



Associations between strategy use in general English communication and interpreting practice: A self-report study among interpreter trainees

Pedro Humánez-Berral

Universidad de Cantabria
Santander, Cantabria, Spain

pedro.humanez@unican.es 

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7186-5245> 

Antonio Hermán-Carvajal

Universidad de Córdoba
Córdoba, Andalucía, Spain

aherman@uco.es 

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0248-9228> 

Abstract: While both Interpreting Studies and Second Language Acquisition examine how communication problems are managed, little attention has been paid to the relationship between interpreter trainees' strategy use in general second-language communication and in interpreting practice. This study investigated patterns of self-reported strategy use in general English communication (GEC) and interpreting practice (IP) among 66 interpreter trainees enrolled in Spanish Translation and Interpreting programs. Two questionnaires, each containing 10 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, were administered to examine strategy use in both contexts. Descriptive statistics, correlation analyses and a general linear model were used to examine cross-context associations and the potential contribution of gender, educational context and prior interpreting coursework. The results revealed a strong positive association between overall self-reported strategy use in GEC and IP. Moreover, in the general linear model, GEC strategy use was the only significant predictor of self-reported IP strategy use. The overall model explained 41% of the variance in IP strategy use and 33% after adjustment, while gender, educational context and experience in interpreting courses exerted no significant effects. These results suggest that incorporating explicit strategy instruction into the language courses of Translation and Interpreting programs can help trainees develop strategic awareness that may support later interpreting practice, in line with the principles of Translation and Interpreting-Oriented Language Learning and Teaching.

Keywords: interpreting; communication strategies; interpreting strategies; general English communication; interpreting-oriented language learning and teaching.

I. Introduction

Linguistic competence is widely acknowledged as fundamental for the professional practice of translators and interpreters, and it is included as one of the (sub)competences within translation competence in models such as Kelly's (2005), the PACTE Group's (2018), and the European Master's in Translation's (European Commission, 2022). However, many questions and areas for further research remain at the intersection of Translation and Interpreting (TI) Studies and Second Language Acquisition, particularly because, as Schmidhofer (2022, p. 265) notes, "additional language learning in TI programmes is some kind of no-man's land between the two disciplines".

At this intersection between disciplines, known as Translation and Interpreting-oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT), most studies have focused specifically on translation practice rather than on interpreting (Schmidhofer, 2022). This mirrors the greater interest that has existed in the literature since the 1990s in translation pedagogy compared to interpreting pedagogy (Cerezo Herrero & Schmidhofer, 2021; Schmidhofer, 2022). Consequently, there is currently a significant research gap regarding Interpreting-oriented Language Learning and Teaching (ILLT).

This lesser attention to interpreting in the literature and in pedagogical approaches is also reflected in curricular design, particularly in language training within TI degrees in Spain. Notably, TI students seem to consider that greater importance should be given to the development of foreign language competence, with a particular emphasis on oral production, which is often inadequate or even absent from language courses (Schmidhofer et al., 2021). This shortcoming may negatively affect interpreting training and practice, since oral production is essential for interpreting performance and the development of the underlying communicative skills that interpreting requires.

A particularly relevant aspect in Second Language Acquisition is the learning and use of communication strategies (CSs). CSs are the tools that language learners employ to manage linguistic difficulties during general L2 communication (Fernández Dobao, 2002). As Bartłomiejczyk (2006) hinted, a parallel can be drawn between CSs and interpreting strategies (ISs), which are the deliberate thoughts and actions used by interpreters to prevent or overcome challenges in interpreting practice (Gile, 1995, 2009).

This parallel is supported by the findings reported in Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal's (2025) study, where interpreter trainees were found to report using strategies significantly more frequently in General English Communication (GEC) than in their Interpreting Practice (IP), even if they seem to prioritize and deprioritize roughly the same strategies for both GEC and IP.

Considering the results of that study, the question of whether there is a relationship between strategy use in the two contexts, and whether strategy use in GEC accounts for strategy use in IP, remained open. Likewise, the study did not examine whether this relationship might be moderated by gender, experience in interpreting courses, or the educational context in which interpreting is learned. These issues are addressed in the present study.

To this end, our study first provides the theoretical background, with a focus on CSs and ISs. It then presents the research questions and methodology, including the participants, instruments, and data analyses. The subsequent sections report the results, followed by a discussion of the findings and their pedagogical implications, and finally the conclusions.



2. Theoretical background

2.1 Communication strategies

Research has shown that the use of CSs is influenced by a wide range of factors. Some of them are learners' proficiency level in the target language (Jourdain, 2000; Poulishse, 1990), the influence of the LI (Tarone & Yule, 1989), personality and learning styles (Luján-Ortega & Clark-Carter, 2000), gender (Basterrechea et al., 2017; Jiménez Catalán, 2003), and task-related variables such as cognitive demands, time pressure, or the interlocutor's role (Poulishse, 1990).

Less proficient learners tend to resort to CSs more frequently because of their limited linguistic resources (Fernández Dobao, 2002; Poulishse, 1990). They often rely on avoidance, miming or LI-based strategies (e.g., calque, borrowing, foreignizing), whereas more advanced learners are more likely to use L2-based strategies (Jourdain, 2000).

As mentioned above, gender appears to play a role in the development of strategic competence. Basterrechea et al. (2017), who examined the self-reported use of CSs (the researchers analyzed the same strategies that we included in the present study) among CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) primary education pupils, found no statistically significant gender differences in the overall frequency of reported strategy use. However, when strategy patterns were considered, differences did emerge: female learners tended to refrain from responding when uncertain, whereas male students were more inclined to guess and showed to prioritize ambiguity. Girls also relied more on borrowing strategies, which provided reassurance that their intended meaning was conveyed unambiguously. In contrast, boys preferred to predict and demonstrated a greater willingness to take risks in communication. Although the participant profile (primary-level CLIL learners) in Basterrechea et al. (2017) differs from that of the present study (university students), similar patterns are reflected in Lai (2010), who investigated Chinese university students majoring in English. Lai (2010) reported that male and female students employed CSs with comparable frequency and types, though female students were found to use these CSs with greater efficiency.

As for task-related variables, Poulishse (1990), found that the type of communicative task often outweighs the role of proficiency, a finding later confirmed by Fernández Dobao (2002), who observed that, in more demanding tasks, advanced learners used avoidance and LI-based strategies as much as low-proficiency learners. This task effect is particularly relevant to interpreting practice, which can be regarded as a highly demanding communicative task that imposes additional challenges. These challenges require strategic responses, especially in the early stages of interpreter training, when trainees have not yet automatized interpreting-specific strategies.

Given their importance, CSs have been the focus of several taxonomies proposed over the past decades. Dörnyei and Scott (1997) noted that many widely used classifications share common strategies such as paraphrasing, avoidance, miming, appeals for assistance, and LI-based strategies like calque or foreignizing. A key distinction was introduced by Færch and Kasper (1984), who divided CSs into achievement strategies and reduction strategies. Achievement strategies allow learners to reach their communicative goal by mobilizing alternative resources, while reduction strategies involve abandoning or simplifying the intended message. Nakatani (2010) later described

achievement strategies as active efforts to repair and maintain interaction, in contrast to reduction strategies, which reflect more evasive behavior often observed among lower-proficiency learners.

