies a departure from strict adherence to even spacing and equal communality, allowing for some flexibility in the arrangement of variables. This flexibility is often necessary in order to accommodate the complexity of psychological constructs, which may not always fit neatly into a rigid circular structure. It refers to any graphical or conceptual representation where variables or dimensions are organized in a circular or circular-like manner. This umbrella term recognizes the spectrum of circular models, acknowledging variations in the spacing, organization, and relationships among variables.

As researchers delve into the intricacies of psychological spaces, the choice between a strict circumplex, a quasi-circumplex, or a more general circular structure becomes crucial. These models play a pivotal role in visualizing and understanding the complex interplay of variables, offering researchers nuanced frameworks to explore and interpret their data.

Individual differences are conceptualized in models usually composed of a set of variables. Taking into account the relations between the variables, two kinds of models can be distinguished. In the first type, relations between variables are not strictly determined, while in the second type the relations between variables are precisely described based on theoretical reasoning. In the first type of models the necessary requirement is the differentiability between variables. As an example, take the Dark Triad (?). Narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism are expected to be related to each other (because they describe a common phenomenon), but not too much (because they focus on various aspects of the described phenomenon). Such models are usually tested through the means of factor analysis. In the second type of models, two requirements matter. In addition to the differentiability between variables, precisely determined relations between variables are expected. There are several subtypes of such models. In some of them the variables are claimed to be orthogonal, thus the correlations between variables are expected to be zero. This is, for example, the case for the Big Five (?). A special case of models within this type are the circular and circumplex models. In such models, there are several expectations regarding the relations between variables. Some variables are expected to be orthogonal (not correlated), some variables are expected to be negatively correlated and some variables are expected to be more correlated than others.

The circumplex model can be defined through the terms of: 1) the possibility to locate variables differentiated in the model in the two-dimensional space with 2) equal spacing (i.e. same distance between variables within the model around circumplex) and 3) equal communality (i.e. same distance between variables from the middle of the circle) (Gurtman, 1994, ?). On the basis of these criteria, one could differentiate four models, depicted on Fig. 1: a circular one (less restrictive Model 1), quasi-circumplex (Model 2 and 3), and circumplex (most restrictive Model 4).

In Model 1 all variables have assigned a circular order, but they are not equally spaced or have equal communality. Such models are called circular.

In a circular factor model, there are two primary components which determine how strictly defined the model is: spacing (angular distance) and communality (common score variance) [8]. **CircE** and **CIRCUM** (a DOS program developed by Browne [6]) allows unconstrained as well as equally spaced estimations of the variables’ spatial positions around 360. Levels of circumplexity (unconstrained; variable angles but fixed distance; completely constrained) For each of the datasets, three model types are considered: 1. ‘Unconstrained’ where both the spacing and communalities are allowed to vary. 2. ‘Equal communalities’ where the angles between factors are allowed to vary, but each factor’s distance from the origin is constrained. 3. ‘Rigid circumplex’ where both spacing and communalities are constrained to form an ‘ideal’ circumplex structure.

This circular arrangement of the variables can be tested using a method proposed by Rounds et al. (2000).

Two models fulfill one of the requirements mentioned above but not another, that is: variables

in Model 2 are located with equal spacing but unequal communalities, while variables in Model 3 are located with unequal spacing but equal communalities. These models are referred to as quasi-circumplex. Finally, there is Model 4, where both spacing and communalities are equal. This model is referred to as circumplex.

### *1.2. Locating external variables within circumplex models*

Circumplex models allow for the testing of complex hypotheses not only about relations between circumplex variables but also about relations with external variables. Therefore, the analyses include two parts. The first one is testing the internal structure of the model in order to confirm its circumplex nature. The second one is the analysis of relations between external variables with variables differentiated in the circumplex or, in other words, **these variables could be located within the space defined by the circumplex**. This part is especially interesting because locating variables allows hypotheses to be formulated regarding all circumplex variables simultaneously. For example, some of the relations between a particular variable and all variables from a circumplex model would be expected to be strong, some weak, some negative, and some positive. The circumplex model precisely predicts all of them.

Circumplex models usually describe a given area of psychological functioning in a comprehensive way. For example, the assumption of the interpersonal circumplex (?) is that it describes the whole range of interpersonal behaviours. The same concerns other circumplex and circular models like values (?), affects (Russell, 1980) or identity formation modes (?), to mention just a few. Thus, locating an external variable within the space of a circumplex enables interpretation of this variable in the context of the comprehensive description of a given psychological area of interest. A special case within circumplex models that enables such an interpretation, albeit exceptionally far reaching, is the Circumplex of Personality Metatraits (??).

