

**“You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”**

Halina Sierocka

**Białystok Legal English Centre,
Faculty of Law, University of Białystok, Poland**

1. Introduction

As many scholars (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991; Jordan, 1997; Basturkmen, 2010; Northcott, 2014; Author, 2014; Champion, 2016) point out, teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) poses many challenges that teachers have to face. Firstly, they have to deal with ‘domains of knowledge which the average educated native speaker could not reasonably be expected to be familiar with’ (Tudor 1997, p. 9; Basturkmen, 2006). Thus, from the outset they have far less subject-matter knowledge or they have less conscious knowledge of a particular specialism than their students, despite the fact that they have significant experience in teaching and are familiar with academic texts and/or the skills involved (Early, 1981; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998; Basturkmen, 2010). Secondly, formal TESOL training is mainly concerned with General English so ESP teachers have limited possibilities to obtain professional training (Howard, 1997; Master, 1997; Basturkmen, 2010; Atai & Fatahi-Majd, 2014; Basturkmen, 2014; Krajka, 2014; Champion, 2016) or to refer to the research or guidelines in this question (Basturkmen, 2014), which is of crucial importance. As Richards (2001, p. 99) remarks: “exceptional teachers can often compensate for the poor-quality resources and materials (...) but inadequately trained teachers may not be able to make effective use of teaching materials no matter how well they are designed”. Moreover, they are frequently unable to consult other ESP teachers or subject specialists when confronted with dilemmas relating to subject matter content. Another problem, which affects and somewhat hinders the development of ESP teaching, is the fact that ESP courses are frequently held for a limited period of time or they are very narrowly angled and tailored to reflect the needs of a particular group of students and/or changing circumstances, therefore, formulating some rules of conduct and good practice becomes problematic.

The notion and the roles of the ESP teacher have to-date been extensively discussed by abundant researchers. Most academics agree that the role of the ESP teacher goes far beyond teaching (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Robinson, 1991; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998; Jordan, 1997; Belcher, 2006; Dale & Tanner, 2012; Hall, 2013; Taillefer, 2013; Basturkmen, 2014; Lesiak-Bielawska, 2015). Dudley-Evans & St John (1998, pp. 14-17) for example, introduced the term ‘practitioner’ encompassing the roles of teacher, course designer, materials provider, researcher, collaborator or evaluator, which reflects the variety of challenges and tasks that every ESP teacher has to face. Another dilemma which ESP teachers are frequently confronted with is the question of subject knowledge. Over the years a number of divergent views have been expounded on this topic (Ewer, 1983; Taylor, 1994; Dudley-Evans, 1997; Ferguson, 1997; Sifakis, 2003; Master, 2005; Belcher, 2006; Kim, 2006; Harding, 2007; Ses̓ek, 2007; Wu & Badger, 2009; Northcott, 2014). Some believe that the ESP teacher should be willing to acquire knowledge of the specialisms his/her students are studying, others are quite skeptical about it, sharing the opinion that ESP teachers need to be interested in the subject area rather than have subject matter expertise. An overwhelming majority however, highlight that a knowledge of fundamental principles of the subject area and/or an understanding of the nature of the material of the ESP specialism would be sufficient.

“You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”

Halina Sierocka

As presented above there has been a plethora of studies into the concept of ESP teaching, the roles of the ESP teacher as well as specialist discourse but research particularly into Legal English pedagogy and the role of teacher of English for Legal Purposes (ELP) is quite limited (Howe, 1993; Candlin et al, 2002; Northcott & Brown, 2006; Northcott, 2009; Deutch, 2003; Co-author & Author, 2013, Northcott, 2014; Author, 2014; Author, 2016). To a large extent this might be grounded in the specificity and complexity of Legal English (Melinkoff, 1963; Block, 1986; Bhatia, 1993; Pieńkos, 1999; Gibbons, 2004; Haigh, 2004; Ingels, 2006; Schane, 2006; Frade, 2007; Jopek- Bosiacka, 2008; Gotti, 2009; Cao, 2010; Eades, 2010; Bhatia, 2010; Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011) which may pose obstacles in teaching and learning ELP.