Another influential taxonomy, and one particularly relevant for drawing parallels with ISs, is Dörnyei and Scott's (1997) framework. This taxonomy categorizes CSs into three groups: (1) direct strategies, (2) interactional strategies, and (3) indirect strategies. Direct strategies include resource deficit-related behaviors such as avoidance (message abandonment, message reduction, omission) and achievement moves like paraphrasing (circumlocution, approximation, use of all-purpose words), borrowing (word coinage), calque (literal translation), restructuring, foreignizing, code-switching and miming. They also include self-repair mechanisms (e.g., self-rephrasing, self-correction) and strategies to deal with others' performance problems (e.g., other-repair). Interactional strategies cover appeals for assistance, comprehension checks, accuracy checks, and clarification or confirmation requests, as well as responses such as guessing, interpretive summaries, or expressing non-understanding. Finally, indirect strategies help manage processing pressure, including the use of fillers, repetitions, or verbal strategy markers, and even feigning understanding.

Although these classifications were developed several decades ago, they remain an important theoretical and methodological basis for more recent work. For example, Martínez-Adrián et al. (2019) investigated the use of CSs among CLIL primary education pupils. Yet, when viewed from the perspective of TILLT, the arguably most comprehensive review to date (Schmidhofer, 2022) does not explicitly identify strategic training as a relevant concern among TILLT scholars. Although this review mentions reading strategies linked to "text competence" (Andreu et al., 2002; Civera García, 1996), these references appear to be much more closely associated with translation than with interpreting. To the best of our knowledge, there have been no advances or calls in TILLT for systematic training in strategies specifically oriented towards interpreting practice. This gap is noteworthy, since such training could prove highly beneficial given the partial overlap between CSs and ISs (Humánez-Berral & Hermán-Carvajal, 2025).

2.2 Interpreting strategies

In Interpreting Studies, considerable attention has been devoted to the challenges interpreters encounter and the strategies they develop to address them. A central contribution in this regard is Gile's (1995, 2009) Effort Models, which conceptualize interpreting as a cognitively demanding activity requiring the simultaneous management of several efforts: listening and analysis, production, memory, and coordination. These efforts compete for limited cognitive resources, and interpreters must therefore respond to difficulties that may compromise accuracy and fluency, such as fast speech, dense information, or poor sound quality.

To cope with such challenges, interpreters rely on strategies. Gile (1995, 2009) distinguishes between strategies, understood as planned actions aimed at achieving specific goals, and tactics, which are spontaneous actions adopted during performance. In this study, however, we follow Arumí Ribas (2012), X. Li (2015) and others in using the broader term "strategies" to encompass both. Strategies may be applied consciously, but repeated use can lead to automatization (X. Li, 2015; Zanetti, 1999). In this regard, authors such as Dong et al. (2019), Gile (2009), X. Li (2013) or



Y. Li & Yan (2025) emphasize the pedagogical value of making strategies explicit in interpreter training.

Beyond distinctions such as strategies versus tactics, recent work has sought to systematize the variety of ISs. Li (2015), drawing on earlier classifications by scholars such as Gile (2009), Kalina (1998), Riccardi (2005), Donato (2003), Pöchhacker (2004) or Al-Khanji et al. (2002), recategorizes strategies into four broad groups: knowledge-based, language-based, meaning-based, and delivery-based. These categories highlight how strategies address cognitive, linguistic and communicative constraints inherent to interpreting¹.

Early work on ISs concentrated mainly on simultaneous interpreting (Barik, 1971; Wilss, 1978), which continues to be a major focus of research (Al-Khanji et al., 2002; Bartłomiejczyk, 2006; Dayter, 2021; Wang, 2021). More recently, scholars have expanded their scope to include consecutive interpreting (Arumí Ribas, 2012), sight translation (Ma & Li, 2021) and public service interpreting (Vargas-Urpi, 2016; Vargas-Urpi & Arumí Ribas, 2014). Although research on sign-language interpreting has also examined interpreting strategies (González Montesino, 2016), cognitive-load management (Wang, 2021) and strategic decision-making (Napier, 2002), the present review focuses on spoken-language interpreting because the empirical study concerns spoken General English Communication and spoken interpreting practice among Translation and Interpreting students.

Factors that seem to influence the use of ISs include experience and topic knowledge (Arumí Ribas, 2012), direction (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006), cognitive aspects such as memory (Riccardi, 2005), explicit strategic instruction (X. Li, 2013; Y. Li et al., 2025) or modality (Bartłomiejczyk, 2006; X. Li, 2013; Riccardi, 2005). It is important to recognize that the application of certain strategies may vary according to the interpreting modality. For example, note-taking is a particularly critical and relevant strategy in consecutive interpreting, whereas its significance may be reduced in other contexts, such as in simultaneous interpreting. Focusing specifically on the influence of linguistic knowledge in interpreting practice, Donato (2003) and Bartłomiejczyk (2006) affirm that strategy use is closely linked to the language pair and the direction of the interpreting task. In general, interpreting into the B language presents a cognitive disadvantage (Wu & Liao, 2018). However, these authors argue that strategic use and awareness of norms allow interpreters to be resourceful and efficient in achieving communicative goals.

An especially relevant dimension of interpreting practice for achieving its inherent communicative goals is the use of a foreign language. Tiselius (2024) characterizes interpreter trainees as high achievers in language proficiency. Yet, as Gile (1987) pointed out, even highly proficient trainees can produce frequent linguistic errors in interpreting tasks, sometimes even in their L1. This has been attributed to the heavy cognitive load of interpreting, which interferes with linguistic performance. As Arumí Ribas (2012) notes, interpreter training programs must therefore equip students with a robust repertoire of strategies to manage these combined cognitive and linguistic demands.

Gile (1987) also observed that interpreter trainees may struggle more in their L2 during interpreting than in non-interpreting contexts, despite their overall proficiency. A parallel can be drawn with findings from general L2 communication: the studies by Poulishie (1990) and Fernández

¹ For a detailed list of specific strategies within each group, see Li (2015).

Dobao (2002) demonstrated that task demands often outweigh the effect of proficiency, leading even advanced learners to rely on CSs such as avoidance and transfer, much as interpreter trainees may resort to ISs such as omission or paraphrasing. More broadly, we argue that meaningful parallels can be established between CSs and ISs, particularly among the ISs that Li (2015) categorizes as knowledge-based, language-based or meaning-based. Table 1 presents the repertoire of equivalent CSs and ISs proposed by Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025).

Table 1: Interpreting strategies and definitions and potential equivalent CSs and definitions

ISs names	Definition	Potential equivalent CSs	Definition
Anticipation	The interpreter anticipates the occurrence of a specific source-text segment before it is spoken by the speaker.	Predicting	The L2 speaker anticipates upcoming language input based on contextual or linguistic cues.
Approximation, attenuation	The interpreter cannot find the perfect equivalent for a lexical element, and they provide a near equivalent, synonym, or a less precise version in the target discourse instead.	Paraphrasing	The L2 speaker reformulates an intended message using alternative expressions with equivalent meaning.
Direct inquiry	The interpreter seeks clarification from providers or users to determine the meaning of an unknown word.	Appeal for assistance	The L2 speaker asks another person for help in producing or understanding a linguistic form.
Evasion, neutralization	The interpreter avoids taking a definitive position when the source discourse lacks clarity, leaving the decision to the audience instead of misleading them.	Avoidance	The L2 speaker circumvents the need to use an unknown form by avoiding reference to the concept altogether.
Inferencing	The interpreter recovers lost or unclear information using the speech context and their general knowledge.	Guessing	The L2 speaker tries to guess what something means in English when they do not understand it.
Lexical and syntactic transfer	The interpreter relies on the source language as a basis for lexical or syntactic transfer, using target-language words that are etymologically, phonetically, or even superficially similar to those in the source language, sometimes based on tenuous similarities such as shared initial letters.	Borrowing	The L2 speaker uses a word or expression from their L1 when the equivalent L2 form is unknown.
		Foreignizing	The L2 speaker modifies an L1 word to conform to perceived L2 phonological or morphological patterns.
Non-verbal communication	The interpreter employs non-verbal communication cues, such as gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice, to	Miming	The L2 speaker uses physical gestures to convey intended meaning when lexical items are unavailable.

