

Translation and Interpreting-Oriented Language Learning and Teaching (TILLT): Where Do We Stand?

Formación lingüística orientada a la traducción e interpretación: una visión general del panorama actual

Astrid Schmidhofer^a  0000-0001-6287-3032

^aUniversity of Innsbruck, Austria

ABSTRACT

Language training in translation and interpreting programmes has invariably been, and continues to be, on the fringes of Translation Studies. In this article, I provide an overview of the research output classified by topic and type of publication. Moreover, I offer an analysis of those areas that have received most attention in the existing literature, namely goals and methodology, and show the points on which there is most agreement. Finally, I briefly refer to emerging research questions in this area, as well as to avenues for further research, and argue why TILLT (Translation and Interpreting-Oriented Language Learning and Teaching) should move towards adopting an interdisciplinary approach.

Keywords: enseñanza de lenguas, TILLT, competencia traductora

RESUMEN

La formación lingüística en los programas de traducción e interpretación siempre ha estado y sigue estando al margen de los estudios de traducción. En este artículo ofreceremos una visión general del panorama científico actual clasificado por temas y tipos de publicación. Además, se aporta un análisis de las áreas que más atención han recibido en la literatura existente, que son los objetivos y la metodología, y se muestra en qué puntos hay más acuerdo. Al final, se esbozan algunas áreas de interés emergentes y nuevas vías de investigación y se aboga por adoptar un enfoque más interdisciplinario.

Palabras clave: language teaching, TILLT, translation competence

Article info

Corresponding author:
Astrid Schmidhofer
Astrid.Schmidhofer@uibk.ac.at

Publication history:
Received: 01.08.2021
Reviewed: 20.04.2022
Accepted: 30.05.2022

Conflict of interest:
None.

Funding:

This article was written within the project LANGTI (Languages for Translation and Interpreting, Project-ID: V 895-G) funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).

How to cite:

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>

1. Introduction

Even though language competence is a *sine qua non* for Translation and Interpreting (TI) activities and training, and despite language courses constituting a considerable part of many TI programmes, the nature of language competence and its development have never been central to Translation Studies. This has been attributed (and rightfully so, in my view) to the historical divide between Translation Studies and Language Learning (Carreres, 2014; Schmidhofer, 2019) and to the fact that additional language learning in TI programmes is some kind of no-man's land between the two disciplines.

While the interest in translation and, to a lesser extent, interpreting teaching has soared within the disciplines since the 1990s, the teaching of additional languages in TI programmes has received only marginal interest and been researched mostly by Spanish researcher-teachers, probably because there is no entrance level for many languages at Spanish universities and, thus, students need to make fast progress to be able to meet the goals of the programme. Cerezo Herrero was right when he denounced almost 10 years ago “que la bibliografía existente relativa a este tema era bastante escasa y que gran parte de las publicaciones se hacían eco unas de otras”¹ (2013: 7). However, the panorama has changed over the past decade and the number of contributions has increased steadily (Koletnik, 2020: 319). Furthermore, the chronological overview provided by Cerezo Herrero and Schmidhofer (2021) offers proof of the growing interest in this area of research.

In the present article, I will offer a classification of 109 TILLT contributions that have been published in the last 30 years, and will show which aspects have received most attention. What is more, I will describe the two areas that have been most widely discussed in the TILLT literature, namely goals and methodology. Finally, I will outline various emergent areas of research and explain why TILLT should move towards more interdisciplinary research.

2. Methodology

The methodology applied in this research can be divided into three phases: bibliographical research, selection and classification. For the bibliographical research, a number of databases, online resources, and libraries² were consulted, which rendered approximately 150 items published between the late 1980s and August 2021³. All texts published in print or online were included in my database. The languages used in the search were Spanish, Catalan, English and German, as all items found in published volumes and in the reference lists of the analysed items were written in one of these languages.

The decisive selection criterion for the inclusion of an item was that it is entirely (or at least primarily) dedicated to TILLT and addresses the specificity of this teaching. I have excluded articles that focus mainly on the teaching of translation and that mention language competence or language teaching merely *en passant*. Likewise, I have omitted contributions that describe general, mostly communicative language teaching approaches and merely add “for translation trainees” without dwelling on the specificity of this teaching.

I have classified the items from different perspectives in order to offer a picture as complete as possible. The first category, *thematic focus*, indicates which areas have been most

thoroughly addressed. The second category, *language use*, reveals the balance between teaching receptive skills only and teaching receptive as well as productive skills. The third category, *specific language*, shows which languages have been most often targeted by TILLT authors. The fourth category, *specific skill/area*, gives an idea as to which language skills are frequently focused upon in TILLT research. The final category, *type of publication*, provides information on which types of publications dominate the TILLT literature.

3. Research Overview

The following overview shows the research output classified by category. As not all contributions fit into all categories, only *thematic focus* and *type of publication* include all 109 contributions.

Table 1: Research overview by category

Focus	Category	Number	Authors
	General	42	Berenguer, 1996; Brehm Cripps, 1996; Civera García, 1996; Berenguer, 1997; Brehm Cripps, 1997; MacKenzie, 1998; Berenguer, 1999; Pérez González, 1999; Recio Ariza, 1999; Andreu & Orero, 2001; Li, 2001; Möller Runge, 2001a; Möller Runge, 2001b; Oster, 2003b; Ruzicka Kenfel, 2003; Giersiepen, 2005; Mulligan, 2006; Oster, van Lawick & Gamero, 2006; Clouet & Wood, 2007; Cruz García & Adams, 2008; Oster, 2008; Recio Ariza, 2008; Stalmach Pajestka, 2008; López Roperó & Tabuena Cuevas, 2009; Clouet, 2010a; Clouet, 2010b; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010; Recio Ariza & Holl, 2012; Cerezo Herrero, 2013; Schmidhofer, 2013; Liendo, 2015; Koletnik, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2018; Schmidhofer, 2018; Cerezo Herrero, 2019a; Asker, 2020; Cortés González, 2020; Yeghoyan, 2020; Fois, 2021; Koletnik, 2021; Oster, 2021; Roiss, 2021
Thematic focus	Methodology	22	Prüfer-Leske, 1997; Berenguer, 1998; Arntz, 1999; González Rodríguez, 1999; Rico, 1999; Angelelli & Degeldre, 2002; Gómez-García, 2002-2003; Nord, 2003; Oster, 2003a; Martín Santana, 2004; Hernandez Guerra & Cruz García, 2009; Recio Ariza, 2011; Roiss, 2015; Singer, 2016; Cerezo Herrero, 2017; Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017; Schmidhofer, 2017; Weinberg Alarcón, Caamaño Matamala & Mondaca Becerra, 2018; Seidl & Janisch, 2019; Schmidhofer, 2020a; Cruz García, 2021; Recio Ariza, 2021
	Research report	16	Vilar Sánchez, 2001; Balteiro Fernández, 2009; Adams & Cruz García, 2015; Adams & Cruz García, 2016; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Schmidhofer, 2016; Adams & Cruz García, 2017; Cruz García, 2017; Romero, 2018; Singer, Rubio & Rubio, 2019; Schmidhofer, 2019; Koletnik, 2020; Koletnik & Tement, 2020; Adams, 2021; Schmidhofer, Cerezo Herrero & Koletnik, 2021; Seidl, 2021
	Goals	11	Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999; Civera García, Oster & Hurtado Albir, 1999; Andreu et al., 2002; Asker, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2019a; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b; Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021; Pietrzak, 2013; Schmidhofer, 2020b; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015; Soriano, 2004