The structure of the circumplex is key to determining where external variables are located. Given differing angles and communalities, the external variable can occupy different locations within the circumplex. Revealing and validating the true structure of a particular circumplex model is therefore key to reliably identifying correct location of external variables within the circumplex space.

### *1.3. Translating circumplex instruments*

Typically, circumplex scales are measured via a series of questions in a survey instrument. These instruments are initially developed in one language and the validity and structure of the instrument is tested in that language. Often these instruments are directly translated into other languages to enable their use in other countries. However, the validity of the instrument in the new language is not guaranteed. Changes in the correlation structure can be caused by errors in the translation process, by semantic and linguistic differences between the translated scales even given a valid translation, and by a lack of generalisability of the circumplex instrument.

It is easy to see how errors in the translation process can lead to changes in the correlation structure. For example, if a question is mistranslated, then the responses to that question will not be correlated with the responses to the other questions in the instrument. Semantic and linguistic differences between the translated scales can also lead to changes in the correlation structure. For example, if a question is translated into a language where the concept does not exist or cannot be easily expressed, then the responses to that question will not be correlated with the responses to the other questions in the instrument. Finally, it may be that even if the original instrument is valid for e.g. the English-speaking population, it may not be valid for other populations due to cultural differences.

#### *1.3.1. Goals of translating a circumplex instrument*

Two approaches could be taken when attempting to translate a survey instrument. The first approach would attempt to achieve direct concurrence with the original instrument, where each scale is directly correlated with the corresponding scale from the original instrument. If the circumplex structure is identical

between the two languages, then this approach would allow for the most direct comparison between the two languages. However, if the circumplex structure is not identical between the two languages, then this approach would lead to a loss of information. The second approach would attempt to achieve the same circumplex structure in the new language as in the original language. This approach would allow for the most direct comparison between the two languages.

In this second approach, identifying the differences in structure between translations enable the process of locating an external variable to be corrected for the differences in structure. Given that at minimum a quasi-circumplex structure can be confirmed, then the deviations in either the angles or communalities from the ideal circumplex structure can be measured and accounted for. When this is done separately for the original and translated instruments, then an external variable which has the same theoretical location in both instruments should be located in the same location in both corrected instruments.

This has an important impact on comparing results under the two translations. If an external variable is theoretically located in a single, fixed position in the circumplex space, locating it without accounting for the differences in structure between the two translations will lead to different locations in the two translations. The interpretation of this result would then be that the external variable is located in different positions in the two languages. However, if the differences in structure are accounted for, then the external variable should be located in the same position in both translations. By applying the correction we can attempt to discover differences in the effect of external variables, independent of the differences in structure between the two translations.

#### 1.4. A test case: The Soundscape Circumplex Model (SCM)

In 2010, [Axelsson et al. \(2010\)](#) proposed a *principle components* model of soundscape perception. Due to its similarity to the widely-studied Russell’s circumplex model of affect ([Russell, 1980](#)), Axelsson’s principal component model is often referred to as the Soundscape Circumplex Model (SCM) in soundscape literature. The SCM and the Swedish Soundscape Quality Protocol (SSQP) ([Axelsson et al., 2012](#)) utilizing it quickly became the predominant method of soundscape assessment in both scientific literature and professional practice ([Aletta and Torresin, 2023](#)), due to its ease of use, interpretability, and, crucially, its ability to summarise the complex interrelationships between soundscape descriptors within a straightforward and familiar two-dimensional space. Together with a similar principal component model in [Cain et al. \(2013\)](#), the framework of the circumplex model of soundscape perception was subsequently adapted into an integral part of the standardised protocols for soundscape data collection, specifically in Method A of [ISO/TS 12913-2:2018 \(2018\)](#).

Currently, the soundscape community relies very heavily on the framework proposed in [ISO/TS 12913-2:2018 \(2018\)](#), both for theory development and for procuring empirical evidence of the benefits of the soundscape approach, in real life scenarios. In a recent systematic literature review, [Aletta and Torresin \(2023\)](#) identified 254 scientific publications which have referred to ISO 12913 since its publication in 2018, with 50 of them appropriately making use of the data collection methods. Of those, several papers included multiple studies, with 51 studies making use of the SCM as recommended in the ISO standard. In addition, the SCM has been used in many more studies without reference to the ISO standard ([Engel et al., 2018](#)), and has been haphazardly translated into many languages ([Tarlao et al., 2016](#); [Nagahata, 2019](#); [Tarlao et al., 2020](#); [Aletta et al., 2019](#)).