ISs names	Definition	Potential equivalent CSs	Definition
	supplement or clarify verbal information when it is unclear, incomplete, or unreliable.		
Omission, skipping, ellipsis, message abandonment	The interpreter pauses or remains silent, leaving some messages uninterpreted due to issues with comprehension, note-taking, or memory.	Avoidance	The L2 speaker circumvents the need to use an unknown form by avoiding reference to the concept altogether.
Parallel reformulation, substitution	The interpreter invents plausible elements or substitutes misunderstood ones with available information to avoid pauses or incomplete sentences due to comprehension, note-taking, or note-reading failures.	Guessing	The L2 speaker tries to guess what something means in English when they do not understand it.
Paraphrasing, explaining	The interpreter explains the intended meaning of a source term when the appropriate target equivalent is difficult to retrieve.	Paraphrasing	The L2 speaker reformulates an intended message using alternative expressions with equivalent meaning.
Transcodage, transcoding, calque	The interpreter uses a word-for-word translation when they are unable to grasp the overall meaning of the source text.	Calque	The L2 speaker translates an L1 expression into the L2 on a word-for-word basis.
Morphological creativity	Not documented as a strategy in Interpreting Studies	Morphological creativity	The L2 speaker creates novel word forms by applying known morphological rules to express a concept.

Source: Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025). Adapted from Poulisse (1990), Yule and Tarone (1990), Purdie and Oliver (1999), Bartłomiejczyk (2006), Li (2013), and Vargas Urpi (2016).

As shown in Table I, there seem to be clear parallels between several ISs and CSs, with many of them sharing similar functions despite being used in different communicative contexts. These parallels raised an important question: do interpreter trainees report using the same strategies in general L2 communication as they do in interpreting tasks?

A first attempt to address this issue was made by Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025), who compared reported strategy use in English for General Purposes (EGP) and English for Interpreting Purposes (EIP)² among interpreter trainees. Their study found broad similarities: paraphrasing, avoidance, appeal for assistance and guessing were the most frequent strategies in both contexts, whereas L1-based strategies (borrowing, calque, foreignizing) and morphological

² In the present study, *General English Communication* is treated as equivalent to *English for General Purposes*, and *English for Interpreting Practice* as equivalent to *English for Interpreting Purposes*.

creativity were the least frequent. At the same time, differences also emerged: miming was frequent in EGP but rare in EIP, while predicting was underused in EGP and moderately used in EIP. Although these findings provided valuable initial insights, Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025) did not examine whether the reported use of these strategies correlated across the two contexts, nor whether strategy use in GEC predicted strategy use in IP when demographic and educational variables were considered. Building on this, the present paper seeks to address this gap by investigating the potential relationship between strategy use in EGP and IP and to what extent the self-reported use of strategies in GEC accounts for the use of strategies in IP, along with additional variables.

3. The present study

Taking into account the considerations outlined above, there seems to be a lack of studies addressing the potential relation and interaction of strategies in GEC and IP. This study aims to contribute to this emerging line of research by exploring both types of strategies among interpreter trainees. The research questions guiding the present study are as follows:

Research question 1: What are the patterns of self-reported communication strategy use among interpreter trainees in GEC and IP?

Research question 2: To what extent is the self-reported use of strategies in GEC related to their use in IP?

Research question 3: To what extent does self-reported strategy use in GEC predict self-reported strategy use in IP when demographic and educational factors are included in the model?

To address these questions, the study adopts a quantitative methodological approach. This section provides a description of the participants, the instruments, and the analyses conducted.

3.1 Participants

Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. Before accessing the questionnaire, participants were presented with an informed consent form explaining the aims of the study, the type of data collected, the voluntary nature of participation and the anonymous treatment of responses. Only participants who provided informed consent could proceed to the questionnaire. No personal identifying data were collected and the dataset used for analysis did not contain information that would allow individual participants to be identified. Participation was not linked to course assessment and students were informed that non-participation would have no academic consequences. Where participants were recruited in teaching contexts involving the authors, the invitation to participate made clear that participation was optional and unrelated to course evaluation.

An initial pool of 78 interpreter trainees completed the questionnaire administered in this study. For the purposes of the present analysis, however, 8 Erasmus students whose LI was not Spanish were excluded, as well as 4 Spanish students from a different Spanish university, as they



represented a very small subgroup compared to the institutions that accounted for the majority of the sample. Consequently, the responses of 66 participants were retained for analysis. They were enrolled in TI programs at two Spanish universities: 32 at the Universidad de Granada and 34 at the Universidad de Córdoba. The participants' mean age was 21.91 years ($SD = 3.87$), ranging from 19 to 43. The sample consisted of 56 women and 10 men, a distribution that reflects the gender balance typically observed in TI programs and reported in previous research on TI students and professionals (e.g., Li, 2013; Vargas-Urpi, 2015).

All participants reported Spanish as their L1, although six also reported an additional L1 other than English, namely Catalan, Romanian, Ukrainian, and Arabic. All of them identified English as their L2, though their self-reported proficiency levels varied according to the CEFR, as 43 participants reported a C1 level, 19 a C2, and only 4 a B2.

The participants' experience in interpreting courses also differed: 38 had completed 6 ECTS credits in interpreting (approximately 60 hours of in-class learning and 90 hours of autonomous learning), 19 had completed 12 ECTS credits (120 in-class hours and 180 autonomous hours), one had completed 18 ECTS credits (180 in-class hours and 270 autonomous hours), and another had completed 24 ECTS credits (240 in-class hours and 360 autonomous hours). In addition, seven participants were enrolled in their first interpreting course, which was still ongoing at the time of data collection. By then, they had completed approximately 4 ECTS credits (about 40 in-class hours and 60 autonomous hours), but had not yet completed the course.

3.2 Instruments

The study was conducted through an online survey consisting of four parts: an informed consent form, a background information section, and two questionnaires on the self-reported use of strategies in GEC and IP. After providing informed consent, participants completed the background section, which collected demographic and academic information (see "Participants" section). The third and fourth parts of the survey consisted of self-reported strategy use questionnaires for GEC and IP, adapted from Martínez-Adrián et al. (2019) to each communicative context by Humánez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025). The adaptation process consisted of specifying the communicative context (GEC or IP) of each item, while retaining the same underlying strategy across the GEC and IP versions. This parallel formulation was intended to make the two contexts comparable without assuming that strategies operate identically in ordinary L2 interaction and interpreting tasks. The adapted items were reviewed by the authors for conceptual equivalence, clarity and relevance to the target population.

Each questionnaire included 10 items, each representing a different strategy, which participants rated on a 5-point Likert scale according to the extent to which they used them from 1 (never used) to 5 (used a lot). The items, listed in Appendix I (provided in the Appendix in both their original Spanish version and their English translation), covered guessing, miming, morphological creativity, predicting, paraphrasing, borrowing, calque, foreignizing, avoidance and appeal for assistance (see Table I for definitions). The third part of the survey focused on strategy use in GEC, while the fourth part referred to strategy use in IP. To ensure clarity, each section contained specific instructions and items were explicitly contextualized. For example, the item for guessing in the GEC



questionnaire was “If I don’t understand something during a conversation in English, I try to guess what it means,” whereas the equivalent item in the IP questionnaire was “If I don’t understand something in the English message I have to interpret, I try to guess what it means”³. Internal consistency was assessed using McDonald’s omega coefficient. The reliability of each individual scale was acceptable, with omega values of .68 for both the GEC and IP scales, while the omega coefficient for the overall scale was .79.