Focus	Category	Number	Authors
Thematic focus	Teaching & learning resource	6	Brehm Cripps, 2004; Doerr, 2005; Berenguer et al., 2006; Balbuena Torezano, 2007; Möller Runge & Burbat, 2007; Barceló Martínez et al., 2021
	Curriculum analysis	3	Cerezo Herrero, 2014-2015; Cerezo Herrero, 2015; Carrasco Flores & Navarro Coy, 2019
	Material Analysis	3	Carrasco Flores, 2016; Carrasco Flores, 2019b; Schwarz, 2020
	Syllabus design	2	Beeby, 2003; Beeby, 2004
	State of the art of TILLT	2	Cerezo Herrero, 2020; Cerezo Herrero & Schmidhofer, 2021
	Other	2	Andreu et al, 2003; Romero, 2021
Productive & receptive language use	C language	20	Civera García, 1996; Prüfer-Leske, 1997; Arntz, 1999; Civera García, Oster & Hurtado Albir, 1999; González Rodríguez, 1999; Recio Ariza, 1999; Andreu & Orero, 2001; Möller Runge, 2001a; Möller Runge, 2001b; Gómez-García, 2002-2003; Oster, 2003b; Martín Santana, 2004; Oster, van Lawick & Gamero, 2006; Clouet & Wood, 2007; Möller Runge & Burbat, 2007; Oster, 2008; Recio Ariza, 2008; Stalmach Pajestka, 2008; Schmidhofer, 2013; Romero, 2021
	B language	11	Brehm Cripps, 1996; Brehms Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999; Beeby, 2003; Beeby, 2004; Brehm Cripps, 2004; López Ropero & Tabuenca Cuevas, 2009; Clouet, 2010a; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010; Cerezo Herrero, 2015; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Cortés González, 2020
Specific language	English	32	Li, 2001; Beeby, 2003; Beeby, 2004; Brehm Cripps, 2004; Martín Santana, 2004; Mulligan, 2006; Clouet & Wood, 2007; Cruz García & Adams, 2008; Balteiro Fernández, 2009; Hernandez Guerra & Cruz García, 2009; López Ropero & Tabuenca Cuevas, 2009; Clouet, 2010a; Clouet, 2010b; Cerezo Herrero, 2013; Cerezo Herrero, 2015; Liendo, 2015; Carrasco Flores, 2016; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Singer, 2016; Cerezo Herrero, 2017; Koletnik, 2017; Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2018; Carrasco Flores, 2019a; Carrasco Flores, 2019b; Carrasco Flores & Navarro Coy, 2019; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b; Koletnik, 2020; Koletnik & Tement, 2020; Cruz García, 2021; Fois, 2021; Koletnik, 2021
	German	26	Berenguer, 1996; Berenguer, 1999; Recio Ariza, 1999; Möller Runge, 2001a; Möller Runge, 2001b; Vilar Sánchez, 2001; Gómez-García, 2002-2003; Oster, 2003b; Ruzicka Kenfel, 2003; Doerr, 2005; Giersiepen, 2005; Berenguer et al., 2006; Oster & van Lawick & Gamero, 2006; Balbuena Torezano, 2007; Möller Runge & Burbat, 2007; Oster, 2008; Recio Ariza, 2008; Roiss, 2015; Schmidhofer, 2016; Schmidhofer, 2019; Seidl & Janisch, 2019; Cortés González, 2020; Schwarz, 2020; Recio Ariza, 2021; Roiss, 2021; Seidl, 2021
	French	3	González Rodríguez, 1999; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010; Barceló Martínez et al., 2021
	Russian	1	Stalmach Pajestka, 2008
	Italian	1	Romero, 2021

Focus	Category	Number	Authors
Specific skill & area	Writing	5	Schmidhofer, 2016; Asker, 2017; Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017; Schmidhofer, 2017; Asker, 2020
	Listening	4	Oster, 2003b; Cerezo Herrero, 2013; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Cerezo Herrero, 2017
	Grammar	4	Vilar Sánchez, 2001; Doerr, 2005; Recio Ariza, 2011; Adams, 2021
	Reading	3	Cruz García, 2017; Romero, 2018; Weinberg Alarcón & Caamaño Matamala & Mondaca Becerra, 2018
	Vocabulary	2	Koletnik & Tement, 2020; Oster, 2021
	Pronunciation	1	Balteiro Fernández, 2009
Type of publication	Article in published volume	45	Berenguer, 1996; Brehm Cripps, 1996; Civera García, 1996; Prüfer-Leske, 1997; MacKenzie, 1998; Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999; Civera García & Oster & Hurtado Albir, 1999; González Rodríguez, 1999; Recio Ariza, 1999; Rico, 1999; Andreu & Orero, 2001; Angelelli & Deguedre, 2002; Beeby, 2004; Martín Santana, 2004; Mulligan, 2006; Cruz García & Adams, 2008; Recio Ariza, 2008; Stalmach Pajestka, 2008; Balteiro Fernández, 2009; López Ropero & Tabuenca Cuevas, 2009; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Iguada, 2010; Recio Ariza, 2011; Recio Ariza & Holl, 2012; Pietrzak, 2013; Roiss, 2015; Adams & Cruz García, 2016; Carrasco Flores, 2016; Asker, 2017; Schmidhofer, 2017; Schmidhofer, 2018; Seidl & Janisch, 2019; Koletnik & Tement, 2020; Schmidhofer, 2020a; Schmidhofer, 2020b; Schwarz, 2020; Yeghoyan, 2020; Adams, 2021; Cerezo Herrero & Schmidhofer, 2021; Cruz García, 2021; Koletnik, 2021; Oster, 2021; Recio Ariza, 2021; Roiss, 2021; Romero, 2021; Seidl, 2021
	Journal article	42	Berenguer, 1998; Berenguer, 1999; Arntz, 1999; Pérez González, 1999; Li, 2001; Vilar Sánchez, 2001; Andreu et al., 2002; Gómez-García, 2002-2003; Andreu et al. 2003; Beeby, 2003; Nord, 2003; Oster, 2003a; Ruzicka Kenfel, 2003; Giersiepen, 2005; Clouet & Wood, 2007; Hernandez Guerra & Cruz García, 2009; Clouet, 2010b; Schmidhofer, 2013; Cerezo Herrero, 2014-2015; Cerezo Herrero, 2015; Liendo, 2015; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Singer, 2016; Adams & Cruz García, 2017; Cerezo Herrero, 2017; Cruz García, 2017; Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017; Romero, 2018; Weinberg Alarcón & Caamaño Matamala & Mondaca Becerra, 2018; Carrasco Flores, 2019a; Carrasco Flores, 2019b; Carrasco Flores & Navarro Coy, 2019; Cerezo Herrero, 2019a; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b; Schmidhofer, 2019; Singer & Rubio & Rubio, 2019; Cerezo Herrero, 2020; Koletnik, 2020; Cerezo Herrero & Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021; Fois, 2021; Schmidhofer & Cerezo Herrero & Koletnik, 2021
	PhD	7	Berenguer, 1997; Brehms Cripps, 1997; Cerezo Herrero, 2013; Koletnik, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2018; Asker, 2020; Cortés González, 2020
	Proceedings	5	Oster, 2003b; Soriano, 2004; Oster, van Lawick, Gamero, 2006; Oster, 2008; Adams & Cruz García, 2015
	Textbook	4	Brehm Cripps, 2004; Berenguer et al., 2006; Balbuena Torezano, 2007; Möller Runge & Burbat, 2007
	Monograph	3	Möller Runge, 2001a; Möller Runge, 2001b; Clouet, 2010a
	Grammar book	1	Doerr, 2005
	Self-study book	1	Barceló Martínez et al., 2021
	Case study report	1	Schmidhofer, 2016

Comments:

- *Thematic focus*: It was not always easy to identify a clear thematic focus. Early contributions in particular are often of a general nature and briefly address a variety of issues. This is the reason why nearly 40% have been classified as *general*. The other categories show the researchers' clear preference for teaching methodology and goals, whereby it needs to be highlighted that goals also are very prominent in general contributions (as the definition of goals is the logical first step in the development of a teaching programme). The number of research reports also constitutes an important percentage. Almost all research reports have been published in the past seven years, which indicates an increasing concern about claims and tenets on the part of empirical research. The number of teaching and learning resources is surprisingly small, and they are mainly centred on German (Möller Runge & Burbat, 2004; Berenguer et al., 2006; Balbuena Torezano, 2013) and English (Brehm Cripps, 2007). The other topics that are mentioned (i.e. material analysis, syllabus design, and the state of the art of TILLT) have received only marginal attention thus far, but offer interesting possibilities for further research.