The Soundscape Circumplex Model (SCM) was developed in 2010 by [Axelsson et al. \(2010\)](#) to describe the perception of ambient sound environments. It has since been used in a number of studies to describe the perception of soundscapes in different contexts and cultures ([ISO/TS 12913-2:2018, 2018](#)). The SCM is composed of eight scales, which closely resemble the eight scales of the Circumplex Model of Affect ([Russell, 1980](#)). The 7 scales are arranged in two bipolar dimensions, with pleasant-annoying along the x-axis (valence) and eventful-uneventful along the y-axis (arousal). Arranged in a circular pattern around the circumplex, beginning at 0 degrees and moving counter-clockwise, the eight scales are: pleasant (0)

### 1.5. Locating one circumplex within another

Once the general circumplex structure is tested, it is possible to investigate the likelihood to locate an external variable (e.g., psychoacoustic loudness,  $N$ ) within the empirical circumplex. The circumplex model provides a precise framework for predicting the relationships between an external variable and all circumplex variables. The Structural Summary Method (SSM) yields several key estimations, including: Model fit ( $R^2$ ), which assesses how well the observed sinusoidal curve aligns with the cosine function, indicating the goodness of fit. Elevation, representing the average correlation between an external variable and all circumplex variables. Amplitude (vector length), measuring the distance from the mean of the external variable's correlation to its peak correlation with circumplex variables. This value signifies the uniqueness of the profile, indicating whether it is prominently associated with a specific circumplex variable or equally related to all. Angular displacement, denoting the angle at which the profile reaches its maximum point, indicating the empirical location of the variable within the circumplex as observed in the data. The Structural Summary Method (SSM) is a technique used to summarize correlation patterns among measurement scores that are hypothesized to conform to a circumplex structure (Rogoza, Ciecuch, & Strus, 2021). SSM aims to fit a sinusoidal curve to data points ( $q_i$ ) based on their nominal angular positions ( $i$ ). This is achieved by optimizing the parameters for elevation ( $e$ ), amplitude ( $i$ ), and displacement ( $d$ ). Mathematically, these parameters are used to model the correlational information ( $q_i$ ) in equation 1:  $q_i = e + i \cos(i - d)$ . (1) It is essential to evaluate how well the sinusoidal curve aligns with the cosine function by examining its goodness of fit, as indicated by the  $R^2$  value. If  $R^2$  values fall below 0.70, it is advisable not to interpret the remaining coefficients and to discontinue the process of locating external variables. Conversely,  $R^2$  values exceeding 0.80 indicate a strong fit. Additionally, it's worth mentioning that amplitude estimates, reflecting the distinctiveness of the profile, and elevation estimates, indicating the presence of a general factor, are considered notable when they surpass 0.15.

## 2. A four step procedure for the analysis of circumplex models

In Rogoza et al. (2021), the authors propose a three-step procedure for assessing circumplex models. The steps in this procedure are: 1) “verify whether the analyzed model is circumplex or not” using Structural Equation Modelling based on Browne (1992)’s model; 2) “test the possibility to locate an external variable within empirical circumplex” using the Structural Summary Method (Gurtman, 1994); and 3) “assess the extent of which empirical locations are in congruence to the theoretical predictions within the circumplex structure” (Rogoza et al., 2021).

We expand upon the three-step procedure proposed by Rogoza et al. (2021) and adapt it to the specific case of testing multiple variations (i.e. translations) of the same circumplex instrument. The goals of this procedure are, for each translation, to verify the quasi-circumplex structure of the instrument, to derive angle corrections, and to test the congruence between the corrected circumplex and the theoretical circumplex structure. We do this by first adding an initial step to incorporate Rounds et al. (2000)’s test of the circular ordering of the scales to confirm that the order of the scales is maintained across translations. We then follow the same three steps as Rogoza et al. (2021), but we adapt the third step to test the congruence between the circumplex structure of the original instrument and the circumplex structure of the translated instruments and to allow for adjustments to be made by extracting adjusted angles from the SEM step.

### 2.1. Step 1: Confirm the circular ordering of the circumplex scales

In line with the procedure taken in Gurtman and Pincus (2000), we begin by confirming the circular ordering of the circumplex scales. This test, developed by Rounds et al. (2000), the test of the circular order model involves comparing the obtained order relations for a set of scales against their hypothesized order given a certain circular model. This test is applied in order to ensure that the process of translation has not altered the order of the scales and so the test is applied against the order of the scales in the original instrument. The test is applied to each translation separately, and the results are compiled into a single table.