3.3 Data analyses

This study reports quantitative data analyzed through different statistical analyses conducted using Jamovi (The Jamovi Project, 2024). First, two additional variables were computed: one representing the mean of all strategies in GEC and the other representing the mean of all strategies in IP. In the tables presenting the results, these variables are referred to as *Overall* for each respective context. To address the first research question, descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation (SD) and 95% confidence interval (CI)⁴ were computed to explore patterns of self-reported strategy use in GEC and IP among interpreter trainees.

To address the second research question, Spearman’s correlation coefficients were computed for overall strategy use and all the individual strategies in GEC and IP contexts to assess whether interpreter trainees report consistent patterns of strategy use across the two settings. The strength of the correlations was interpreted following Cohen’s (1988) guidelines (≈ 0.10 = weak; ≈ 0.30 = moderate; ≈ 0.50 = strong).

The third research question was examined using a general linear model in which IP strategy use was the dependent variable to analyze whether GEC strategy use predicted IP strategy use after controlling for gender, university context and the number of interpreting ECTS credits completed. Prior to the interpretation of the model, the assumption checks were assessed. The homogeneity of residual variances, which tests whether the variability of the outcome is comparable across groups, was examined using Levene’s test. The results ($F = 1.823$; $df1 = 9$; $df2 = 56$; $p = 0.082$) indicated that the assumption of equal variances was met. The normality of residuals, which tests whether the differences between observed and predicted values are approximately normally distributed, was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. The results ($p = 0.843$) indicated that the residuals did not significantly depart from normality. Therefore, no violations of assumptions were detected, and the model could be applied appropriately, with its estimates interpreted with confidence. Standardized regression coefficients (β), which indicate the strength and direction of each predictor’s contribution, along with their significance levels (p) and the proportion of variance explained by the model (R^2 , adjusted R^2) were reported in the model. In addition, omnibus F-tests and partial eta squared (η^2p) values were examined to provide complementary information on the overall importance of each predictor for self-reported use of strategies in IP.

³ The items were presented to participants in Spanish. The English version provided here is the authors’ translation for inclusion in the present article.

⁴ A 95% confidence interval provides a range of values within which the true population mean is expected to fall with 95% probability, based on the sample data.

4. Results

This section presents the results for the analyses carried out to address the research questions. To address the first research question, we examined the descriptive patterns of self-reported strategy use in both GEC and IP. Table 2 reports descriptive statistics for the self-reported use of CSs in both GEC and IP contexts. For each strategy, the table reports the mean and SD which reflect the average level of strategy use and the variability across participants, respectively. In addition, 95% CIs are provided, which indicate the range of values within which the true population mean is expected to fall with 95% confidence. In both contexts, participants reported varying levels of strategy use, with some strategies being employed frequently (means above 4), while others were used only occasionally (means near or below 2). This variability was more pronounced in IP, where the spread of mean scores ranged from 1.67 to 4.46, compared to 2.24 to 4.49 in GEC. Additionally, mean scores were generally higher for GEC than for IP, indicating that interpreting trainees may employ such strategies in non-interpreting settings.

Interestingly, participants reported relying less on LI-based strategies (calque, borrowing, foreignizing) than on other types of strategies, particularly in the interpreting context, where mean scores were at or below 2. In contrast, intralingual strategies such as paraphrasing and guessing were more frequently reported, alongside the moderate to frequent use of reduction strategies like avoidance. This contrast seems to point to a preference among trainees for strategies that maintain the flow of communication in the target language, while LI-based solutions appear to be a last resort, especially in interpreting tasks. The SDs, which mostly cluster around 1, suggest moderate variability in the use of most strategies and thus a reasonable degree of consistency across participants. Lower SD values, found for paraphrasing in both GEC (0.68) and IP (0.83), indicate that participants were more uniform in their reliance on this strategy. In contrast, higher SDs approaching or exceeding 1.3, such as borrowing in GEC and miming or predicting in IP, point to greater individual differences, with some trainees reporting frequent use while others reported rarely using these strategies. These descriptive results provide a foundation for examining whether the use of strategies in one context is associated with their use in the other.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of GEC and IP strategies

Strategy	GEC				IP			
	Mean	95% CI		SD	Mean	95% CI		SD
		Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper	
Overall	3.248	3.109	3.388	0.567	2.953	2.812	3.094	0.573
Guessing	4.045	3.812	4.279	0.951	3.515	3.259	3.771	1.041
Miming	3.833	3.533	4.134	1.222	2.773	2.434	3.112	1.378
Morphological creativity	2.242	1.973	2.512	1.096	1.894	1.653	2.135	0.978
Predicting	2.864	2.550	3.177	1.275	3.182	2.845	3.518	1.369
Paraphrasing	4.485	4.316	4.653	0.684	4.455	4.251	4.658	0.826
Borrowing	2.591	2.271	2.911	1.300	1.667	1.418	1.916	1.012
Calque	2.606	2.308	2.904	1.213	2.409	2.133	2.685	1.122
Foreignizing	2.424	2.141	2.707	1.151	2.273	1.982	2.564	1.183
Avoidance	3.636	3.361	3.911	1.118	3.788	3.488	4.088	1.221
Appeal for assistance	3.758	3.521	3.994	0.961	3.576	3.223	3.929	1.436

Source: The Authors.



The second research question concerned whether the use of strategies in GEC was associated with their use in IP. To investigate this, we calculated correlations between each strategy across the two contexts. Table 3 reports Spearman's correlations between self-reported strategy use in GEC and IP. Overall strategy use showed a positive, strong association across contexts ($\rho = .59$, $p < .001$), indicating that students who reported greater frequency of strategy use in GEC also tended to do so when interpreting. In interpreting the results at the level of individual strategies, it is useful to consider Cohen's (1988) guidelines, according to which correlations of around .10 are weak, .30 moderate, and .50 strong. Against this benchmark, the correlations varied from moderate to strong, and all were statistically significant. This pattern indicates that the use of strategies in GEC was consistently associated with their use in IP. These findings suggest a systematic relationship between strategy use in the two contexts, providing the rationale for examining whether GEC strategy use also predicts IP strategy use.

Table 3: Spearman's correlation between GEC and IP strategies

Strategy	ρ	p
Overall	0.59	< .001
Guessing	0.29	0.020
Miming	0.41	< .001
Morphological creativity	0.63	< .001
Predicting	0.29	0.019
Paraphrasing	0.67	< .001
Borrowing	0.49	< .001
Calque	0.54	< .001
Foreignizing	0.75	< .001
Avoidance	0.43	< .001
Appeal for assistance	0.35	0.004

Source: The Authors.

The third research question examined whether strategy use in GEC could predict strategy use in IP after controlling for demographic and educational factors, namely university affiliation, gender, and the number of interpreting ECTS credits completed. To answer this, we conducted a general linear model, the results of which are reported in Tables 4 and 5. The assumptions of homogeneity of variances and normality of residuals were verified, and no violations were detected, supporting the use of the model for the present exploratory analysis. The assumption checks are described in more detail in the Data analyses section. The model summary indicated that the predictors together explained about 41% of the variance in IP strategy use ($R^2 = .41$, adjusted $R^2 = .33$). This means that nearly half of the differences observed among students in their self-reported use of strategies during interpreting practice can be understood in light of the predictors included in the model. Closer inspection of the coefficients showed that this explanatory power was driven almost entirely by GEC strategy use, whereas university, gender, and interpreting ECTS credits contributed very little to the prediction.