- *Productive/receptive language use*: This category refers mainly to Spain, where there is a clear distinction between B and C languages in translation programmes. B languages are considered to be active additional languages, and translation and/or interpreting into a foreign language is conducted; meanwhile, in a C language, only translation and/or interpreting into L1 is expected. As the vast majority of contributions originated in Spain, it seemed to be relevant to include this distinction in the overview. As can be observed from the numbers, contributions concerning a C language are much more common than those concerning a B language. The reason seems to be that no entrance level is required for C languages, which means that fast progress is even more important in this case than for B languages.

- *Specific language*: As was to be expected, English is the language that has received most attention in the TILLT literature. However, what is most surprising is the abysmal difference between German and all other languages. The reasons are that German is a common C language in Spain, albeit much more difficult to learn than Romance languages such as French and Italian, and that, maybe due to this difficulty, there are a considerable number of teachers of German actively involved in TILLT (e.g. Möller Runge, 2001; Oster, 2006; Roiss, 2015; Recio Ariza, 2021; Roiss, 2021).

- *Specific skill/area*: Even though writing seems to have been increasing as of late (e.g. Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017), it needs to be pointed out that the most analysed and debated skill is reading. Many of the early contributions dedicated considerable space to the importance of reading comprehension and its development, as it is the most relevant skill for the teaching of C languages and translation. Listening comprehension received very little attention at the beginning and was mentioned as some sort of *add-on* to reading, but was given more importance thanks to the contributions by Cerezo Herrero (2013; 2016). Moreover, grammar received considerable space in a few of the earlier methodological contributions (e.g. Gómez García, 2002-2003; Schmidhofer, 2013) and has been the focal point of different contributions over time. Other aspects like vocabulary and pronunciation continue to be underresearched.

- *Type of publication*: Most early TILLT publications were included in published volumes dedicated to translation or language teaching. The only volume completely dedicated to TILLT to date is the one by Schmidhofer and Cerezo Herrero (2021); sections dedicated to this area

can be found as early as 1998 in Malmkjær (1998) and more recently in Koletnik and Froeliger (2019), Schmidhofer and Wußler (2020) and Stachl-Peier and Schwarz (2020). In recent years, the number of journal articles has increased considerably and is now almost equal to that of published volume contributions. The number of doctoral theses has remained constant over the years, and at least in one case a monograph is based on a doctoral thesis (Möller Runge, 2001). The number of teaching resources, on the other hand, remains rather small.

4. Selected Topics of TILLT

In this section, I will focus on those aspects of TILLT that have been most widely discussed in the literature. These concern the justification of TILLT and its basic assumptions (4.1), goals (4.2), framing TILLT within LSP (Language for Specific Purposes, 4.3), and methodology (4.4).

4.1. Justification and Basic Assumptions of TILLT

The most fundamental assumption sustained by almost all who have researched and written about TILLT, which is also the main argument for establishing TILLT as a field of academic enquiry and practice, is that language teaching and learning within TI programmes needs to be different from general language teaching and learning. It should be conceived in such a way as to prepare students for the specific use that they will later make of languages as language professionals and mediators in intercultural communication (e.g. Berenguer, 1996; Möller Runge, 2001; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002; Gómez García, 2002-2003; Oster, 2008; Clouet, 2010; Cerezo Herrero, 2013; Schmidhofer, 2013; Cerezo Herrero, 2016; Ahmann & Schmidhofer, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2018; Cerezo Herrero, 2019a; Schmidhofer, 2020b; Adams, 2021; Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021; Koletnik, 2021; Recio Ariza, 2021; Roiss, 2021). As students will later use languages professionally in their jobs, many researchers support including TILLT within LSP (Clouet, 2010; Carrasco Flores, 2018; Cerezo Herrero, 2019a; Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021; Koletnik, 2021). This idea of specific training that needs to be different from general language training has also led to a critical analysis of the suitability of the communicative approach.

Preparing students for their future language use implies that the teaching and learning of languages within TI programmes must be geared towards translation and interpreting (Berenguer, 1997: 449). This means that language courses should enable students to develop language competence that will allow them to participate successfully in subsequent translation/interpreting courses (Oster, 2003: 82; Beeby Lonsdale, 2004: 42; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015), contribute to the development of translation and interpreting competence (Carrasco Flores, 2019), and make students fit for the workplace (Adams, 2021: 164; Roiss, 2021: 102). This idea is aptly summarised by Oster (2008: 4) when she states that “la didáctica de las lenguas para traductores necesita el referente de la traducción como actividad profesional para poder determinar sus objetivos y también su metodología”⁴. For most authors, the orientation towards future use implies that language is to be regarded as a tool (e.g. Mackenzie, 1998; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015; Cruz García, 2017: 77; Adams, 2021: 174) or as “a means to reach a further goal, but not an end in itself” (Cerezo Herrero, 2015: 291).

The second assumption that is mainly voiced by translation and interpreting teachers is that language learning must happen before students start translation or interpreting activities. Nord (2011: 289) affirms that “Übersetzen kann man erst lernen, wenn die Sprach- und Kulturkompetenz ein angemessenes Niveau erreicht hat oder punktuell auf ein solches Niveau gebracht worden ist”⁵ (cf. also Cao, 1996: 237; Cerezo Herrero, 2015: 290). This is even more true for interpreting activities, as Seleskovitch explains very graphically when she states that an interpreter “cannot learn or improve his knowledge of a language while expressing the meaning of a message at 150 words a minute” (Seleskovitch, quoted in Bowen, 1989: 51). In general, translation and interpreting teachers expect students to have reached an adequate level of language and to be able to concentrate on the development of translation or interpreting competence (Angelelli & Degueldre, 2002: 93). However, it is difficult to define or quantify the language competence that is needed in order to follow translation and interpreting courses, and descriptions are often quite general and filled with adjectives like “adequate” or “proficient”. Seleskovitch poses the question of what it means to *know* a language, and makes clear that “a language is not a finite or clearly defined mass, which you either possess in its entirety or not at all” (Seleskovitch, 1978, quoted in Cao, 1996: 233).

4.2. Goals of TILLT

4.2.1. General Remarks

It has not been an easy undertaking to gather what has been written on goals for TILLT. Most authors who have written about TILLT have formulated goals, which is to be somewhat expected because goals provide guidance for methodological deliberations and for course design, but in some cases these goals are not formulated explicitly. This overview includes all goals that are mentioned by various authors in the literature; goals that are mentioned by only one or two authors have been excluded due to a lack of space.