The index used for this test is [Hubert and Arabie \(1987\)](#)’s correspondence index (CI). This offers a descriptive measure reflecting the degree to which the model’s ordered predictions align with a specific sample matrix. The metric is calculated as the proportion of predictions met minus the proportion violated, yielding a range from 1.0 (indicating complete prediction fulfillment) to -1.0 (indicating all predictions contradicted). In alignment with the methodology outlined by Tracey et al. ([Tracey, 1997](#)), we applied a randomization test to the hypothesized order relations ([Hubert and Arabie, 1987](#)), producing an exact probability, determining the likelihood of achieving the observed model fit in relation to all potential permutations of the matrix. The index thresholds for this test are: a p-value < 0.05 and a CI > 0.70.

## 2.2. Step 2: Confirm the quasi-circumplex structure of the circumplex scales

We confirm the structure of the circumplex instrument by applying [Browne \(1992\)](#)’s circular stochastic process model with a Fourier series correlation function. This model represents a non-standard Structural Equation Model (SEM) specifically tailored to testing circumplex structures which allows a researcher to examine the extent to which the underlying structure of a sample correlation matrix conforms to a circumplex pattern. The four model variations (unconstrained circular, equal spacing quasi-circumplex, equal-communality quasi-circumplex, and strict circumplex with equal spacing and communality) can each be investigated using this model. For the unconstrained and quasi-circumplex models, Brownen’s model allows for the estimation of the angles and communalities of the circumplex scales. From these results for the quasi-circumplex models, we can derive the corrected angles (or communalities) for each translation, which can be used in the next step of the analysis.

This model is implemented in the CircE package ([Grassi et al., 2010](#)) for R ([R Core Team, 2018](#)). The model is applied to each translation separately, testing each of the four model variations, and the results are compiled into a single table. CircE provides a suite of SEM fit indices, which are statistical measures used to evaluate the goodness of fit of the models. For this study, we use the following fit indices: Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), summarised with their respective thresholds in [Table 2](#).

Readers might note that these indices differ slightly from those used by Rogoza et al., most notably the exclusion of the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), a commonly used metric. RMSEA was excluded from the analysis on the basis of both Rogoza’s own critiques<sup>1</sup> and recent warnings from [West et al. \(2023\)](#).

Table 2: Fit indices and thresholds, including the reference from which the threshold is derived.

Fit Index	Threshold	Reference
Correspondence Index (CI)	p < 0.05, CI > 0.70	<a href="#">Gurtman and Pincus (2000)</a>
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.92	<a href="#">Moshona et al. (2023)</a>
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	0.90	<a href="#">Rogoza et al. (2021)</a>
Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR)	0.08	<a href="#">Moshona et al. (2023)</a> <a href="#">Tarlao et al. (2020)</a>

Once each of the model variations are assessed against the above fit indices, we can determine whether that model variation is a good fit for the data. If the strict circumplex model meets the fit thresholds across the translations tested, then the procedure can be continued and no adjustment will be needed. If, however, the structure of some or all of the translations are found to have a quasi-circumplex structure, then adjustments

<sup>1</sup>“it is worth noting that the RMSEA may not be best suited to evaluate circumplex models. It becomes biased in the case of high correlations between proximal variables, as found in circumplex models, and should be interpreted with caution.” ([Rogoza et al., 2021](#))

will need to be derived and applied to ensure cross-comparability between the translated instruments. If the model variation for the equal-communality model (where the angles are allowed to vary) is a good fit for the data, then we can use the derived angles from CircE as adjustments to the circumplex structure.

Importantly, this table also reports the derived angles for each scale for the unconstrained and Equal comm. models. These angles will be carried over and used in the next stage of the analysis, where we will validate the survey instrument by correlating the survey responses with the acoustic indices using the Structural Summary Method (SSM).

### 2.3. Step 3: Locate the full dataset circumplex scales within each language’s circumplex space

Once the general circumplex structure is tested, it is possible to investigate the likelihood to locate an external variable (this could be an objective feature such as sound level dB or it could be another perceptual or psychometric variable such as tranquility) within the empirical circumplex. The circumplex model provides a precise framework for predicting the relationships between an external variable and all circumplex variables. The Structural Summary Method (SSM) is a technique used to summarize correlation patterns among measurement scores that are hypothesized to conform to a circumplex structure (Rogoza et al., 2021). SSM aims to fit a sinusoidal curve to data points ( $q_i$ ) based on their nominal angular positions ( $\theta_i$ ). This is achieved by optimizing the parameters for elevation ( $e$ ), amplitude ( $i$ ), and displacement ( $d$ ). Mathematically, these parameters are used to model the correlational information ( $q_i$ ) in Equation 1:

$$q_i = e + \alpha \cos(\theta_i - d) \quad (1)$$

SSM analysis yields several key estimations, including:

- Model fit ( $R^2$ ), which assesses how well the observed sinusoidal curve aligns with the cosine function, indicating the goodness of fit.
- Elevation, representing the average correlation between an external variable and all circumplex variables.
- Amplitude (vector length), measuring the distance from the mean of the external variable’s correlation to its peak correlation with circumplex variables. This value signifies the uniqueness of the profile, indicating whether it is prominently associated with a specific circumplex variable or equally related to all.
- Angular displacement, denoting the angle at which the profile reaches its maximum point, indicating the empirical location of the variable within the circumplex as observed in the data.