Table 4 details the individual predictors included in the general linear model conducted. The standardized regression coefficient for GEC ($\beta = 0.63$, $p < .001$) was strong and statistically significant, meaning that students who reported higher levels of strategy use in GEC also tended to report higher levels of strategy use in IP, and that this effect was substantial in size. By contrast, the

coefficients for university affiliation, gender, and the number of interpreting ECTS credits were small and non-significant, indicating that these factors did not play a meaningful role in predicting IP strategy use.

Table 4: Parameter Estimates from the General Linear Model

Predictor	b	SE	β	95% CI	p
CSs	0.64	0.11	0.63	[0.41, 0.87]	<.001
University	-0.16	0.27	-0.27	[-0.70, 0.39]	0.568
Gender	-0.15	0.17	-0.26	[-0.49, 0.20]	0.395
Interpreting ECTS completed	0.00	0.01	0.00	[-0.03, 0.03]	0.984

Source: The Authors.

The omnibus tests shown in Table 5 further confirm this pattern. CSs showed a highly significant effect ($F = 31.53$, $p < .001$) with a large effect size ($\eta^2p = .35$), whereas university, gender, and interpreting ECTS credits had non-significant effects (all $ps > .05$) and negligible effect sizes ($\eta^2p \leq .02$). The overall model was again significant ($F = 5.65$, $p < .001$), with an effect size ($\eta^2p = .41$) consistent with the variance explained reported above. Taken together, these results indicate that the explanatory power of the model came almost entirely from GEC strategy use, while demographic and educational factors added little to the prediction of IP strategy use.

Table 5: Omnibus ANOVA Tests from the General Linear Model

Predictor	F	p	η^2p
CSs	31.53	<.001	0.35
University	0.33	0.568	0.01
Gender	0.73	0.395	0.01
Interpreting ECTS completed	0.28	0.890	0.02
Model	5.65	<.001	0.41

Source: The Authors.

In sum, the results demonstrate clear parallels between strategy use in GEC and IP. While trainees reported some variation in the relative frequency of individual strategies across contexts, overall patterns were strongly aligned, with no strategy pair showing weak associations. Importantly, strategy use in GEC not only correlated with but also significantly predicted strategy use in IP, accounting for most of the variance explained by the models. By contrast, demographic and educational factors such as university affiliation, gender, and interpreting coursework had negligible effects. These findings underscore the significant predictive role of general CS use as a foundation for interpreting practice, suggesting that the strategic behaviors interpreter trainees develop in everyday language use transfer robustly into their interpreting performance.

5. Discussion and pedagogical implications

This study examined the relationship between the self-reported use of strategies in GEC and IP among interpreter trainees. It investigated whether trainees reported similar patterns of strategy use across the two contexts, whether strategy use in GEC and IP was statistically associated, and whether self-reported GEC strategy use predicted self-reported IP strategy use when gender,



university affiliation and interpreting coursework were included in the model. Given the cross-sectional and self-reported nature of the data, the findings are interpreted as evidence of association and statistical prediction, rather than as evidence of causal transfer or strategy development. The first research question aimed to investigate the patterns of strategy use in GEC and IP. The results revealed that interpreter trainees report using strategies more frequently in their communicative interactions in English than in their interpreting practice.

Interestingly, paraphrasing, guessing, avoidance and appeals for assistance emerged as the most frequently reported strategies in IP, each with mean scores above 3.5. These strategies are recommended with caution by consecutive interpreting instructors (Dong et al., 2019; Li & Yan, 2025). The fact that trainees reported frequent use of these strategies may suggest that their responses were influenced by an awareness of what should be used rather than by their actual practice. However, predicting, a strategy that is highly recommended by instructors (Dong et al., 2019; Li & Yan, 2025), was only reported at a moderate level. This discrepancy between instructors' recommendations regarding predicting and trainees' responses seems to indicate that the participants' responses may reflect the strategies they genuinely employ in IP rather than those perceived as desirable.

On the contrary, the relatively low reliance on LI-based strategies (i.e., calque, foreignizing and borrowing) in both GEC and IP contexts is consistent with the participants' generally high self-reported L2 English proficiency. Prior research has shown that more proficient L2 speakers tend to rely on their L2 to manage communication difficulties, thereby avoiding strategies that involve direct recourse to their LI (Jourdain, 2000). In this study, interpreter trainees reported using LI-based strategies even less frequently in IP than in GEC. This pattern is consistent with research on interpreting strategies, which highlights interpreters' tendency to suppress LI-based strategies. For example, Li (2013) found no evidence of LI-based strategies among the interpreting trainees examined. Although the mean scores for LI-based strategies in our data were not at the minimum (i.e., 1) in IP, they remained low, falling within the 1.5–2.5 range. A plausible explanation can be drawn from Arumí-Ribas and Vargas-Urpi (2017), who observed that professional interpreters may occasionally employ LI-based strategies, but typically in combination with other strategies such as paraphrasing. This may also apply to our participants, who could be reporting occasional use of LI-based strategies because they view them as part of a broader, combined approach to overcoming communicative challenges.

When situated within the wider CSs literature, the finding that participants reported less use of LI-based strategies in IP than in GEC may be somewhat unexpected. Prior studies have shown that task effects play a decisive role in strategy use, often outweighing proficiency, as both low- and high-proficiency L2 speakers have been found to rely on LI-based strategies when task demands increase (Fernández Dobao, 2002; Poulisse, 1990). Given that interpreting is considerably more demanding than general communication (Gile, 2009), it might be expected that interpreter trainees would resort more, not less, to LI-based strategies. One possible explanation for our finding is that trainees may be consciously avoiding such strategies, being aware that the use of the LI could undermine their professional image as interpreters (Gile, 2009; Li, 2013). Instead, they may be deliberately prioritizing alternative strategies, such as paraphrasing for production or guessing for comprehension, which are more consistent with professional norms in interpreting (Gile, 2009).



The second research question addressed the relation between self-reported strategy use in GEC and IP contexts. Our results revealed that there is a strong overall association between the use of strategies in both contexts. The correlation analysis for individual strategies also showed that all strategy pairs were positively and significantly associated, indicating that trainees who reported frequent use of a given strategy in GEC also tended to report frequent use of the corresponding strategy in IP. Li (2013) already provided evidence that strategy use was correlated to the explicit teaching of strategies by interpreting lecturers, while our findings show that self-reported ISs are correlated with the use of the same strategies in GEC. Taken together, both studies suggest the great influence that prior strategic habits and explicit instruction could have in shaping the way interpreter trainees develop an appropriate use of strategies in their IP.

The third research question investigated whether self-reported strategy use in GEC predicted self-reported strategy use in IP along with biographical and educational variables included in the model. The results of the general linear model showed that GEC strategy use was the only significant predictor. The model as a whole explained 41% of the variance in IP strategy use, or 33% after adjustment, and GEC strategy use showed a large partial effect. This resonates with the findings by Li & Yan (2025), who found that the effect of interpreting lecturers' recommendations for strategy use, though significant, had a limited effect on the development of strategies in consecutive interpreting over one year, while the strategies that trainees already used at the beginning of their interpreting learning process accounted for the vast majority of the variance in the development of strategies. Similarly, our results suggest that interpreter trainees' strategy use in interpreting seems to be closely related to the strategies they already use in general communication. The positive and significant correlations between GEC and IP strategy use in our study indicate that pre-existing habits of strategy use may strongly influence how trainees approach interpreting tasks, which aligns with Li and Yan's (2025) argument that prior strategic repertoire plays a decisive role in shaping interpreters' strategic development.