Also, as Author (2014, p. 16) points out many researchers believe that it is a convoluted task to attempt to make a distinction between the pedagogic content and subject matter knowledge while teaching English for Legal Purposes, which is confirmed by Howe (1993, p.148) who reports a conflict between herself as a teacher of English for academic legal purposes and a law teacher, over who should explain the phrase ‘time immemorial’ to students, with the law teacher’s famous comment: ‘You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’. This portrays the common attitude of subject specialists towards language specialists, who believe that learners should be taught the skills of English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and not the content of English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP). In this context, therefore, it is central to examine what the roles are of the ELP teacher (whether these roles are much different from those performed in ESP or even ELT teaching) and whether a model of the Legal English teacher could be provided in the least.

This paper presents the outcomes of the research the aim of which was to examine what methodology, teaching materials and assessment methods ELP teachers use to make the process of learning Legal English effective, what challenges and obstacles they face, as well as how they perceive the roles of ELP teachers. The paper also attempts to shed some light on possible ways of effective co-operation between language and subject specialists, which would not only develop their relationships and contribute to better language acquisition on the part of the law students but have positive implications for Legal English research and practice.

2

2. Purpose and context of the research

The aim of the research project was to investigate the model/role of the ELP teacher in terms of the methodological approach implemented, the outlook on university policy towards teaching languages for specific purposes, the possibility of cooperation with other specialists, and the challenges needing to be faced during their work. In addition, the research project endeavoured to provide the model and define the roles of the Legal English teacher.

The research was carried out at one of the Polish universities among teachers of the department of foreign languages who teach Legal English and teachers of the faculty of law who teach their subjects in English. As an outcome of the Erasmus mobility program, introduced in 2002 at that faculty of law, there are now 77 courses taught in foreign languages, 54 of which are conducted in English, 9 in German, 11 in Russian and 3 in Spanish, which provided the research project with a solid background.

3. Research methodology

3.1. Sample

The sample for the whole study encompassed 34 teachers working at the faculty of law, of this university. The research was conducted among 9 language specialists and 25

“‘You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

subject specialists. For the purpose of the research, it was assumed that a language specialist is an instructor teaching English to law students, whereas a subject specialist is an instructor teaching law in English.

Language specialists

There are 10 teachers teaching Legal English, all employed at the department of foreign languages (an interdepartmental unit of that university, providing services to all faculties), however one of the teachers (unfortunately a very experienced one) without reason refused to participate in the research.

All of the language specialists teach law students (mostly those in their first and second year of studies). Some (33%) also teach Legal English to legal professionals (judges and legal advisors) and occasionally to translators and academics. Aside from their teaching activities, 78% of the language specialists use Legal English in translation and court interpreting and 55% of them use it for designing their teaching materials for classes with law students.

The language specialists are all experienced teachers of General English (the least experienced teacher has been teaching for 13 years and the most experienced for 24 years). As regards teaching English for Specific Purposes i.e. Legal English, the range of experience is wider (from 4–25 years) but teachers with fewer years of experience (4-12 years) preponderate. In the main the language specialists have a degree in applied linguistics or English philology. Three of them hold a PhD degree in arts and one of them graduated both in English and in law. The majority of language specialists (67%) took up teaching Legal English because they were directed to teach at the Faculty of Law. It was not their intended choice or question of interest but a mandatory allocation within their work contract. Only one respondent (11%) commenced teaching Legal English out of attraction for the subject. Other reasons for taking up the post concerned: being burned-out after teaching General English for too long (11%), by coincidence (11%).

The majority of language specialists learnt Legal English on their own (67%), working mainly with authentic material. They also found attending conferences and workshops on Legal English useful in learning the subject matter (33%). Some (33%) believe they learnt a lot preparing for their classes.

Subject-specialists

27 subject specialists teach their subjects in English at the faculty of law. 25 of them participated in the research. Two of them, despite much effort taken by the researcher to contact them neither answered telephone calls nor emails. As far as experience in teaching law in their native language is concerned, there is a huge diversity here. This research group encompassed both very experienced instructors (38 years of experience) and those who have just started their professional career (2 years of experience). Most of the subject specialists however possess relevant experience (13 years on average) in teaching their subject. The subject specialists have been instructing law in English for 6-7 years averagely but there are some teachers who have been giving lectures for over 14 years as well as those who have just started teaching law in English. All of the subject specialists possess a PhD degree in law and eight of them (32%) hold the title of Associate Professor (*dr habilitowany*).