A general goal, which is common ground among TILLT researchers, is that TILLT should be conceived in such a way as to prepare students for translation (and interpreting) activities and contribute to the development of translation competence (Hurtado Albir, preface in Brehm Cripps, 2007: 10; Clouet, 2010: 218; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015: 65-68; Carrasco Flores, 2018: 278-279). TILLT teachers should therefore look to translation and interpreting classes to define their goals and then select their methodologies accordingly, as language classes provide the basis for many other classes (Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 156; Beeby Lonsdale, 2004: 42; Oster, 2008: 82). Most goal inventories are presented as lists⁶ with descriptions; however, we also find three models for translation-oriented language competence (Andreu Lucas et al., 2002; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b; Schmidhofer, 2020b) as well as one LSP-based framework for TILLT (Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021).

4.2.2. Communicative Competence

Definitions of communicative competence can be found in Canale and Swain (1980), Bachman (1990) and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)⁷ (Council of Europe 2001), the last of which is the most cited among teachers of TILLT. Even though the terminology may vary between authors and not always adhere to the distinction stipulated by the CEFR, most authors agree that students must develop communicative com-

petence (Civera García, 1996: 183; Pérez González, 1999: 269; Kiraly, 2000: 164; Clouet, 2010: 129; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010: 268; Recio Ariza & Holl, 2012; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015: 56-59; Asker, 2017: 190; Schmidhofer, 2020b: 29). This is explained by Schmidhofer and Ahmann (2015) in the following way:

Die im Rahmen des GERS definierte kommunikative Kompetenz (...) ist zweifelsohne auch für die Übersetzerausbildung von hoher Relevanz, sind doch die darin definierten Kompetenzen, sowohl die allgemeinen als auch die kommunikativen, Teil des übersetzerischen Werkzeugs⁸ (2015: 56-57).

From the aforementioned quote, it becomes clear that one of the central goals of TILLT is to enable students to communicate in an additional language. Here, parallels with general language teaching and communicative approaches are clearly visible. Besides, many TILLT authors underscore the importance of accuracy and the need to be familiar with different variations of a language.

Some TILLT authors specify *text competence* as a particularly relevant goal in the teaching of future translators and interpreters. The definitions of communicative competence by Canale and Swain (1980), which includes *discourse competence*, and the CEFR (2001), which includes “the mastery of discourse, cohesion and coherence, the identification of text types and forms, irony, and parody” (2001: 13) in *pragmatic competences*, understand the ability to work with text as part of communicative competence. References to text competence in TILLT reflect these definitions. Thus, Ruzicka Kenfel (2003: 6) defines text competence as “saber relacionar correctamente las partes que constituyen el proceso comunicativo que son el emisor, el receptor, el tema y la situación comunicativa”⁹. For text reception, Andreu et al. (2002: 159) define text competence as “la capacitat de comprendre el text en la seva totalitat i d’analitzar tots els factors que el component”¹⁰. With regard to text competence for future translators, other authors also indicate being familiar with text genres and typologies and linguistic conventions (Pérez González, 1999: 269; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b: 94; cf. also Mackenzie, 1998: 15; Cruz García, 2017: 77; Schwarz, 2020: 77; Roiss, 2021: 99) and the contrastive dimension (Berenguer, 1996: 16; Berenguer, 1998).

This competence can be attained by developing reading strategies (Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999: 61-62; Civera García et al., 1999: 72-73; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 161; Asker, 2017: 190) and performing textual analysis (Berenguer, 1999: 138-139; Möller Runge, 2001: 179-185; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 161).

4.2.3. Cultural Competence

It is also recognised by most authors that translators/intepreters must possess ample sociocultural and intercultural competence (Berenguer, 1996: 16-17; Berenguer, 1998: 119; Mackenzie, 1998: 15; Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999: 63-64; Civera García et al., 1999: 74; Pérez González, 1999: 270; Möller Runge, 2001: 93; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 161-162; Burbat & Möller Runge, 2007: 306-307; Clouet & Wood, 2007: 107; Clouet, 2010: 122; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010: 268; Recio Ariza & Holl, 2012; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b: 96; Roiss, 2021: 99).

Based on definitions in translation models, Eyckmans (2017: n.p.) describes cultural competence “as a combination of knowledge, attitudes, behaviour and know-how”, which also

holds validity for TILLT. Authors in the TILLT literature mention the importance of becoming familiar with concepts in the areas of art, history, politics, the economy, and the legal system, as well as comparable concepts in the target culture (Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999: 63), and of acquiring cultural awareness by addressing the relationship between language and culture (Berenguer, 1996: 16-17; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 161; Clouet & Wood, 2007: 107). Furthermore, this competence should be developed by contrasting different cultures (Berenguer, 1996: 16; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 162; Burbat & Möller Runge, 2007: 306-307; Clouet, 2010: 129), with a view to recognising stereotypes (Berenguer, 1996: 16-17) and possible cultural conflicts (Clouet & Wood, 2007: 107), and it should be applied to texts (Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 162; Burbat & Möller Runge, 2007: 306-307).

4.2.4. Contrastive Competence

As translation and interpreting imply working with two languages in parallel or simultaneously, many authors consider it convenient to promote contrastive competence in language classes. The development of contrastive competence should be sought in different areas of language (Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 162; Clouet, 2010: 23; Schmidhofer, 2020b: 29), as well as at the textual level (Berenguer, 1996: 16; Andreu Lucas et al., 2002: 160-161; Clouet, 2010: 23), and is often mentioned in relation to intercultural or textual competence. With regard to language, the focus should be on lexical and grammatical differences and how they operate in context (Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999: 63; Schmidhofer, 2013: 110-111).

4.2.5. Information-Mining Competence

There is ample consensus among TILLT researchers that students should know and be able to use different sources (Berenguer, 1996: 16; Brehm Cripps & Hurtado Albir, 1999: 64; Civera García et al., 1999: 74; Pérez González, 1999: 270; Möller Runge, 2001: 93; Burbat & Möller Runge, 2007: 305-306; Clouet, 2010: 129; Gallego Hernández & Tolosa Igualada, 2010: 268; Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015: 64; Asker, 2017: 190; Cruz García, 2017: 77; Carrasco Flores, 2018: 178; Cerezo Herrero, 2019b: 98; Schmidhofer, 2020b: 29; Roiss, 2021: 99). These include online and paper-based sources like different types of dictionaries, glossaries, grammars, authentic texts, language fora, and encyclopaedias.

4.3. TILLT as a Particular Type of LSP

The idea of framing TILLT within LSP was already put forth by Berenguer in 1997 (1997: 28). It has been reaffirmed in subsequent years by Bernardini (2004), Brehm Cripps (2007) and Clouet (2010) and become increasingly popular in the past few years (Carrasco Flores, 2016; Liendo & Palmira Massi, 2017; Carrasco Flores, 2018, 2019; Cerezo Herrero, 2019a; Koletnik, 2020; Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021; Fois, 2021; Koletnik, 2021). In fact, the orientation of LSP towards students' needs and future use seems to describe neatly the goals of TILLT, since the overall goal of TILLT is to prepare students to utilise languages professionally in the future (Cerezo Herrero, 2019a: 243; cf. also Berenguer, 1997; Oster, 2008).

However, contrary to the common classification by various domains (medicine, law, etc.), Bernardini (2004) considers language teaching for translators to be “a non-standard variety

of LSP” (2004: 103). She points out that the “standard LSP course is that of teaching specific linguistic competencies, relative to a given subject domain”, while language training for translators “involves first and foremost the development of specific capacities required by the translating process in its widest sense” (2004: 103). Similarly, Koletnik (2021: 70-71) observes that in the context of TI programmes, LSP is understood rather as a field of specialisation than of domain-specific communication.