It is essential to evaluate how well the sinusoidal curve aligns with the cosine function by examining its goodness of fit, as indicated by the  $R^2$  value. If  $R^2$  values fall below 0.70, it is advisable not to interpret the remaining coefficients and to discontinue the process of locating external variables. Conversely,  $R^2$  values exceeding 0.80 indicate a strong fit. Additionally, it’s worth mentioning that amplitude estimates, reflecting the distinctiveness of the profile, and elevation estimates, indicating the presence of a general factor, are considered notable when they surpass 0.15.

As described in Rogoza et al. (2021), Step Two involves testing whether external variables can be located within the circumplex. However, in the case of the soundscape circumplex and our SATP data, we don’t have an external variable with a defined theoretical location within the circumplex - for instance loudness does not have a defined location within the circumplex where it is expected to be located.

Because we have derived new angles in the SEM step, we use these ‘adjusted’ angles for calculating the SSM parameters.

In order to determine whether the language circumplexes can adequately allow an external variable to be located, we use the following criteria:

- $R^2 > 0.8$



- amplitude > .15

These indices are based on the criteria used by [Rogoza et al. \(2021\)](#), however we use an increased criterion of  $R^2 > 0.9$  since we have a prior expectation that the circumplex variables should fit very well within each translation’s circumplex.

#### 2.4. Step 4: Accurately locating circumplex items within each language

The final step of [Rogoza et al. \(2021\)](#)’s three step procedure is to test the congruence between the empirical locations and theoretical expectations within the circumplex structure. In the case of the soundscape circumplex and our SATP data, we don’t have an external variable with a defined theoretical location within the circumplex - for instance loudness does not have a defined location within the circumplex where it is expected to be located.

Taking inspiration from [Yik and Russell \(2004\)](#), we propose to use the circumplex structure of the soundscape survey itself as the theoretical expectation. [Yik and Russell \(2004\)](#) proposes that one circumplex can be located within another by calculating the SSM correlation between each of the scales of the reference circumplex and the test circumplex. In this way, each scale of the reference circumplex can be located within the test circumplex, and we can test whether these empirical locations meet our expectations.

The process to do this is as follows:

1. For both the reference and test circumplex, calculate the mean value of each scale for each recording.
2. Calculate the SSM correlation between each scale of the reference circumplex and the test circumplex, in our case using the corrected angles.
3. Test the congruence between the empirical locations and theoretical expectations using the Procrustes congruence test ([Rogoza et al., 2021](#)).

We will be using the full dataset as the reference set and the data from each translation as the test set. This effectively means that we are testing whether each translation is able to locate the circumplex structure of the soundscape survey, consistently across all languages.

This aligns with the overall goal of our process of allowing data (i.e. the circumplex coordinate) from different languages to be directly compared, by correcting for the differences in the circumplex structure between languages.

to minimize  $M^2 = \sum (data1 - data2)^2$ , or the sum of the squares of the pointwise differences between the two input datasets.

##### 2.4.1. Congruence

What [Rogoza et al. \(2021\)](#) (and Orthosim) refer to as Tucker’s Congruence Coefficient is also commonly referred to as the cosine similarity (see the [Tensorly documentation](#)). We therefore use the sklearn implementation of cosine similarity to calculate the congruence between the empirical locations and theoretical expectations. This produces a matrix of cosine similarity values, which we then use to calculate the mean congruence, to match the model congruence from [Rogoza et al. \(2021\)](#).

##### 2.4.2. Procrustes

However, it appears that, despite [Rogoza et al. \(2021\)](#)’s description, this method is not actually based on a Procrustes analysis. The equivalent distance metric from a Procrustes method would be the rotational-based Procrustes distance, i.e. the squared Frobenius norm of the difference between the two orthogonal matrices. See [Andreella et al. \(2023\)](#):

Instead, the second distance exploits the orthogonal matrix parameters solution of the Procrustes problem. The rotational-based distance computes the squared Frobenius distance between these estimated orthogonal matrices. As we will see, this metric measures the level of dissimilarity/similarity in orientation between matrices/subjects before functional alignment.