All of the subject specialists teach their legal domain in English to international students (mostly Spanish) who come to the faculty within their Erasmus mobility programs. The students are usually in their second, third or fourth years of studies.

In keeping with the language specialists, the majority of subject specialists (56%) started to teach legal English because they were asked to do so due to the Erasmus student

mobility programme implemented at that faculty of law. Unlike language specialists, subject specialists could refuse to teach in English if they felt their linguistic competence was inadequate. Some subject specialists took up teaching Legal English for professional development (32%), or because they wanted to be exposed to English (24%) or to improve their linguistic competences because they often participate in international conferences (12%). One respondent undertook to teach law in English because it represented a challenge.

The subject specialists learnt Legal English by various ways and frequently not by the same method. The most common way of learning subject-specific vocabulary covers working on their own initiative using authentic material (80% of subject specialists exploited this method) attending foreign conferences, workshops, overseas programs and scholarships (40%), attending Legal English courses and workshops (32%) and working on the preparation of material for their own classes (16%).

3.2. Research instruments and research questions

The research project mainly assumed a qualitative methodology encompassing a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview conducted with language and subject specialists (questionnaire and interview questions see Appendix A and Appendix B).

The research endeavoured to answer the following questions:

What is the university/faculty of law policy on learning/teaching foreign languages?

What does the cooperation between both groups (subject-specialists and language specialists) look like?

What methodology is exploited by both groups?

What is the model of the Legal English teacher?

The data essential to answering the research questions is both quantitative and qualitative in character. The interview carried out among all the specialists provided quantitative and qualitative data – firstly, the respondents answered the questions, then collected data interpreted and conclusions drawn. The specialists' reflections (with reference to university/faculty policy, cooperation with language and subject specialists, the methodology used, the perception of the role of the Legal English teacher) were of a qualitative character. Finally, further suggestions and recommendations were made.

4

4. Results of the study

4.1. Language specialists

University/faculty policy

This group appeared to be quite fragmented in the aspect of evaluation of university/faculty policy. 55% of the language specialists assessed the policy critically. They stated that there is in fact no policy at all as language specialists needed and still need to cope on their own (in preparing for and conducting Legal English classes) and obtain no help or guidelines from the university/faculty authorities even though those authorities claim that they do support learning and teaching languages for specific purposes. The language specialists also highlight that both university departments (the Department of Foreign Languages and the Faculty of Law) do not cooperate well as they do not contact each other on a regular basis and have a different outlook on teaching languages for specific purposes. In addition, the low priority given to learning foreign languages, the small number of teaching hours allotted and the large groups of students involved, were also emphasized. On the other hand, 45% of the language specialists hold totally conflicting views. They claim that the authorities of the Department of Foreign Languages and the Faculty of Law are aware of the need to instruct

languages for specific purposes, that language specialists may acquire new qualifications in this respect and that there is an emphasis on teaching languages for specific purposes.

Cooperation with subject specialists

66% of the language specialists, when asked whether they had ever sought any assistance or used help from subject specialists, admitted that they had consulted or do consult problem issues with subject specialists although their responses ranged from *frequently* to *occasionally* to *seldom*. One respondent regretted not contacting subject specialists more often whenever problems or dilemmas with subject-matter knowledge arise. 33% of the language specialists said that they have not used/do not use subject specialists' assistance as they can manage on their own using available sources such as law textbooks and the internet. Only one respondent of the latter group admitted that such assistance would be very useful.

Methodology

The vast majority of language specialists (78%) thought that background knowledge (knowing the subject matter) is not indispensable but could be very helpful while teaching and learning Legal English. Only 22% of respondents stated that it is central to achieving learning outcomes.

Similarly, most of the language specialists (78%) believed that B1 level, according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), is the minimum level of general English one should possess to take up ESP classes. One respondent (11%) stated that A2 is sufficient and one other (11%) that B2 is the absolute minimum.

As language and content intertwine during Legal English classes, language specialists and subject specialists were asked whether they rather teach the language or the content or maybe both. 56% of the language specialists believe they teach not only the language but the content as well, although the latter indirectly. 22% of the respondents think that they teach both the language and the content, whereas 11% trust that they teach the language and another 11% that they teach law in English.

