

## preamble

### Browser Meta Info

*This question will not be displayed to the recipient.*

Browser: **Chrome**

Version: **71.0.3578.98**

Operating System: **Macintosh**

Screen Resolution: **1280x800**

Flash Version: **-1**

Java Support: **0**

User Agent: **Mozilla/5.0 (Macintosh; Intel Mac OS X 10\_14\_2) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/71.0.3578.98 Safari/537.36**

*On each survey screen, you will be shown a web page that will undergo automatic translation to another language (e.g., English to Spanish). We are evaluating two techniques in terms of their ability to generate translated pages that are similar in appearance to the original. For each web page, you will be shown portions of the original (reference) page and the corresponding parts of the two translated pages. You will be asked to rate the output of the two techniques for **attractiveness** and **legibility (readability)**, and compare the outputs to the reference in terms of their **appearance similarity**, which includes aspects such as **text size, spacing, and alignment**.*

Does the sample image shown below fit completely on your screen? (Please resize the browser window, if required.)




*Sample Image*

☐ Yes


☐ No

Before you proceed to the survey, please complete the captcha below.




hattrick


Q. For the below images, how would you rate the legibility and attractiveness of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their appearance similarity to the **Reference**?



Reference



Version 1


1 810 online, Woche 4 12/11/2018 02:33:16

[Ein Team erhalten](#)
[Über Hattrick](#)
[Hattrick International](#)
[Forum](#)
[Sprache auswählen](#)

Deutsch ▾


[Login](#)
[Hattrick Fußball-Manager | Komm in die kostenlose Fußballwelt](#)
[Allzeit-Statistiken](#)

## Version 2


	Which version is more <b>legible</b> ? <i>(Legible = are the letters clear? easy to read?)</i>	Which version is more <b>attractive</b> ? <i>(Attractive = looks visually appealing?)</i>	Which version is more <b>similar in appearance</b> to the Reference? <i>(Appearance similarity = similar text size, spacing, alignment?)</i>
Version 1 is much better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Both versions are the same	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 2 is much better than Version 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not able to decide	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)


Q. For the below images, how would you rate the legibility and attractiveness of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their appearance similarity to the **Reference**?



Reference



Version 1



Version 2

Which version is more legible?

(Legible = are the letters

Which version is more attractive?

(Attractive

Which version is more similar in appearance to the Reference?

(Appearance similarity = similar text

*clear?  
easy to  
read?)*      *= looks  
visually  
appealing?)*      *size,  
spacing,  
alignment?)*

**Version 1 is much better than Version 2**

☐☐☐

**Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2**

☐☐☐

**Both versions are the same**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is much better than Version 1**

☐☐☐


I am not able to decide

☐☐☐


Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)

**portland**

Q. For the below images, how would you rate the **legibility** and **attractiveness** of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their **appearance similarity** to the **Reference**?



**Reference**



**Version 1**



## Version 2

	Which version is more <b>legible</b> ? (Legible = are the letters clear? easy to read?)	Which version is more <b>attractive</b> ? (Attractive = looks visually appealing?)	Which version is more <b>similar in appearance</b> to the Reference? (Appearance similarity = similar text size, spacing, alignment?)
Version 1 is much better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Both versions are the same	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 2 is much better than Version 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not able to decide	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>


Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)

checkQ

QX. For this question, please don't rate anything... rather, **select "I am not able to decide" for all** legibility, attractiveness, and similarity in appearance.



Reference



Version 1



Version 2

Which  
version  
is more  
**legible?**

(Legible  
= are  
the

Which  
version is  
more  
**attractive?**

Which  
version is  
more  
**similar in  
appearance**  
to the  
Reference?

<i>letters clear? easy to read?)</i>	<i>(Attractive = looks visually appealing?)</i>	<i>(Appearance similarity = similar text size, spacing, alignment?)</i>
(Select "I am not able to decide")	(Select "I am not able to decide")	(Select "I am not able to decide")
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Version 1 is much better than Version 2**

**Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2**

**Both versions are the same**

**Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1**

**Version 2 is much better than Version 1**


**I am not able to decide**

Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)


**denham1**

Q. For the below images, how would you rate the **legibility** and **attractiveness** of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their **appearance similarity** to the **Reference**?





## Reference



## Version 1



## Version 2

	Which version is more <b>legible</b> ?  (Legible = are the letters clear? easy to read?)	Which version is more <b>attractive</b> ?  (Attractive = looks visually appealing?)	Which version is more <b>similar in appearance</b> to the Reference?  (Appearance similarity = similar text size, spacing, alignment?)
Version 1 is much better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Both versions are the same	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Version 2 is much better than Version 1**



I am not able to decide



Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)

denham2

Q. For the below images, how would you rate the **legibility** and **attractiveness** of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their **appearance similarity** to the **Reference**?