Based on the proof given in ?, given that the input matrices are scaled (i.e. `rotational(scale=True)`), then the Procrustes distance is a true distance measure which obeys  $0 < p(X, Y) < 1$  (Bakhtiar and Siswadi, 2015, 322). Therefore we can convert the Procrustes distance to a similarity measure by subtracting it from 1.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Step 1: Confirm the circular ordering of the circumplex scales

The results of the circular ordering test are shown in Table 3. The following translations were not confirmed to have a circular ordering of their scales which matches the theoretical order: ‘zsm’ and ‘vie’. They are therefore excluded from the following steps of the analysis.

Table 3: Results of the Circular Order analysis of the SATP dataset.

mat	pred	met	tie	CI	p	description
1	288	283	0	0.965	0.000	SATP
2	288	272	0	0.889	0.000	arb
3	288	262	0	0.819	0.000	cmn
4	288	284	0	0.972	0.000	deu
5	288	276	0	0.917	0.000	ell
6	288	286	0	0.986	0.000	eng
7	288	278	0	0.931	0.000	fra
8	288	268	0	0.861	0.000	hrv
9	288	255	0	0.771	0.000	ind
10	288	275	0	0.910	0.000	ita
11	288	264	0	0.833	0.000	jpn
12	288	262	0	0.819	0.000	kor
13	288	261	0	0.812	0.000	nld
14	288	254	0	0.764	0.000	por
15	288	283	0	0.965	0.000	spa
16	288	284	0	0.972	0.000	swe
17	288	261	0	0.812	0.000	tur
18	288	244	0	0.694	0.002	vie
19	288	241	0	0.674	0.002	zsm

#### 3.2. Step 2: Confirm the quasi-circumplex structure of the circumplex scales

The results of the SEM model fit for the equal-communality quasi-circumplex structures are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: SEM fit results

	Language	Model Type	n	m	CFI	GFI	SRMR	Score	passing
1	eng	Equal comm.	864	3	0.93	0.91	0.05	3	Pass
5	arb	Equal comm.	809	3	0.97	0.97	0.04	3	Pass
9	cmn	Equal comm.	1832	3	0.96	0.95	0.04	3	Pass
13	deu	Equal comm.	810	3	0.94	0.92	0.06	3	Pass
17	ell	Equal comm.	810	3	0.93	0.93	0.08	3	Pass
25	hrv	Equal comm.	864	3	0.95	0.93	0.06	3	Pass
29	ind	Equal comm.	891	3	0.93	0.92	0.08	3	Pass

Table 4: SEM fit results

	Language	Model Type	n	m	CFI	GFI	SRMR	Score	passing
33	ita	Equal comm.	810	3	0.94	0.93	0.07	3	Pass
41	kor	Equal comm.	810	3	0.95	0.94	0.08	3	Pass
45	nld	Equal comm.	864	3	0.97	0.94	0.06	3	Pass
53	spa	Equal comm.	1647	3	0.92	0.91	0.06	3	Pass
57	swe	Equal comm.	945	3	0.94	0.92	0.05	3	Pass
61	tur	Equal comm.	918	3	0.93	0.92	0.08	3	Pass
21	fra	Equal comm.	891	3	0.92	0.91	0.10	2	Fail
49	por	Equal comm.	1890	3	0.92	0.92	0.09	2	Fail
37	jpn	Equal comm.	917	3	0.89	0.90	0.09	1	Fail

Of the remaining 16 languages considered, all but 3 pass the fit indices thresholds. The three which do not achieve the required performance are ‘fra’, ‘por’, and ‘jpn’. These are excluded from the following steps of the analysis.

### 3.3. Step 3: Locate the full dataset circumplex scales within each language’s circumplex space

Figure 1 demonstrates the SSM process for locating each of the circumplex scales within the circumplex space of the ‘cmn’ translation. These profile plots show the correlation between the circumplex scales and the external variable (in this case, each of the general attributes) as a function of the angle of the circumplex scale. The SSM model fits a sinusoidal curve to the data points, and the parameters of this curve are used to determine the location of the circumplex scale within the circumplex space. These plots show clearly how adjusting the angles of the circumplex scales can improve the fit of the sinusoidal curve to the data points.




Figure 1: Profile plots for the Mandarin (cmn) translation

The model fit results for each translation are shown in Table 5. Since every translation is able to adequately locate the circumplex scales, we can proceed to the final step of the analysis.