The research shows that all of the language specialists (100%) may design and implement their own syllabus for Legal English courses. All of them (100%) design their own teaching materials although they do so to a different extent and at a diverse frequency. Most of them *sometimes* or *often* prepare their own materials, which usually constitutes 25% - 30% of the material workload. As far as authentic materials are concerned, all of the language specialists use them but at a varied frequency: *always* (11%), *usually* (33%), *often* (22%), *sometimes* (22%), *hardly ever* (11%). The respondents who scarcely use authentic materials comment that they do not use them very often as there are ready-made materials available.

All of the language specialists (100%) prepare their own assessment tests but the frequency at which they test their students varies. Most of the language specialists (66%) set assessment tests or quizzes twice or three times a term.

As regards the post-course questionnaire, only 33% of the respondents irregularly ask for students' feedback, whereas 67% admit to not doing so for various reasons. Firstly, such post-course questionnaires are difficult to be arranged. Secondly, the allocation of hours for learning foreign language in the curriculum is so limited that there is simply no time available to do it. Thirdly, some comment that they do not conduct such a questionnaire as there is a unit at the university, whose specific task is to collect students' feedback after completion of every course provided at the university.

Blended learning i.e. combining traditional methods of teaching/learning a foreign language with distance learning, thanks to IT devices, is becoming increasingly popular although this method has both opponents and proponents. As at the University of Białystok

students have the opportunity to take some of their classes (up 50% of the overall number of classes) in this form, the effectiveness of BLACKBOARD (e-learning platform) and other IT means for teaching Legal English was also included in the questionnaire. Only 22% of language specialists use that method and like it. Some of the respondents in that group (33%) are highly sceptical about this form of teaching. They commented, inter alia, that the teacher cannot be sure that students undertake allocated tasks by themselves without the help of others. Moreover, traditional methods, that is meeting and explaining problems and issues “face-to-face”, were considered far more effective. 33% of language specialists, however, highlight that such e-learning tools might be helpful as supplementary methods of learning a foreign language as students like modern technology. Also, they can undertake tasks when they have time and work at their own pace. One respondent (11%) remained undecided.

Most of the language specialists (66%) consider lack of subject-matter knowledge as the most challenging and/or difficult aspect of teaching English for legal purposes. Another issue (33% of the answers provided), and which surprisingly is of more general nature, is that it is difficult to motivate students and get communication across. Also, they highlight that the process of teaching is hindered by the fact that students themselves are unfamiliar with the discipline and somewhat expect ELP teachers to explain legal issues.

Model of the Legal English teacher

According to the language specialists, a good Legal English teacher should have features that are common to any teacher, not only to a Legal English teacher specifically. A good Legal English teacher should be open, fair, consistent but also flexible. Such person should have a good relationship with their students and be able to interest and motivate them. In addition, they should be well prepared, willing to broaden their knowledge and be ready to prepare for classes to best effect. The requirement of a law degree was mentioned by only one respondent (11%). Two other respondents (22%) found some basics of specialism an advantage but definitely not a condition.

6

4.2. Subject-specialists

University/faculty policy

48% of the subject specialists evaluated university/faculty policy towards teaching/learning foreign languages in a good light. They commented that there are numerous classes conducted in foreign languages, the staff (all of them with at least a PhD degree) are well prepared and continuously improving their linguistic skills attending foreign conferences and publishing in English. In addition, they underscore that the faculty authorities support new initiatives like establishing the Białystok Legal English Centre (a unit that organises legal English courses, conferences for academics dealing with legal linguistics and workshops for Legal English teachers, translators and court interpreters) or foreign law schools of different legal systems, however, some respondents suggested more specialised language courses for teaching staff. Nevertheless, 28% of the subject specialists doubt whether there is any policy to teach languages for specific purposes at all. Some comment that if not for the Erasmus mobility programs and the criterion of international cooperation in the national university rank lists, the policy would hardly exist. Others remark that they cannot say whether it is pursued or not, no practical outcomes can be observed or maybe it is not advertised enough. 12% of the subject specialists evaluate the policy quite critically. They highlight that the number of initiatives undertaken is insufficient and the number of teaching hours inadequate. In addition, they remark that the policy is too student-friendly, which has a negative impact on the process of teaching/learning English for legal purposes. One respondent (4%) assessed the policy critically stating that there are too few teaching hours devoted to instructing languages

“‘You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

for specific purposes and with greater emphasis being placed on other workshop and training facilities, such as for apprenticeship examinations, as they are more valued in the university ranking criteria.