The general linear model also revealed that gender, university affiliation and the number of interpreting credits taken did not significantly account for the self-reported use of strategies in IP. Although gender has been examined in broader studies on strategy use and language learning (e.g., Basterrechea et al., 2017; Lai, 2010), findings have been mixed. While overall frequency of strategy use does not seem to differ significantly between male and female learners, some studies report gender-related preferences: females tend to rely more on borrowing and avoid responding when uncertain, whereas males are more likely to guess, predict, and take risks (Basterrechea et al., 2017); females have also been shown to use strategies with greater efficiency (Lai, 2010). However, such discrepancies do not appear to extend to the context of interpreter training. A plausible explanation is that interpreter trainees represent a relatively homogeneous group of advanced language learners and L2 speakers (Tiselius, 2024), within which the effect of gender on strategy use may be attenuated. Similarly, the absence of significant effects for university affiliation may be linked to the fact that both institutions are Spanish and likely share common structural features, such as curricular organization or similar professional orientations. While variation may exist in local factors, such as individual lecturers' approaches or the methodologies employed, these differences do not seem to have shaped trainees' overall strategic repertoires. The third factor examined was experience in interpreting courses, operationalized as the number of ECTS credits completed. Surprisingly, this



measure did not significantly predict self-reported strategy use in IP. Although we did not expect major changes, given that the maximum gap between students with the least and most experience in interpreting courses amounted to only one year of classes (i.e., one or two courses), we did anticipate some shifts in tendencies, in line with Li & Yan (2025), who examined trainees across an academic year, and Arumí Ribas (2012), who compared novice (undergraduate) and more advanced (postgraduate) trainees. Arumí Ribas (2012) found that novice students reported more problems and a higher overall use of strategies than advanced students, whereas advanced students drew on a wider repertoire of strategies and displayed greater awareness of the challenges involved. Interestingly, while advanced students perceived themselves as failing more often to resolve problems satisfactorily, their broader strategic repertoire allowed them to tackle a wider variety of problems.

In light of our findings, it appears that the number of credits taken alone may not capture the quality or depth of strategic development, which could depend more on instructional practices and explicit strategy training than on sheer quantity of coursework. In the Spanish context, where interpreting courses are typically few in number and often offered in the final years of undergraduate TI programs, the findings support exploring whether strategy-oriented work in earlier language courses can help students develop greater strategic awareness before formal interpreting instruction begins.

5.1 Pedagogical implications

The findings reported in this article hold pedagogical implications for both language teaching and interpreting courses within interpreter training programs. Our results indicate that self-reported strategy patterns are largely similar across GEC and IP, with strong associations between the two contexts and evidence that self-reported strategy use in GEC predicts self-reported strategy use in IP. By contrast, biographical and educational variables (such as university affiliation, gender or the number of interpreting ECTS credits already taken) did not exert a meaningful effect. This suggests that interpreter trainees may be more likely to report using in interpreting those strategies that are already part of their broader communicative repertoire. Consequently, it appears advisable to explore the integration of explicit strategy training into language courses prior to the onset of interpreting instruction, thereby aiming to foster students' strategic awareness before formal interpreting instruction begins. First, it would raise students' awareness of the range of communicative strategies available, potentially helping them to recognize and reflect on their own strategic choices in real-time interaction. Second, early exposure to strategic training in language courses would allow students to practice strategies in less cognitively demanding settings before applying them in the high-pressure context of interpreting. In this way, strategy use could become more automatic, freeing up attentional resources for the additional demands of interpreting tasks.

However, as researchers and interpreting instructors have observed (e.g., Dong et al., 2019; Gile, 2009; Li, 2013; Li et al., 2025), not all strategies are equally beneficial. Some strategies (e.g., paraphrasing or predicting) seem to be highly desirable and should be promoted and refined, whereas others (e.g., calque or avoidance) may hinder interpreting performance and should be used with caution or explicitly discouraged. Therefore, strategy instruction in language courses should



pursue a dual aim: fostering the use of strategies that are pedagogically and professionally valuable, while also raising students' awareness of strategies that interpreting instructors consider less advisable.

This, in turn, points to the value of closer collaboration between language instructors and interpreting instructors within interpreter training programs, promoting TILLT. A coordinated curriculum would help ensure that strategy training in the early stages of language learning within TI programs not only supports communicative competence but also aligns with the professional demands of interpreting. Importantly, this does not mean that language instructors should assume responsibility for interpreting training, nor that the role of interpreting instructors should be diminished. Rather, language instructors can foster language proficiency and strategic behavior prior to interpreting practice, thereby enabling interpreting instructors to work with trainees who are both more proficient and more strategically aware. In this way, strategy instruction at the language-learning stage can complement and reinforce the goals of interpreting pedagogy, ultimately contributing to a more coherent and effective training trajectory.

6. Conclusions

The present study investigated the patterns of self-reported strategy use in GEC and IP among 66 interpreter trainees. It examined whether self-reported strategy use was associated across the two contexts and whether GEC strategy use predicted IP strategy use when gender, educational context and interpreting coursework were included in the model. To this end, descriptive statistics, correlation tests and a general linear model were run using data coming from two 5-point Likert scale questionnaires. Our results revealed that there is a moderate to very strong connection between the self-reported use of strategies in GEC and IP contexts. Additionally, the general linear model revealed that the use of strategies in GEC is a significant predictor that accounts for approximately 41% of the variance of strategies use in IP, or 33% after adjustment, while gender, educational context and experience in interpreting courses had negligible effects.

These findings suggest that the way interpreter trainees use strategies in GEC is closely associated with their strategic repertoire in IP. This highlights the importance of incorporating explicit strategic instruction not only in interpreter training but also earlier in the curriculum, within language courses. Given the relatively limited effect of explicit instruction in interpreting courses alone (Li & Yan, 2025) and the strong influence of pre-existing strategic behaviors, early intervention is critical. Trainees should be trained to strengthen strategies that enhance their IP while avoiding or moderating those that may reduce quality or undermine professional image (Gile, 2009; Li, 2013).

Nevertheless, the empirical results reported here should be considered in light of some limitations. First, the study relied exclusively on self-reported data, which may be affected by overreporting or underreporting of strategy use. Second, the instrument adopted a broad conceptualization of both GEC and IP, without focusing on specific communicative tasks or interpreting modalities. To overcome these limitations, future studies should combine self-reports with empirical data, for instance by compiling corpora of interpreting performances from the same participants and examining the relationship between reported and observed strategy use. Additional methods such as classroom observations, retrospective interviews or experimental tasks targeting



specific interpreting modalities could further refine our understanding. Finally, research exploring the impact of early strategic instruction in language courses on subsequent IS use would offer valuable insights for curriculum development and for theories of strategy transfer.

Despite these limitations, the findings seem to provide evidence that strategy use in IP cannot be understood in isolation from GEC strategy use. Strategic behaviors developed in general communication seem to be central to interpreting performance. This underscores the need to reconceptualize strategy training as a continuum that begins in language learning and culminates in interpreting practice, highlighting the importance of TILLT as a framework to integrate strategic awareness into language instruction in ways that directly support the demands of interpreting.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the participants for their time and willingness to contribute to this study. We also extend our gratitude to Guillermo Rodríguez Pages for supporting participant recruitment.