In this context, two frameworks have been developed recently. The first framework was created by Carrasco Flores (2019) for the teaching of English to future translators and interpreters (ETI). It comprises eight objectives, which include raising students’ language awareness at different levels (e.g. spelling, morphosyntax and pragmatics), the development of the four skills (always in accordance with the translation or interpreting process), and the development of extralinguistic knowledge, documentation skills, and professional skills. The second one was developed by Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer and Koletnik (2021) and connects the goals, contents, stakeholders and perspectives of the teaching context. The goal and central element of the framework is that of *professional language use*, flanked by *language skills*, the *thematic spectrum*, and *materials*, the last three of which are connected to the *contrastive perspective*. Beneath the central element and connected thereto are *student aspects* and *teacher aspects*. The ultimate central goal of the model is for students to become professional language users and language experts. The choice of teaching materials depends on the situation, but, as a rule, authentic materials should be used, including texts that resemble translation assignments. The thematic spectrum should be oriented towards the subject areas taught in specialised courses at the university in question. The contrastive perspective was introduced in order to prepare students to work with two languages, whose aim is to advance not only competence in both languages but also the ability to relate and separate the two languages. Teachers should develop not only didactic competence but also the ability to analyse learners’ linguistic needs and design their teaching units accordingly. Moreover, they should be aware of the professional reality of translators and/or interpreters and incorporate topics related to the industry and profession into their teaching. However, what is particularly important is their role as advisors in the development of learner autonomy, as a considerable part of language development must occur outside the classroom. Students should achieve skills and attitudes not only for translation/interpreting, but also for language learning. Attitudes include the development of learner autonomy, i.e. the competence with which to plan, control and take responsibility for one’s own learning process. Student aspects, furthermore, encompass the emotional development from the language user to the translator (cf. Schmidhofer & Ahmann, 2015: 58-62), as well as enculturation into Translation Studies (cf. Seidl, 2021: 48).

4.4. TILLT Methodology

4.4.1. General Remarks

Besides goals, methodological considerations are the topic most thoroughly discussed in the TILLT literature. This section contains comments on the suitability of the communicative approach, complete methodological proposals developed within TILLT, and the use of translation.

4.4.2. The Communicative Approach and TILLT

The strong presence of communication as one of the goals of TILLT proves that the communicative approach, whose declared goal is to enable learners to communicate in an additional language, is highly relevant for TILLT. For many authors, however, this approach is not adequate as a standalone approach, but rather only as a valid basis which needs to be adapted or complemented by TI-oriented elements or procedures (Civera García, 1996; Gómez García, 2002-2003: 106-107; Cerezo Herrero, 2013: 166-167; Schmidhofer, 2013; Roiss, 2015: 85; Ahmann & Schmidhofer, 2017: 25-27; Jiménez Gutiérrez, 2020: 152).

The advantages of using a communicative approach for TILLT (as named by the authors) include its action-oriented view on language (Schmidhofer, 2020a: 119), its orientation towards real-life communication and authentic materials (Rico Pérez, 1999: 56; Schmidhofer, 2020a: 119), its flexibility (which allows for the use of L1) (Cerezo Herrero, 2013: 167), and its practical and, therefore, motivational procedures (Cerezo Herrero, 2013: 167).

One drawback that is most often mentioned among researchers is the permissive stance towards errors (Gómez García, 2002-2003: 106-107; Ahmann & Schmidhofer, 2017: 27; Schmidhofer, 2020a: 119; cf. also Seidl & Janisch, 2019: 178). Adams (2021) points out that

[a]lthough in some other cases, a communicative approach favouring fluency over accuracy may be deemed appropriate, this cannot be the case for TI undergraduates, as both their written and aural comprehension of source texts, and written and oral production of target texts, depend on the correct decoding and encoding of the language used (2021: 174).

It has also been criticised that there is a strong focus on oral skills and interpersonal communication (Gómez García, 2002-2003: 106-107; Schmidhofer, 2020a: 119). Ahmann and Schmidhofer (2017) recognise the value of the communicative approach for TILLT, but consider that it lacks a specific orientation towards future translation and interpreting:

Aufgrund der kommunikativen Sprachvermittlung werden die Studierenden eher zu Fremdsprachennutzern als Mediatoren ausgebildet, wodurch die Chance versäumt wird, bereits in der Sprachausbildung die Grundlagen für eine erfolgreiche übersetzerische Tätigkeit zu legen. So nehmen in den Sprachkursen metasprachliche Kompetenz, Recherche über Sprache, Aspekte sprachlicher Präzision und Korrektheit sowie ein umfassender Ausbau des Wortschatzes über die unmittelbaren Bedürfnisse des Nutzers hinaus im Vergleich zum Sprachhandeln eine viel zu geringe Rolle ein¹¹ (2017: 30).

4.4.3. Comprehensive Teaching Proposals Developed within Translation Studies

Based on a review of the existing methods of language teaching, from which he highlights the Grammar-Translation Method and the communicative approach, Cerezo Herrero (2013: 169-171) delineates a method, which he calls *método traductológico-comunicativo*, to “desarrolla[r] habilidades traductológicas partiendo de una base comunicativa”¹² (2013: 169). Its cornerstones are an analysis of the linguistic and cultural needs of students, a balanced development of all four skills, a central role of vocabulary development, and deductive grammar teaching. Classes are to be held in an additional language, but L1 can be used for contrastive activities that should address linguistic, sociolinguistic, sociocultural and discursive aspects. Materials should be preferably authentic, but textbook materials can be used in an adapted

manner. Furthermore, teaching should take into account the body and emotions and promote lifelong learning.

Schmidhofer (2013: 100-112) explains methodological guidelines for the teaching of C languages, which have a communicative orientation, but adds or highlights some aspects that are usually paid little attention in communicative teaching. She focuses mainly on reading comprehension because this is the immediate communicative need in her teaching context. Text work is approached from two different perspectives and combines authentic and didactic texts, the first of which aims at the development of different reading strategies for a global and detailed understanding, taking into account top-down and bottom-up processes and textual analysis; meanwhile, the other perspective considers the translator's viewpoint and involves writing summaries in L1 or conducting translation based on a syntactic analysis of the text. Reading activities also include working with sources and parallel texts in L1. The other skills are to be worked upon depending on students' needs. Writing should include texts for professional communication as well as texts for expressing personal experiences (as the latter are important for maintaining students' motivation). The teaching of grammar should be explicit, as for TI students it is deemed to be a quick way of learning languages, and be comprehensive (by presenting complete subsystems), cognitive (by focusing on the regularities of subsystems and creating an internal grammar of the additional language), contrastive (to integrate new structures into the existing structures and use knowledge of other languages) and pedagogical (by taking into account the capacity of learners to process new input). Accuracy should be emphasized in written skills, for which the author suggests self-correction procedures. The role of L1 is discussed thoroughly as a means of bringing a contrastive perspective into the classroom to support learning and detect potential difficulties, and of explaining and clarifying meanings. Classes should be taught in an additional language as much as possible, but the choice really depends on the distance between the additional language and L1, which is the reason as to why Schmidhofer advocates a gradually increasing use of the additional language.

The third proposal is the *Hildesheimer Drittsprachenmodell* (Arntz, 1999), a methodology conceived for advanced students of Translation Studies who would like to learn a third additional language for translation in a short period of time. The model comprises three consecutive modules to be attended in three semesters. The first module is dedicated to receptive skills (mostly focused on reading), the second to productive skills, and the third to the translation of general and popular texts from the additional language into L1. The courses are based on a contrastive teaching approach in order to use the competence in other languages that students already possess. The Dutch course on receptive skills that Arntz describes includes ten units, each one built around an original text in Dutch, usually an informative text related to Dutch/Belgian culture, economy, society or history. At the beginning of each unit, there are texts that explain the relationship between Dutch and other Germanic languages, particularly German and English. Throughout the ten units, all relevant aspects of grammar are addressed, especially those commonly found in written language. There are frequent comparisons with other Germanic languages, and a strong focus on not only *false friends*, so common between German and Dutch, but also *good friends* or *distant acquaintances*. The first module is accompanied by a module on linguistics, wherein students learn more about the historical development of the language as well as its similarities and differences with other languages of the same family.