Cooperation with language specialists

When asked whether the subject specialists sought any assistance or used help from linguists 76% of respondents replied that they had neither asked for assistance before nor used their linguistic help on a regular basis. They explained that such help was not indispensable or that they did not like to bother anybody else, hence they used other sources such as dictionaries and the internet. Some of them admitted that such assistance would be helpful at times. 24% of the subject specialists stated that they had consulted some aspects with language specialists but qualified that such consultations had not become a regular practice.

Methodology

Subject specialists believe that background knowledge is central to learning Legal English. 60% of respondents stated that it is indispensable, whereas 28% said that it could be very helpful to acquire subject-matter knowledge in a foreign language. Some of them added that it rather depends on the legal domain which is being taught as some legal disciplines necessitate at least an introduction to the subject i.e. tax law or company law, whereas others such as constitutional law or arbitration do not require special preparations.

As far as the minimum language level to learn the merits in English is concerned, the subject specialists are relatively fragmented. 32% of them state that B1/B2 level (according to CEFR) is required, another 32% believe that B1 level is sufficient to learn language for specific purposes but 16% of the respondents define the minimum level as ‘intermediate’, which in fact may encompass both B1/B2 and B1 levels. One interviewee describes the minimum linguistic competence as “so the student could understand me”.

52% of the subject specialists believe that they teach the content i.e. law in English. Nonetheless, 44% of the subject specialists think that they teach not only the content but also the language. Surprisingly, one respondent cited teaching the language rather than the content “during my Legal English classes I teach the language i.e. Legal English and some aspects of law (indirectly)”.

All of the subject specialists (100%) may design and implement their own syllabus for Legal English course, although one comment was made that such a syllabus is not very creative as it reflects the syllabus prepared in Polish and is just translated into English. Also, all of them (100%) design their own teaching materials although at different frequency. Some prepare resources for every class, other teachers produce materials every two classes, others for the whole term. Depending on the legal discipline concerned, tailor-made materials constitute a larger or smaller share of the resources exploited during their classes. All of the subject specialists (100%) use authentic materials while teaching their discipline in English. Their exploitation is very high or high with 60% of respondents *always* using such materials and 20% using them *usually* or *often*. The remaining 20% of respondents exploit them periodically.

As far as testing is concerned, only 32% of the subject specialists prepare and set their own assessment tests or quizzes (typically at the end of each term or when the course is completed). A vast majority (68%) assess students’ performance by means of alternative methods, which regrettably as the subject specialists comment, is conditioned by the fact that their students hardly ever speak decent English. Therefore, essays, presentations, attendance and active participation are the most common evaluation criteria of student performance.

None of the subject specialists gather feedback from students after the course. 36% of them present the argument that this is the task of the evaluation department that deals with evaluation of all of the courses offered by the university. A massive majority (64%) do not provide any particular reason. “I didn’t know it is was necessary” or “I don’t know”, comprised the most common response.

The effectiveness of e-learning platform BLACKBOARD and other IT devices for teaching Legal English was critically evaluated by the subject specialists. 40% stated that it is not a good method as it promotes cheating; it may be convenient for students and teachers but legal domains and problems are best discussed and explained during traditional classes where students can ask questions and develop their skills in legal reasoning. Besides, numerous students and teachers prefer personal contact and frequently e-learning lessons look like a collection of tasks that might be sent as an attachment by email. Moreover, it has been commented that not all students (especially extra-mural students) are good at using technology, not to mention technical problems with the equipment and some disruptions of the internet connection. In addition, e-learning classes require an excess of preparation on the part of the teacher and self-discipline from students, which is not always forthcoming. However, 36% of subject specialists admit that it could be a valuable supplement to traditional classes owing to students’ interests in new technologies. In addition, it might be a good communication channel between students and teachers and a way of checking their knowledge. Only 16% of respondents stated that they use the method and find it either efficient or very efficient. 8% of the subject specialists found its efficiency difficult to evaluate.