References

- Al-Khanji, R., El-Shiyab, S., & Hussein, R. (2002). On the Use of Compensatory Strategies in Simultaneous Interpretation. *Meta*, 45(3), 548–557. <https://doi.org/10.7202/001873ar>
- Andreu, M., Berenguer, L., Orero, P., & Ripoll, O. (2002). Competència traductora i ensenyament de llengües estrangeres. *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció*, (7), 155–165.
- Arumí Ribas, M. (2012). Problems and Strategies in Consecutive Interpreting: A Pilot Study at Two Different Stages of Interpreter Training. *Meta*, 57(3), 812–835. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017092ar>
- Arumí Ribas, M., & Vargas-Urpi, M. (2017). Strategies in public service interpreting: A roleplay study of Chinese-Spanish/Catalan interactions. *Interpreting. International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, 19(1), 118–141. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.19.1.06aru>
- Barik, H. C. (1971). A Description of Various Types of Omissions, Additions and Errors of Translation Encountered in Simultaneous Interpretation. *Meta*, 16(4), 199–210. <https://doi.org/10.7202/001972ar>
- Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2006). Strategies of Simultaneous Interpreting and Directionality. *Interpreting*, 8(2), 149–174. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.2.03bar>
- Basterrechea, M., Martínez-Adrián, M., & Gallardo-del-Puerto, F. (2017). Gender Effects on Strategic Competence: A Survey Study on Compensatory Strategies in a CLIL Context. *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada*, (17), 47–70. <https://doi.org/10.12795/elia.2017.i17.03>
- Cerezo Herrero, E., & Schmidhofer, A. (2021). 25 Years of Research on Language Training in TI Programmes: Taking Stock and Ways Forward. In E. Cerezo Herrero & A. Schmidhofer (Eds.), *Foreign Language Teaching in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 17–44). Peter Lang.
- Civera García, P. (1996). La enseñanza de la lengua C. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *La enseñanza de la traducción* (pp. 183–188). Universitat Jaume I.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>



- Dayter, D. (2021). Strategies in a Corpus of Simultaneous Interpreting: Effects of Directionality, Phraseological Richness, and Position in Speech Event. *Meta*, 65(3), 594–617. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1077405ar>
- Donato, V. (2003). Strategies Adopted by Student Interpreters in SI: A Comparison between the English-Italian and the German-Italian Language-Pairs. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, (12), 101–134.
- Dong, Y., Li, Y., & Zhao, N. (2019). Acquisition of Interpreting Strategies by Student Interpreters. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 13(4), 408–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2019.1617653>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.51997005>
- European Commission. (2022). *European Master's in Translation: Competence Framework 2022*. European Commission.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two Ways of Defining Communication Strategies. *Language Learning*, 34(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00995.x>
- Fernández Dobao, A. M. (2002). The Effect of Language Proficiency on Communication Strategy Use: A Case Study of Galician Learners of English. *Miscelánea*, 25, 53–75. https://doi.org/10.26754/ojs_misc/mj.200210524
- Gile, D. (1987). Les exercices d'interprétation et la dégradation du français: une étude de cas. *Meta*, 32(4), 420–428. <https://doi.org/10.7202/002909ar>
- Gile, D. (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training* (Rev. ed.). John Benjamins.
- González Montesino, R. H. (2016). *La estrategia siempre a mano: propuestas didácticas para la interpretación en lengua de signos* [PhD Dissertation]. Universidade de Vigo. <https://www.investigacion.biblioteca.uvigo.es/xmlui/handle/11093/628>
- Humánez-Berral, P., & Hermán-Carvajal, A. (2025). A Comparative Analysis of Interpreter Trainees' Self-Reported Strategy Use in L2 English Communication and Interpreting Practice. *Sendebarr*, 36, 255–273. <https://doi.org/10.30827/sendebarr.v36.32608>
- Jiménez Catalán, R. M. (2003). Sex Differences in L2 Vocabulary Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 54–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00037>
- Jourdain, S. (2000). A Native-Like Ability to Circumlocute. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00061>
- Kalina, S. (1998). *Strategische Prozesse beim Dolmetschen*. Gunter Narr.
- Kelly, D. (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice*. St. Jerome.
- Lai, H. (2010). Gender Effect on the Use of CSs. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p28>
- Li, X. (2013). Are Interpreting Strategies Teachable? Correlating Trainees' Strategy Use with Trainers' Training in the Consecutive Interpreting Classroom. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, (18), 105–128.
- Li, X. (2015). Putting Interpreting Strategies in Their Place. *Babel*, 61(2), 170–192. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.61.2.02li>

- Li, Y., & Yan, H. (2025). Exploring the Relationship between Interpreting Students' Online Strategy Use and Instructors' Recommendations: A Longitudinal, Mixed-Methods Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 1525–1536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12730>
- Luján-Ortega, V., & Clark-Carter, D. (2000). Individual Differences, Strategic Performance and Achievement in Second Language Learners of Spanish. *Studia Linguistica*, 54(2), 280–287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00067>
- Ma, X., & Li, D. (2021). A Cognitive Investigation of 'Chunking' and 'Reordering' for Coping with Word-order Asymmetry in English-to-Chinese Sight Translation. *Interpreting*, 23(2), 192–221. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00057.ma>
- Martínez-Adrián, M., Gallardo-del-Puerto, F., & Basterrechea, M. (2019). On Self-reported Use of Communication Strategies by CLIL Learners in Primary Education. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(1), 39–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817722054>
- Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying Strategies That Facilitate EFL Learners' Oral Communication: A Classroom Study Using Multiple Data Collection Procedures. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 116–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00987.x>
- Napier, J. (2002). *Sign Language Interpreting: Linguistic Coping Strategies*. Douglas McLean.
- PACTE Group. (2018). Competence Levels in Translation: Working towards a European Framework. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 12(2), 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2018.1466093>
- Pöschhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. Routledge.
- Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110868975>
- Purdie, N., & Oliver, R. (1999). Language Learning Strategies Used by Bilingual School-aged Children. *System*, 27(3), 375–388. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00032-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00032-9)
- Riccardi, A. (2005). On the Evolution of Interpreting Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting. *Meta*, 50(2), 753–767. <https://doi.org/10.7202/011016ar>
- Schmidhofer, A. (2022). Translation and Interpreting-oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT): Where Do We Stand? *Sendebär*, 33, 264–283. <https://doi.org/10.30827/sendebär.v33.23654>
- Schmidhofer, A., Cerezo Herrero, E., & Koletnik, M. (2021). Why We Need TI-oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT). *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 18(1), 71–89. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.18.1.71-89>
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford University Press.
- The Jamovi Project. (2024). *Jamovi* (2.5). [Software].
- Tiselius, E. (2024). Interpreting and Language Proficiency. In C. D. Mellinger (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting and Cognition* (pp. 238–253). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429297533-18>
- Vargas-Urpi, M. (2016). Problems and Strategies in Public Service Interpreting as Perceived by a Sample of Chinese-Catalan/Spanish Interpreters. *Perspectives*, 24(4), 666–678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1069861>
- Vargas-Urpi, M., & Arumí Ribas, M. (2014). Estrategias de interpretación en los servicios públicos en el ámbito educativo: estudio de caso en la combinación chino-catalán. *Intralinea*, 16.