### Denham says thank you to his constituents

November 14, 2018

Following an in-person meeting with Representative-elect Josh Harder, U.S. Representative Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) issued the following statement thanking his constituents for his time in office: "It has been an absolute honor to serve our community a...

[READ MORE](#)

### Denham statement on California wildfires

November 13, 2018

Today, U.S. Representative Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) released the following statement on the devastation and loss of life caused by the ongoing California wildfires: "My prayers are with all those affected today by the ongoing wildfires in California, ...

[READ MORE](#)

### Denham continues fight for water storage funding

November 09, 2018

Today, U.S. Representative Jeff Denham continued his push to bring more water storage to the Central Valley, sending a letter to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting funding for major California water projects including Temperance Flat, Los Vaqu...

[READ MORE](#)

## Reference

Denham dice gracias a sus  
constituyentes

14 de noviembre 2018

Después de una reunión en persona con el Representante electo Josh Harder, representante estadounidense Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) emitió la siguiente declaración agradeciendo a sus constituyentes por su tiempo en el cargo: “Ha sido un honor absoluto para servir a nuestra comunidad un ...

LEE MAS

Denham declaración sobre  
incendios forestales de  
California

13 de noviembre 2018

Hoy en día, representante de los EEUU Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) dio a conocer la siguiente declaración sobre la devastación y pérdida de vidas causada por los incendios forestales en curso de California: “Mis oraciones están con todos los afectados por los incendios forestales hoy en curso en California, ...

LEE MAS

Denham continúa lucha por  
la financiación de  
almacenamiento de agua

09 de noviembre de, 2018

Hoy en día, representante de los EEUU Jeff Denham continuó su esfuerzo para traer más capacidad de almacenamiento de agua para el Valle Central, el envío de una carta a la oficina de la recuperación de Estados Unidos solicitando financiación para grandes proyectos de agua de California, incluyendo la templanza plana, Los Vaqu ...

LEE MAS

Version 1

Denham dice gracias a sus  
constituyentes

14 de noviembre 2018

Después de una reunión en persona con el Representante electo Josh Harder, representante estadounidense Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) emitió la siguiente declaración agradeciendo a sus constituyentes por su tiempo en el cargo: “Ha sido un honor absoluto para servir a nuestra comunidad un ...

LEE MAS

Denham declaración sobre  
incendios forestales de  
California

13 de noviembre 2018

Hoy en día, representante de los EEUU Jeff Denham (R-Turlock) dio a conocer la siguiente declaración sobre la devastación y pérdida de vidas causada por los incendios forestales en curso de California: “Mis oraciones están con todos los afectados por los incendios forestales hoy en curso en California, ...

LEE MAS

Denham continúa lucha por  
la financiación de  
almacenamiento de agua

09 de noviembre de, 2018

Hoy en día, representante de los EEUU Jeff Denham continuó su esfuerzo para traer más capacidad de almacenamiento de agua para el Valle Central, el envío de una carta a la oficina de la recuperación de Estados Unidos solicitando financiación para grandes proyectos de agua de California, incluyendo la templanza plana, Los Vaqu ...

LEE MAS

Version 2

Which  
version  
is more  
legible?

(Legible  
= are  
the  
letters  
clear?

Which  
version is  
more  
attractive?

(Attractive  
= looks

Which  
version is  
more  
similar in  
appearance  
to the  
Reference?

(Appearance  
similarity =  
similar text  
size,

*easy to  
read?)*      *visually  
appealing?)*      *spacing,  
alignment?)*

**Version 1 is much better than Version 2**

☐☐☐

**Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2**

☐☐☐

**Both versions are the same**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is much better than Version 1**

☐☐☐

**I am not able to decide**

☐☐☐

Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)

**hachiojima1**

Q. For the below images, how would you rate the **legibility** and **attractiveness** of **Version 1** and **Version 2**, and their **appearance similarity** to the **Reference**?



## Reference



Version 1



Version 2

Which version is more legible?

(Legible = are the letters clear? easy to read?)

Which version is more attractive?

(Attractive = looks visually appealing?)

Which version is more similar in appearance to the Reference?

(Appearance similarity = similar text size, spacing, alignment?)

Version 1 is much better than Version 2

☐☐☐

Version 1 is somewhat better than Version 2

☐☐☐

**Both versions are the same**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is somewhat better than Version 1**

☐☐☐

**Version 2 is much better than Version 1**

☐☐☐

I am not able to decide

☐☐☐

Q. Could you explain your answers? We would like to know the reasons for your choice of version for legibility, attractiveness, and appearance similarity. (Optional)

Powered by Qualtrics