There are four aspects which the subject specialists find most challenging and difficult to deal with while teaching law in English. First is the linguistic competence of the course participants (which is inconsistent and frequently of a very low standard). This results in more serious consequences and poses more problems. The subject specialists comment that they recurrently have to adjust the content of the lesson to match the students’ language level, which lowers teaching standards and makes learning outcomes difficult to achieve. Another challenge is the fact that classes are held in a foreign language, which, apart from being more time-consuming in terms of preparation, makes it difficult to convey subject matter knowledge with precision. This is closely connected with a third problem area, namely working within two completely different legal systems i.e. continental and common law, which consequently generates the problem of finding appropriate equivalents. Another sensitive area that the subject specialists refer to, is the fact that students often lack any content-related knowledge. Some of the subject specialists went so far as to comment that most of them are not interested in studying at all and treat the Erasmus mobility programs as an “Erasmus travel agency”.

Model of the Legal English teacher

The subject specialists believe that a good Legal English teacher should have the same features as any other good teacher i.e. to be competent and well prepared (both in terms of the subject specialism and linguistic competence). The teacher should also be student-friendly, patient, consistent, flexible and possessed of high communicative and interpersonal skills, thus one who can motivate students and convey difficult content in an interesting and interactive way. The respondents also highlight that a good Legal English teacher should use various and interactive teaching methods and constantly improve their qualifications. Surprisingly enough only 28% of the subject specialists expect a good Legal English teacher to have a thorough working knowledge of the background specialism involved.

5. Discussion

The first research aspect examined related to the evaluation of university/faculty of law policy on learning/teaching foreign languages, languages for specific purposes in particular. The results have shown that both groups have a similar outlook on the problem. Relatively the same number of language specialists (44%) and subject specialists (48%) assess this policy positively. Even though these numbers are comparable it is the group of language specialists that criticizes the policy more directly. 56% of the language specialists claimed that such policy does not exist and that the work of linguists is undervalued (large classes, a limited number of hours, no clear guidelines or support from the university/faculty). At first sight the subject specialists seem not to be so disapproving (only one respondent (4%) assessed the policy critically). However, responses from the remainder of this group might suggest that they did not want to provide explicit answers (some of them doubted the existence of any such policy and others evaluate the policy at an average level), which might be construed as indirect criticism.

Interesting findings concern the question of cooperation between the two groups. The results indicate that they have contrasting views in that respect. An overwhelming majority of the subject specialists (76%) have never asked for linguistic assistance, whereas the language specialists are more willing to consult problematic issues with subject specialists (although they do this on an irregular basis). In the author's opinion this is grounded in the fact that it is much easier and faster to resolve linguistic issues than subject-matter dilemmas due to the variety of resources to hand (dictionaries, word reference forums, glossaries, corpus lists etc.) and which are also readily available online.

The third area approached, and the most complex, relates to the methodology exploited while teaching English for Legal Purposes or teaching law in English. The research outcomes indicate that there are only two methodological issues (out of eight) in which both groups strongly disagree i.e. the role of background knowledge (knowing the subject specialism) and assessment methods. These divergences might, however, be explained by the specificity of each profession and particular circumstances. Although a relatively similar number of respondents from both groups agree that background knowledge could be helpful while teaching/learning English for Legal Purposes they present divergent views on the question of whether or not such knowledge is indispensable (78% of the language specialists believe that it is not, whereas 60% of the subject specialists think the opposite). Another (glaring) discrepancy concerns the approach to assessment and testing. Only 32% of subject specialists prepare and set their own tests and quizzes, whereas all of the linguists prepare their own tests and set them regularly. In the interviews the subject specialists explain that they have to use assessment methods other than tests and quizzes, such as writing assignments and presentations or even to make assessments on the basis of class attendances due mainly to the insufficient linguistic competences of incoming foreign students. In the remaining methodological aspects (minimum language level to learn ELP, syllabus design and implementation, exploitation of authentic materials, effectiveness of blended learning) the language and subject specialists' views are fairly alike. Both language and subject specialists believe that minimum B1 level (according to CEFR) is required before taking up ELP classes. Moreover, both types of teachers may design and implement their own syllabus (and they do that), prepare their own teaching materials and value authentic materials alike, although the subject specialists use the latter more often. Also, both research groups assess blended learning quite critically, opting for traditional methods of instruction where all doubts and dilemmas are best explained *ad hoc*, albeit with each conceding that e-learning tools could serve as a valuable supplement to traditional classes. Interestingly enough when it comes to challenges or difficulties the results show that both research groups face similar problems and

“‘You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

at least some of the problems are discipline-related, like the fact that the majority of language specialists lack subject-matter knowledge, whereas the subject specialists find teaching subject-matter content in a foreign language challenging.