- Wang, J. (2021). *Simultaneous Interpreting from a Signed Language into a Spoken Language*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367815769>
- Wilss, W. (1978). Syntactic Anticipation in German-English Simultaneous Interpreting. In D. Gerver & H. W. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language Interpretation and Communication* (pp. 343–352). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-9077-4_30
- Wu, Y., & Liao, P. (2018). Re-conceptualising Interpreting Strategies for Teaching Interpretation into a B Language. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 12(2), 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2018.1451952>
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1990). Eliciting the Performance of Strategic Competence. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 179–184). Heinle & Heinle.
- Zanetti, R. (1999). Relevance of Anticipation and Possible Strategies in the Simultaneous Interpretation from English into Italian. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, (9), 79–98.

Appendix

Strategy (Context)	Item (original version in Spanish)	Item (translated version into English)
Guessing (EGP)	Si no entiendo algo durante una conversación en inglés, intento adivinar lo que quiere decir.	If I don't understand something during a conversation in English, I try to guess what it means.
Miming (EGP)	Si no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, uso las manos o lenguaje corporal para expresar lo que quiero decir.	If I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I use my hands or body language to express what I want to say.
Morphological creativity (EGP)	Si no conozco una palabra durante una conversación en inglés me invento una nueva (por ejemplo, si no sé decir «balloon», invento la palabra «airball»).	If I don't know a word during a conversation in English, I make up a new one (e.g., if I don't know how to say “balloon”, I make up the word “airball”).
Predicting (EGP)	Cuando alguien me habla durante una conversación en inglés, intento adivinar lo que va a decir después.	When someone speaks to me during a conversation in English, I try to guess what they are going to say next.
Paraphrasing (EGP)	Si no conozco una palabra durante una conversación en inglés, digo algo que signifique lo mismo (por ejemplo, si no sé decir «viewpoint», digo «a place where you can look at landscapes»).	If I don't know a word during a conversation in English, I say something that means the same thing (e.g., if I don't know how to say “viewpoint”, I say “a place where you can look at landscapes”).
Borrowing (EGP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, lo digo en otra lengua (por ejemplo, si no recuerdo una palabra en inglés, la digo en español).	When I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I say it in another language (e.g., if I don't remember a word in English, I say it in Spanish).

Strategy (Context)	Item (original version in Spanish)	Item (translated version into English)
Calque (EGP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, traduzco literalmente de mi lengua materna (por ejemplo, decir «heart finger» en vez de «middle finger»).	When I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I translate literally from my mother tongue (e.g., I say "heart finger" instead of "middle finger").
Foreignizing (EGP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, adapto la palabra equivalente de mi lengua materna (por ejemplo, decir «deception» en vez de «disappointment»).	When I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I adapt the equivalent word from my mother tongue (e.g., I say "deception" instead of "disappointment").
Avoidance (EGP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, evito decirlo o referirme a ello.	When I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I avoid saying it or making reference to it.
Appeal for assistance (EGP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo durante una conversación en inglés, pido ayuda a otra persona (por ejemplo, «¿Puedes repetir?», al interlocutor o «¿cómo se dice esto?», a otra persona que esté cerca).	When I don't know how to express something during a conversation in English, I ask someone else for help (e.g., "Can you repeat?" to the speaker or "How do you say this?" to someone else nearby).
Guessing (EIP)	Si no entiendo algo de lo que dice el mensaje en inglés que tengo que interpretar, intento adivinar lo que quiere decir.	If I don't understand something in the English message I have to interpret, I try to guess what it means.
Miming (EIP)	Si no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, intento usar gestos o lenguaje corporal.	If I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I try to use gestures or body language.
Morphological creativity (EIP)	Si no conozco una palabra en inglés durante mi interpretación, invento una nueva (por ejemplo, si no sé decir «balloon», invento la palabra «airball»).	If I don't know an English word when I am interpreting, I invent a new one (e.g., if I don't know how to say "balloon", I invent the word "airball").
Predicting (EIP)	Mientras escucho el mensaje que debo interpretar, intento adivinar lo que se va a decir a continuación.	As I listen to the message I have to interpret, I try to guess what will be said next.
Paraphrasing (EIP)	Si no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, uso otras palabras que signifiquen lo mismo (por ejemplo, si no sé decir «viewpoint», digo «a place where you can look at landscapes»).	If I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I use other words that mean the same thing (e.g., if I don't know how to say "viewpoint", I say "a place where you can look at landscapes").
Borrowing (EIP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, lo digo en otra lengua (por ejemplo, si no recuerdo una palabra en inglés, la digo en español).	When I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I say it in another language (e.g., if I don't remember a word in English, I say it in Spanish).

Strategy (Context)	Item (original version in Spanish)	Item (translated version into English)
Calque (EIP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, traduzco literalmente de la otra lengua (por ejemplo, decir «heart finger» en vez de «middle finger»).	When I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I translate literally from the other language (e.g., I say "heart finger" instead of "middle finger").
Foreignizing (EIP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, adapto la palabra de la otra lengua (por ejemplo, decir «deception» en vez de «disappointment»).	When I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I adapt the word from the other language (e.g., I say "deception" instead of "disappointment").
Avoidance (EIP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, evito decirlo o referirme a ello.	When I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I avoid saying it or making reference to it.
Appeal for assistance (EIP)	Cuando no sé expresar algo en inglés mientras interpreto, pido ayuda a mi interlocutor u otra persona (por ejemplo, «¿Puede repetir?», al interlocutor o «¿cómo se dice esto?», a un compañero de interpretación).	When I don't know how to express something in English while interpreting, I ask my interlocutor or another person for help (e.g., "Can you repeat?" to the interlocutor or "How do you say this?" to a fellow interpreter).

Source: Humáñez-Berral and Hermán-Carvajal (2025).

Editorial notes

Authorship contribution

Conceptualization: P. Humáñez-Berral, A. Hermán-Carvajal

Methodology: P. Humáñez-Berral, A. Hermán-Carvajal

Data collection: A. Hermán-Carvajal, P. Humáñez-Berral

Formal analysis: P. Humáñez-Berral

Investigation: P. Humáñez-Berral, A. Hermán-Carvajal

Writing – original draft: A. Hermán-Carvajal, P. Humáñez-Berral

Writing – review and editing: P. Humáñez-Berral, A. Hermán-Carvajal

Research dataset

Not applicable.

Funding

This research was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033) through the predoctoral contract PRE2021-100711.

Image copyright

Not applicable.

Approval by ethics committee

The participants in this study signed an informed consent form and no personal data were collected.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.



Cadernos de Tradução, 46, 2026, e108739
Graduate Program in Translation Studies
Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil. ISSN 2175-7968
DOI <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2026.e108739>

Data availability statement

The data generated in this study that are not included in this article may be made available by the authors upon reasonable request.

License

The authors grant *Cadernos de Tradução* exclusive rights for first publication, while simultaneously licensing the work under the [Creative Commons Attribution](#) (CC BY) 4.0 International license. This license enables third parties to remix, adapt, and create from the published work, while giving proper credit to the authors and acknowledging the initial publication in this journal. Authors are permitted to enter into additional agreements separately for the non-exclusive distribution of the published version of the work in this journal. This may include publishing it in an institutional repository, on a personal website, on academic social networks, publishing a translation, or republishing the work as a book chapter, all with due recognition of authorship and first publication in this journal.

Publisher

Cadernos de Tradução is a publication of the Graduate Program in Translation Studies at the Federal University of Santa Catarina. The journal *Cadernos de Tradução* is hosted by the [Portal de Periódicos UFSC](#). The ideas expressed in this paper are the responsibility of its authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or the university.

Section editors

Andréia Guerini – Willian Moura

Style editors

Alice S. Rezende – Ingrid Bignardi – João G. P. Silveira – Kamila Oliveira

Article history

Received: 13-11-2025

Approved: 23-06-2026

Revised: 12-07-2026

Published: 09-2026