Table 5: Fit results for locating the general circumplex within each language

	PAQ1	PAQ2	PAQ3	PAQ4	PAQ5	PAQ6	PAQ7	PAQ8
arb	0.998	0.999	0.995	0.995	0.998	0.999	0.997	0.995
cmn	0.997	0.996	0.988	0.993	0.999	0.999	0.989	0.992
deu	0.998	0.999	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.999	0.998

Table 5: Fit results for locating the general circumplex within each language

	PAQ1	PAQ2	PAQ3	PAQ4	PAQ5	PAQ6	PAQ7	PAQ8
ell	0.998	0.995	0.998	0.998	0.997	0.998	0.996	0.997
eng	0.997	0.998	0.999	0.996	0.997	0.999	0.998	0.994
hrv	0.997	0.997	0.994	0.995	0.997	0.998	0.995	0.991
ind	0.996	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.996	0.993	0.999	0.996
ita	0.892	0.996	0.998	0.986	0.980	0.991	0.996	0.977
kor	0.997	0.996	0.996	0.998	0.998	0.991	0.997	0.998
nld	0.993	0.999	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.996	0.999	0.999
spa	0.998	0.996	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.996	0.999	0.999
swe	0.994	0.998	0.997	0.997	0.996	0.997	0.997	0.996
tur	0.997	0.997	0.998	0.999	0.996	0.993	0.999	0.997

#### 3.4. Step 4: Accurately locating circumplex items within each language

Table 6 shows the results of the congruence test between the circumplex structure of the original instrument and the circumplex structure of the translated instruments. In addition to calculating these results with the adjusted angles to apply the Step 4 test, we also calculate the results using the unadjusted angles to demonstrate the impact of the adjustment.

Table 6: Correspondence between the general circumplex and the language-specific circumplex

	Language	Eq Ang Model	Corr Ang Model	Eq Ang Procrustes	Corr Ang Procrustes
0	arb	0.992	0.943	0.982	0.982
1	cmn	0.932	0.993	0.885	0.991
2	deu	0.985	0.957	0.973	0.983
3	ell	0.985	0.989	0.970	0.979
4	eng	0.988	0.977	0.983	0.983
5	hrv	0.990	0.969	0.982	0.985
6	ind	0.965	0.951	0.935	0.982
7	ita	0.984	0.952	0.974	0.975
8	kor	0.958	0.977	0.921	0.975
9	nld	0.978	0.972	0.939	0.978
10	spa	0.986	0.981	0.967	0.978
11	swe	0.986	0.973	0.972	0.976
12	tur	0.957	0.986	0.921	0.980

When the adjusted angles for each translation are applied, the resulting circumplex scale location achieve good congruence with their theoretical locations. It should be noted that this is not the case without using the adjusted angles: locating the scales with the cmn translation using the unadjusted angles results in a score of 0.885, below the fit threshold of 0.9, but this increases to 0.991 when using the adjusted angles (see Figure 6). All translations see some degree of improvement by using the adjusted angles.

Figure 2 gives an example of the impact of using the corrected angles for locating the circumplex scales.




Figure 2: Locating the language-specific circumplex for Mandarin, using equal angles and corrected angles

#### 4. Summary

#### 5. References

#### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their thanks to Karn Watcharasupat and Steffen Lepa for their helpful discussions which contributed to the development of this analysis. We would also like to thank the many international teams which collected data for the Soundscape Attributes Translation Project (SATP), and the many participants who contributed their time and effort to the project.

#### References

- Aletta, F., Guattari, C., Evangelisti, L., Asdrubali, F., Oberman, T., Kang, J., 2019. Exploring the compatibility of "Method A" and "Method B" data collection protocols reported in the ISO/TS 12913-2:2018 for urban soundscape via a soundwalk. *Applied Acoustics* doi:[10.1016/j.apacoust.2019.05.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2019.05.024).
- Aletta, F., Torresin, S., 2023. Adoption of iso/ts 12913-2:2018 protocols for data collection from individuals in soundscape studies: an overview of the literature. *Current Pollution Reports* doi:[10.1007/s40726-023-00283-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-023-00283-6).
- Andreella, A., De Santis, R., Vesely, A., Finos, L., 2023. Procrustes-based distances for exploring between-matrices similarity. *Statistical Methods and Applications* 32, 867–882. doi:[10.1007/s10260-023-00689-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10260-023-00689-y).
- Axelsson, Ö., Nilsson, M.E., Berglund, B., 2010. A principal components model of soundscape perception. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 128, 2836–2846. doi:[10.1121/1.3493436](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3493436).
- Axelsson, Ö., Nilsson, M.E., Berglund, B., 2012. The Swedish soundscape-quality protocol, *Acoustical Society of America (ASA)*. pp. 3476–3476. doi:[10.1121/1.4709112](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4709112).
- Bakhtiar, T., Siswadi, S., 2015. On the symmetrical property of procrustes measure of distance. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* 99. doi:[10.12732/ijpam.v99i3.7](https://doi.org/10.12732/ijpam.v99i3.7).
- Browne, M.W., 1992. Circumplex models for correlation matrices. *Psychometrika* 57, 469–497. doi:[10.1007/bf02294416](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02294416).
- Cain, R., Jennings, P., Poxon, J., 2013. The development and application of the emotional dimensions of a soundscape. *Applied Acoustics* 74, 232–239. doi:[10.1016/j.apacoust.2011.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2011.11.006).
- Cieciuch, J., Topolewska, E., 2016. Circumplex of identity formation modes: A proposal for the integration of identity constructs developed in the erikson–marcia tradition. *Self and Identity* 16, 37–61. doi:[10.1080/15298868.2016.1216008](https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2016.1216008).
- Engel, M.S., Fiebig, A., Pfaffenbach, C., Fels, J., 2018. A Review of Socio-acoustic Surveys for Soundscape Studies. *Current Pollution Reports* 4, 220–239. doi:[10.1007/s40726-018-0094-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-018-0094-8).