Last but not least of the issues examined is the question of how both groups describe the model of a (good) Legal English teacher. Surprisingly, both the language and subject specialists provided fairly alike features of a good Legal English teacher, which might be the attributes of any teacher, not necessarily those of an ELP or ESP instructor. Both groups feel that a Legal English teacher should be fair, consistent, flexible, student-friendly, well-prepared and should constantly improve his/her qualifications. In addition, such person should be able to motivate students thus using various and interactive teaching methods to convey complicated content in an interesting and involving manner. Remarkably, neither group finds that a thorough knowledge and experience in teaching their specialism makes a good Legal English teacher. It is treated more in the vein of an advantage rather than a condition.

6. Conclusion and recommendations for further study

In summary, this research project has revealed that the language and subject specialists perceive the model and roles of the ELP teacher fairly alike. They share views on university/faculty policy, syllabus design and implementation, the effectiveness of e-learning tools and the use of authentic materials. In fact the only discrepancies refer to those areas which are discipline-related (teaching the language or the content, assessment and the role of background knowledge) which definitely could be solved or at least compensated by regular collaboration between linguists and subject specialists or by team working. Such collaboration or team working has to-date been widely discussed by a number of scholars (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Parker, 1990; Morsink et al., 1991; Barron, 1992; Gaffield-Vile, 1996; Jordan, 1997; Buckley, 1998; Dudley-Evans & St John 1998; Dudley-Evans, 2001; Barron, 2002; Basturkmen, 2006; Northcott & Brown, 2006; Dale & Tanner, 2012; Basturkmen & Shackelford, 2015; Author, 2016), who mostly claim that it could have a positive impact on the teaching and learning of English, and not just for legal purposes. Another problem which the study revealed is that there is a kind of “communication breakdown” or rather lack of communication between the two groups when they face problems falling into the other group’s discipline-related competence. Either they are unwilling to ask for assistance or use other strategies to dispel their doubts or dilemmas. Maybe it is the role of university faculty policy to make this cooperation work within institutional boundaries.

The author hopes that the present study has raised some questions which may provoke discussion and further research in the area in question, as there are several issues both of an academic and methodological nature that could be pursued as a consequence of this research project. Firstly, further study might seek to discover whether such collaboration or team working is feasible and effective. Another area worth examining would be to verify how it might function within institutional boundaries and what challenges and obstacles both groups could face. Finally, the implications of such cooperation for ESP/ELP classroom practices might be explored.

References

Author (2014)

Author (2016)

Co-author & Author (2013)

Atai, M.R. & Fatahi-Majd, M. (2014). Exploring the practices and cognitions of Iranian ELT instructors and subject teachers in teaching EAP reading comprehension. *English for Specific Purposes* 33, 27-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.07.007>

Barron, C. (1992). Cultural Synthonicity: Co-operative relationships between the ESP unit and other departments in *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching* 15.

Barron, C. (2002) Problem-solving and EAP: themes and issues in a collaborative teaching venture *English for Specific Purposes* 22, 297-314. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(02\)00016-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(02)00016-9)

Basturkmen, H. (2006). *Ideas and Options in English for Specific Purposes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781410617040>

Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>

Basturkmen, H. (2014). LSP teacher education: Review of literature and suggestions for the research agenda. *Ibérica* 28, 17-33.