4.4.4. The Use of Translation

Although the question of using translation in the language classroom is particularly relevant in a context in which students are to be prepared for translation and interpreting activities, it has received little attention, as, according to Koletnik (2020), “the discussion about the role and possible benefits (and pitfalls) of using translation and other practices that allow resorting to multiple languages in the ALT (Additional Language Teaching) of future translators seems to be lagging behind this debate” (2020: 318). This might be due to the controversial role of translation in the history of language teaching. In the Grammar-Translation Method, which was used in Europe far into the 20th century, the translation of mostly isolated sentences is one of the most common forms of practice, which proves to be uncondusive to communicative competence and, at best, helpful in developing grammatical awareness (for a full discussion of the pros and cons, cf. Zojer, 2009). Consequently, translation was hardly discussed in language teaching, but has made a comeback as of late as a form of mediation (Council of Europe, 2020), understood as a communicative activity focused on communication across linguistic boundaries.

According to the TILLT literature, translation could be beneficial to this teaching context in two ways: it could help to enhance language competence and/or to initiate the development of translation competence. Even though the first aspect is also mentioned (Möller Runge, 2001: 148; Gómez-García, 2002-2003: 109), it is the second aspect that is mostly dwelled upon by those authors who advocate the inclusion of translation in TILLT. López Ropero and Tabuenca Cuevas (2009: 127) suggest including the translation of sentences or short extracts embedded in real situations. Schmidhofer (2013) intends to enable students to approach texts from a translator’s perspective and train in language transfer by asking students to summarise texts in their L1. Jiménez Gutiérrez (2020: 160) advocates the use of pedagogical translation¹³ in TILLT as a learning tool, and designed an activity that includes the translation of short sentences into the additional language in order to help students to develop grammatical and lexical mastery from a contrastive perspective. She highlights that students considered the translation activities, which were undertaken collaboratively, to be motivational because they enable students to work with two languages in a way similar to that of a translator.

Koletnik (2020) adopts a different approach and emulates real translation tasks embedded in a communicative situation to practise grammatical structures under instruction. In her empirical research, Koletnik (2020; 2021) addresses both of the questions raised above. Her study, which was conducted in English language courses with students of TI, focuses on the question of whether translation can be “effectively and efficiently used in FTL to strengthen selected aspects of linguistic competence” (2021: 79). She compared a group of students who were taught grammar with the help of translation to another group who were taught without referring to translation. There were no significant results between the two groups in quantitative terms, but qualitative interviews revealed that many of the students considered translation to be a valuable tool in language teaching. A second topic included in her research is the influence of translation in language teaching upon students’ translation competence. The study showed that the inclusion of translation in language teaching has a positive effect on translation into L1, albeit not on translation into the additional language being learnt.

5. Discussion

The TILLT literature seems to be eager to establish TILLT as a field of its own within Translation Studies arguing that language competence is an integrative subcompetence of TI competence¹⁴ and, therefore, should be developed with a view to TI activities and in a different way (as in general language courses). However, the results of the bibliographical study show that TILLT continues to be a marginal field of enquiry. The number of items that met the criterion of being considered to be *TILLT literature* is rather limited, and most contributions are short articles in edited volumes or journals. Extensive contributions are scarce and almost exclusively found in the form of PhD dissertations. Moreover, it needs to be mentioned that many contributions are based on the authors' perceived teaching needs and experience and describe goals and classroom procedures. There is little empirical research, and the empirical studies that have been conducted are mostly small-scale. What is more, research has commonly been conducted merely in relation to tenets from Translation Studies and with little reference to neighbouring fields.

The overview of topics that I have presented shows that TILLT has thus far mostly focused on *what* should be achieved and *how* to achieve it. The *what* has been answered by defining goals that accord with the aforementioned needs to meet requirements in subsequent classes. This implies that TILLT has been strongly outcome-oriented and concerned with what students should know and be able to do. Regarding the *how*, the TILLT literature has been mostly focused on the teaching side of TILLT, i.e. on what teachers can do *in class* to further these goals and promote an instrumental view on language that is logically derived from competence models. However, if TILLT does not reach out and form links with other disciplines, it is condemned to go around in circles, never departing from the focus on goals and the perspective of instrumental language use. TILLT can only thrive if it widens its scope and starts to adopt a more interdisciplinary approach. This path has already been initiated by a few authors who have opened up new areas of enquiry. Topics of interdisciplinary research with language teaching and learning could include material research and development (Adams & Cruz García, 2017; Carrasco, 2018) and the learning dimension (Cerezo Herrero, Schmidhofer & Koletnik, 2021). The study of possible uses of technological language tools in TILLT like corpora (Singer, 2016; Fois, 2021) or machine translation could combine TILLT, data-driven learning research, and computational linguistics; what is more, the topics of enculturation (Seidl, 2021), professional identity, and investment could open up areas of sociologically oriented research.

6. Conclusions

There have been powerful arguments put forth by many authors that are in favour of establishing TILLT as an area of enquiry within the field of Translation Studies. The language use of future TI professionals is clearly different from that of general language users, and it is the most indispensable prerequisite for TI activities, which is the reason as to why it is in the interest of the discipline to describe this competence and how it can be best developed. It is thus an area of research *and* practice, and research results can directly be fed into teaching and learning practice. Some areas, such as goals and classroom procedures, have been explored quite well, but for TILLT to become a full-fledged area of research that stands alone, it must go further and set itself up as an interdisciplinary field of enquiry with firm links to other disciplines.

References

- Adams, H. (2021). Teaching grammar in translation and interpreting in Spain: The trainers' view. In A. Schmidhofer & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 163-178). Peter Lang.
- Adams, H. & Cruz García, L. (2017). Use of teaching materials in foreign language classes for trainee translators in Spain. *BABEL-AFIAL*, 26, 101-118.
- Ahmann, H. & Schmidhofer, A. (2017). Translationsdidaktik 15 Jahre nach Bologna – zur Notwendigkeit einer Verringerung der Verschulung und zur Integration und Abgrenzung vom GERS in der Sprachausbildung. In U. Stachl-Peier & E. Schwarz (Eds.), *Das Spiel der Sprachen 4* (pp. 9-36). Grazer Translation Studies.
- Andreu Lucas, M., Orero Clavero, P., Berenguer, L., & Ripoll López, O. (2002). Competència traductora i ensenyament de llengües estrangeres. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 7, 55-165.
- Angelelli, C. & Degueldre, C. (2002). Bridging the gap between language for general purposes and language for work: An intensive superior-level language/skill course for teachers, translators, and interpreters. In B. Lou Leaver (Ed.), *Developing Professional-Level Language Proficiency* (pp. 91-110). Cambridge University Press.
- Arntz, R. (1999). Ausbildung in „Dritt Sprachen“ – ein neuer Ansatz. *Lebende Sprachen*, 2, 49-53.
- Asker, B. (2017). „Ja gibt es denn sowas überhaupt?“ Translationsorientierte Schreibkompetenz aus Sicht der Lernenden. In U. Stachl-Peier & E. Schwarz (Eds.), *Das Spiel der Sprachen 4* (pp. 165-197). Grazer Translation Studies.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Balbuena Torezano, M. (2013). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Übersetzer*. Bienza.
- Beeby Lonsdale, A. (2004). Language Learning for Translators: Designing a Syllabus. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes* (pp. 39-65). John Benjamins.
- Berenguer, L. (1996). Didáctica de segundas lenguas en los estudios de traducción. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *La enseñanza de la traducción* (pp. 9-30). Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Berenguer, L. (1997). *L'ensenyament de llengües estrangeres per a traductors: Didàctica de l'alemany*. PhD dissertation. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Berenguer, L. (1998). La adquisición de la competencia cultural en los estudios de traducción. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 2, 119-129.
- Berenguer, L. (1999). Cómo preparar la traducción en la clase de lenguas extranjeras. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 4, 135-150.
- Berenguer, L., Doerr, E., Ferriz, M.C., & Ripoll, O. (2006). *Lengua alemana para traductores. Nivel básico*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Bernardini, S. (2004). Corpus-aided language pedagogy for translator education. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes* (pp. 97-111). John Benjamins.
- Bowen, M. (1989). Language learning before translator/interpreter training. In P. W. Krawutschke (Ed.), *Translator and Interpreter Training and Foreign Language Pedagogy Strategy* (pp. 51-64). SUNY Press.
- Brehm Cripps, J. (2007). *Targeting the Source Text. A Coursebook in English for Translator Trainees*. 2nd ed. Publicacions Universitat Jaume I.
- Brehm Cripps, J. & Hurtado Albir, A. (1999). La primera lengua extranjera. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *Enseñar a traducir* (pp. 59-70). Edelsa.
- Burbat, R. & Möller Runge, J. (2007). Das Lehren und Lernen einer zweiten und/oder weiteren Fremdsprache in der Übersetzer- und Dolmetscherausbildung. *Babel: International Journal of Translation*, 53(4), 303-320. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.53.4.02bur>

- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Cao, D. (1996). On translational language competence. *Babel: International Journal of Translation*, 42(4), 231-238. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.42.4.05cao>
- Carrasco Flores, J.A. (2016). Analysing English language teaching materials for translators and interpreters: a case study. In A. M. Rojo López, & N. Campos Plaza (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarity in Translation Studies. Theoretical Models, Creative Approaches and Applied Methods* (pp. 311-328). Peter Lang.
- Carrasco Flores, J.A. (2018). *English for Translation and Interpreting: a Cognitive and Methodological Framework of Reference for Materials Analysis and Development*. PhD dissertation. Universidad Complutense.
- Carrasco Flores, J.A. (2019). Teaching English for translation and interpreting: a framework of reference for developing the translator's bilingual sub-competence. *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, 27, 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.5209/cjes.62822>
- Carreres, Á. (2014). Translation as a means and as an end: reassessing the divide. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(1), 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2014.908561>
- Cerezo Herrero, E. (2013). *La enseñanza del inglés como lengua B en la formación de traductores e intérpretes en España: la comprensión oral para la interpretación*. PhD dissertation. Universitat de València.
- Cerezo Herrero, E. (2015). English language teaching for translator and interpreter trainees: syllabus analysis and design. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 22, 289-306.
- Cerezo Herrero, E. (2016). Lengua B Inglés: Un estudio transversal sobre la comprensión oral para la interpretación. *Sendebare*, 27, 97-122.
- Cerezo Herrero, E. (2019a). Lenguas extranjeras con fines traductológicos: En busca de una identidad propia. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 26, 239-254.
- Cerezo Herrero, E. (2019b). Sistematización de competencias en la enseñanza de la lengua B para traducción e interpretación en el EEES a partir de una modelo de competencia traductora. *MonTI: Monografías de traducción e interpretación*, 11, 77-107.
- Cerezo Herrero, E. & Schmidhofer, A. (2021). 25 years of research on language training in TI programmes: taking stock and ways forward. In A. Schmidhofer, & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 17-44). Peter Lang.
- Cerezo Herrero, E., Schmidhofer, A. & Koletnik, M. (2021). An LSP framework for translation and interpreting pedagogy. *Revista de lenguas para fines específicos*, 27(2), 140-156.
- Civera García, P. (1996). La enseñanza de la lengua C. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *La enseñanza de la traducción* (pp.183-188). Castellón, Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Civera García, P., Oster, U., & Hurtado Albir, A. (1999). La segunda lengua extranjera. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), *Enseñar a traducir* (pp.71-86). Edelsa.
- Clouet, R. (2010). *Lengua inglesa aplicada a la traducción. Una propuesta curricular adaptada al Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior*. Comares.
- Clouet, R. & Wood, M. (2007). El papel de la segunda lengua extranjera en los estudios de traducción en España: algunas reflexiones desde el enfoque cultural. *Filología y Lingüística*, XXXIII(1), 101-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v33i1.4279>
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment Companion Volume*. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Cruz García, L. (2017). Foreign language training in translation and interpreting degrees in Spain: a study of textual factors. *Revista digital de investigación en docencia universitaria*, 11(2), 75-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19083/ridu.11.583>

- Eyckmans, J. (n.d.). *Cultural Competence in Translation Studies and Its Assessment*. <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/8552979/file/8552981.pdf>
- Fois, E. (2021). Translator training, English language teaching and corpora: scenarios and applications. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 15(4), 59-78.
- Gallego Hernández, D. & Tolosa Igualada, M. (2010). Lengua B para traductores e intérpretes o del proceso de llevar la lengua B al espacio-tiempo de la mediación. In M. P. Blanco García (Ed.), *El Cid y la Guerra de la Independencia. Dos hitos en la historia de la traducción y la literatura* (pp. 265-274). Universidad Complutense, Instituto Universitario de Lenguas Modernas y Traductores.
- Gómez García, C. (2002-2003). Sobre la necesidad de contravenir las reglas de las nuevas metodologías. *Encuentro: Revista de investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas*, 13-14, 101-112.
- Jiménez Gutiérrez, I. (2020). Desarrollo de la subcompetencia lingüística en alumnos de traducción e interpretación a través de herramientas de aprendizaje colaborativo. In T. Barceló Martínez (Ed.), *Metodologías innovadoras en la enseñanza-aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras para traductores e intérpretes* (pp. 149-164). Comares.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Routledge.
- Koletnik, M. (2020). Teaching future translators language through translation – does it help their translating? *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E.*, 7, 314-356.
- Koletnik, M. (2021). LSP and additional language teaching for translators: new researched-based evidence. In A. Schmidhofer & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 69-86). Peter Lang.
- Koletnik, M. & Froeliger, N. (Eds.) (2019). *Translation and Language Teaching. Continuing the Dialogue*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Liendo, P. & Palmira Massi, M. (2017). Academic literacy, genres and competences. A didactic model for teaching English to translation students. *ELIA*, 17, 251-272. 10.12795/elia.2017.i17.11
- López Ropero, L. & Tabuena Cuevas, M. (2009). Lengua B1 (traducción e interpretación) y competencias. In C. Gómez Lucas & S. Grau Company (Eds.), *Propuestas de diseño, desarrollo e innovaciones curriculares y metodología en el EEES* (pp. 121-134). Marfil.
- Mackenzie, R. (1998). The place of language teaching in a quality oriented translators' training programme. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation & Language Teaching. Language Teaching & Translation* (pp. 15-20). Routledge.
- Malmkjær, K. (Ed.) (1998). *Translation & Language Teaching. Language Teaching & Translation*. Routledge.
- Möller Runge, J. (2001). *Siglo XXI: ¿Innovamos? La enseñanza de una segunda lengua extranjera*. Alhulia.
- Möller Runge, J. & Burbat, R. (2004). Fremdsprachenvermittlung in der Übersetzer Ausbildung: Vorstellung eines am Fremdesprachenwachstums orientierten Konzepts. In E. Fleischmann, P. A. Schmitt & G. Wotjak (Eds.), *Translationskompetenz* (pp. 647-658). Stauffenburg.
- Nord, C. (2011). *Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität. Theorie, Methode und Didaktik des funktionalen Übersetzens*. Frank & Timme.
- Oster, U. (2003). El fomento de la autonomía y el trabajo en grupo en el aprendizaje de lenguas para traductores a través de un entorno virtual de trabajo. *Quaderns: Revista de traducció*, 10, 79-90.
- Oster, U. (2006). *Diversificación de la evaluación en la enseñanza de lengua alemana para traductores*. Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Oster, U. (2008). El reto de enseñar la lengua C en la titulación de Traducción e Interpretación (antes y después de Bolonia). In M. Cerezo García (Ed.), *De los proyectos de convergencia a la realidad de los nuevos títulos*. Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Pérez González, L. (1999). La didáctica y el papel de las lenguas en la formación de traductores e intérpretes. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 7(2), 265-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.1999.9961364>