- Grassi, M., Luccio, R., Blas, L.D., 2010. CircE: An r implementation of browne's circular stochastic process model. *Behavior Research Methods* 42, 55–73. doi:[10.3758/brm.42.1.55](https://doi.org/10.3758/brm.42.1.55).
- Gurtman, M.B., 1994. Differentiating normal and abnormal personality. Springer Publishing Company, New York, NY, US. chapter The circumplex as a tool for studying normal and abnormal personality: A methodological primer. pp. 243–263.
- Gurtman, M.B., Pincus, A.L., 2000. Interpersonal adjective scales: Confirmation of circumplex structure from multiple perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26, 374–384. doi:[10.1177/0146167200265009](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200265009).
- Guttman, L., 1954. A new approach to factor analysis: the radex., Free Press, New York, NY, US, pp. 258–348.
- Hubert, L., Arabie, P., 1987. Evaluating order hypothesis within proximity matrices. *Psychological Bulletin* 102, 172–178. URL: <https://oce.ovid.com/article/00006823-198707000-00013/HTML>.
- ISO/TS 12913-2:2018, 2018. Acoustics – Soundscape – Part 2: Data collection and reporting requirements. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.
- Moshona, C.C., Lepa, S., Fiebig, A., 2023. Optimization strategies for the german version of the soundscape affective quality instrument. *Applied Acoustics* 207, 109338. doi:[10.1016/j.apacoust.2023.109338](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2023.109338).
- Nagahata, K., 2019. Examination of soundscape-quality protocols in Japanese, in: INTER-NOISE 2019 MADRID - 48th International Congress and Exhibition on Noise Control Engineering, Madrid.
- R Core Team, 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rogoza, R., Cieciuch, J., Strus, W., 2021. A three-step procedure for analysis of circumplex models: An example of narcissism located within the circumplex of personality metatraits. *Personality and Individual Differences* 169, 109775. doi:[10.1016/j.paid.2019.109775](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109775).
- Rounds, J., McKenna, M.C., Hubert, L., Day, S.X., 2000. Tinsley on holland: A misshapen argument. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 56, 205–215. doi:[10.1006/jvbe.1999.1738](https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1999.1738).
- Russell, J.A., 1980. A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 39, 1161. doi:[10.1037/h0077714](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0077714).
- Schwartz, S.H., 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries, Academic Press. volume 25 of *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, pp. 1–65. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0065260108602816>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6).
- Tarlao, C., Steele, D., Fernandez, P., Guastavino, C., 2016. Comparing soundscape evaluations in French and English across three studies in Montreal, in: Proceedings of the INTER-NOISE 2016 - 45th International Congress and Exposition on Noise Control Engineering: Towards a Quieter Future.
- Tarlao, C., Steffens, J., Guastavino, C., 2020. Investigating contextual influences on urban soundscape evaluations with structural equation modeling. *Building and Environment* 188. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036013232030857X>, doi:[10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107490](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107490).
- Tracey, T.J.G., 1997. Randall: A microsoft fortran program for a randomization test of hypothesized order relations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 57, 164–168. doi:[10.1177/0013164497057001012](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164497057001012).
- West, S.G., Wu, W., McNeish, D., Savord, A., 2023. Handbook of Structural Equation Modeling. second ed.. Guilford Publications, New York, NY. chapter Model Fit in Structural Equation Modeling. pp. 184–205.
- Wiggins, J.S., 1979. A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 37, 395–412.
- Yik, M.S.M., Russell, J.A., 2004. On the relationship between circumplexes: Affect and wiggins' ias. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 39, 203–230. doi:[10.1207/s15327906mbr3902\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_4).