- Recio Ariza, M. A. (2021). Fremdsprachenunterricht im Übersetzen und Dolmetschen im 21. Jahrhundert: Ausarbeitung eines auf dem Kognitivismus basierenden Entwurfes eines MOOC für den Unterricht der deutschen Sprache für zukünftige ÜbersetzerInnen und DolmetscherInnen. In A. Schmidhofer & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 139-162). Peter Lang.
- Recio Ariza, M. A. & Holl, I. (2012). Relevante Kompetenzen beim Fremdspracherwerb (DaF) in der Übersetzerausbildung und deren Bewertung vor dem Hintergrund des Gemeinsamen Europäischen Referenzrahmens. In L. Zybatow, A. Petrova & M. Ustaszewski (Eds.), *Translationswissenschaft interdisziplinär: Fragen der Theorie und Didaktik* (pp. 393-398). Peter Lang.
- Rico Pérez, C. (1999). Training the translator in a second language: a communication approach. In A. Argüeso Gonzalez (Ed.), *Traducción, interpretación, lenguaje. Cuadernos de tiempo libre* (pp. 53-64). Fundación Actilibre.
- Roiss, S. (2015). DaF für Übersetzer: Die zielgruppengerechte Vermittlung unter lernpsychologischen, methodologischen und textlinguistischen Aspekten. In M. A. Recio Ariza et al. (Eds.), *Interacciones – Wechselwirkungen* (pp. 77-91). Peter Lang.
- Roiss, S. (2021). Methodologische Überlegungen hinsichtlich einer TILLT- DaFAusbildung: ein holistisches handlungsorientiertes Unterrichtsmodell. In A. Schmidhofer & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 87-112). Peter Lang.
- Ruzicka Kenfel, V. (2003). Lengua alemana en traducción/interpretación: un concepto particular de la enseñanza de alemán como lengua extranjera. *Babel-AFIAL*, 12, 5-29.
- Schmidhofer, A. (2013). La especificidad de la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera en los Estudios de Traducción. *Alfinge*, 25, 95-114.
- Schmidhofer, A. (2019). Sprachdidaktik und Translationswissenschaft. *MTM*, 11, 157-184.
- Schmidhofer, A. (2020a). Fremdsprachenmethodik aus translationsorientierter Perspektive. In L. Zybatow & A. Petrova (Eds.), *Was ist und was soll Translationswissenschaft? Beiträge zur Translata III* (pp. 115-120). Peter Lang.
- Schmidhofer, A. (2020b). Translationsorientierte Fremdsprachenkompetenz: Versuch einer Modellierung. In A. Schmidhofer & A. Wußler (Eds.), *Bausteine translationsorientierter Sprachkompetenz und translatorischer Basiskompetenzen* (pp. 21-33). Innsbruck University Press.
- Schmidhofer, A. & Ahmann, H. (2015). Translationsrelevanter Fremdsprachenunterricht: Besonderheiten und Zielsetzungen. *Moderne Sprachen*, 59(1), 49-70.
- Schmidhofer, A. & Cerezo Herrero, E. (Eds.) (2021). *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes*. Peter Lang.
- Schmidhofer, A. & Wußler, A. (Eds.) (2020). *Bausteine translationsorientierter Sprachkompetenz und translatorischer Basiskompetenzen*. Innsbruck University Press.
- Schwarz, E. (2020). „Wir können nur bedingt mit Lehrwerken arbeiten.“ Über die Anforderungen an Lehrwerke und translationsorientierten Sprachunterricht. In U. Stachl-Peier & E. Schwarz (Eds.), *Ressourcen und Instrumente der translationsrelevanten Hochschuldidaktik* (pp. 73-92). Frank & Timme.
- Seidl, E. & Janisch, E. (2019). What a difference language teaching makes in translator training. In M. Koletnik, & N. Froeliger (Eds.), *Translation and Language Teaching. Continuing the Dialogue* (pp. 171-188). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Seidl, E. (2021). ‘Translation and interpreting oriented language learning and teaching’ (TILLT) als hochschuldidaktische Professionalisierung. In A. Schmidhofer & E. Cerezo Herrero (Eds.), *Foreign Language Training in Translation and Interpreting Programmes* (pp. 45-68). Peter Lang.
- Singer, N. (2016). A proposal for language teaching in translator training programmes using data-driven learning in a task-based approach. *International Journal of English and Translation Studies*, 4(2), 155-167.

Stachl-Peier, U. & Schwarz, E. (Eds.) (2020). *Ressourcen und Instrumente der translationsrelevanten Hochschuldidaktik*. Frank & Timme.

Zojer, H. (2009). The methodological potential of translation in second language acquisition. In A. Witte, T. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 31-51). Peter Lang.

Notas

1. “that the existing literature on this subject was rather scarce and that most publications echoed each other”. (All quotes in languages other than English have been translated by the author.)
2. These include Dialnet, BITRA, Google Scholar, and ResearchGate, among others. Another important source was that of reference lists of other TILLT publications.
3. To my knowledge, there have been no previous publications on the topic. Even though I tried to access as many contributions as possible, some older contributions (e.g. Estelrich, 1998; Prüfer-Leske, 1998), quoted by Möller Runge (2001), could not be found.
4. “language teaching for translators needs translation as a professional activity as a reference to be able to determine its goals and also its methodology”.
5. “One can only learn to translate when one’s language and cultural competence has reached an appropriate level or has been selectively brought up to such a level”.
6. The terminology used by different authors is rather varied, including *competence*, *skill*, *attitude* and *awareness*, and these terms cannot always be clearly delimited.
7. According to the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001: 13), communicative language competence comprises linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic components. Linguistic competences refer to the language as a system, sociolinguistic competences to the “sociocultural conditions of language use”, and pragmatic competences to the “functional use of linguistic resources”.
8. “The communicative competence defined within the framework of the CEFR is undoubtedly also highly relevant for translator training, since the competences defined therein, both general and communicative, are part of the translator’s toolkit”.
9. “know how to correctly relate the parts that make up the communicative process, which are the sender, the receiver, the subject and the communicative situation”.
10. “the ability to totally understand a text and analyse all factors by which it is made up”.
11. “Due to communicative language teaching, students are trained to be foreign language users rather than mediators, which means that the opportunity is missed to lay the foundations for successful translation work already in language training. Thus, in language courses, metalinguistic competence, information mining about language, aspects of linguistic precision and accuracy as well as a comprehensive expansion of vocabulary beyond the immediate needs of the user play far too small a role compared to language action”.
12. “develop translation abilities on a communicative basis”.
13. The term *pedagogical translation* is widely used nowadays in international literature on language teaching. In English, however, the term *grammar translation* is preferred.
14. Until now, the point of reference has been mostly translation and not so much interpreting, which is due to the fact that interpreting is only taught at later BA stages or at master’s level.