Basturkmen, H. & Shackelford, N. (2015). How content lecturers help students with language: An observational study of language-related episodes in interaction in first year accounting classrooms. *English for Specific Purposes* 37, 87–97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.08.001>

Belcher, D. (2006). English for specific purposes: Teaching to the perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study and everyday life. *TESOL Quarterly* 40, 133-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40264514>

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315844992>

Bhatia, V.K. (2010). Legal writing: specificity. Specification in legislative writing: accessibility, transparency, power and control. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203855607.ch3>

Bhatia, V.K., & Bhatia, A. (2011). Legal discourse across cultures and socio-pragmatic contexts. *World Englishes* 30 (4), 481-495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.2011.01727.x>

Block, D. (1991). Some thoughts on DIY materials design. *ELT Journal*, 45 (3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/45.3.211>

Buckley, F.J. (1998). *Team Teaching: What, Why, and How?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452220697>

Campion, G.C. (2016). ‘The learning never ends’: Exploring teachers’ views on transition from General English to EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 23, 59-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.003>

Candlin, C.N., Bhatia, V.K., & Jensen, C.H. (2002). Developing legal writing materials for English second language learners: problems and perspective. *English for Specific Purposes* 21, 299-320. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(01\)00029-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(01)00029-1)

Cao, D. (2010). Legal translation. Translating legal language. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203855607.ch6>

“‘You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

- Dale, L. & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL Activities. A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deutch, Y. (2003). Needs analysis for academic legal English courses in Israel: a model of setting priorities. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2, 125-146. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1475-1585\(03\)00013-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1475-1585(03)00013-4)
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1997). Five questions for LSP teacher training. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*, 58-67. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (2001). Team-teaching in EAP: Changes and adaptations in the Birmingham approach. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*, 225-238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524766.018>
- Dudley-Evans, T. & St John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eades, D. (2010). Using English in the legal process. In J. Maybin & J. Swann (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to English Language Studies*, 197-207. London, UK: Routledge.
- Early, P. (1981). The ESP teacher's role – Implications for the 'knower-client' relationship" in *The ESP Teacher: Role, Development and Prospects (ELT Documents 112)*, 42-52. London: The British Council.
- Ewer, J.R. (1983). Teacher training for EST: Problems and methods. *The ESP Journal* 2, 9-31. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-2380\(83\)90007-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0272-2380(83)90007-0)
- Ferguson, G. (1997). Teacher education and LSP: The role of specialised knowledge. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*, 80-89. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Frade, C. (2007). Power dynamics and legal English. *World Englishes* 26 (1), 48-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.2007.00487.x>
- Gaffield-Vile, N. (1996). Content-based second language instruction at the tertiary level *ELT Journal* 50/2, 108-114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.2.108>
- Gibbons, J. (2004). Taking Legal English seriously. In J. Gibbons, V. Prakasam, V. K. Tirumalesh & H. Nagarajan (Eds.), *Language and the Law*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Private Limited. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/096394709500400207>
- Gotti, M. (2009). Globalizing trends in legal discourse. In F. Olsen, A. Lotz, & D. Stein (Eds.), *Translation Issues in Language and Law*: 55-75 Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230233744_5
- Haigh, R. (2004). *Legal English*. New York: Cavendish Publishing Limited.
- Hall, D. R. (2013). Teacher education for languages for specific purposes" in C.A. Chapelle (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Applied Linguistics*, 5537-5542. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1144>
- Harding, K. (2007). *English for Specific Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, R. (1997). LSP in the UK. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*, 41-57. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Howe, P. (1993). Planning a pre-sessional course in English for academic legal purposes. In G. Blue (Ed.), *Language Learning and Success: Studying Through English*. 148-157. London: Macmillan.
- Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511733031>
- Ingels, M. B. (2006). *Legal English Communication Skills*. Lueven: Acco.
- Jopek-Bosiacka, A. (2008). *Przekład Prawny i Sądowy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

““You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511733062>
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for Specific Purposes* 25, 479–489. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.10.001>
- Krajka, J. (2014). Student teachers and teacher students –telecollaboration in LSP teacher education. *English for Specific Purposes World* 43, Vol.15
- Lesiak-Bielawska, E.D. (2015). Specyfika pracy nauczyciela języka specjalistycznego (JS) a implikacje dla procesu kształcenia. In M. Sowa, M. Mocarz-Kleindienst & U. Czyżewska (Eds.), *Nauczanie Języków Obcych na Potrzeby Rynku Pracy*. 380-392. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Morsink, C. V., Thomas, C. C. & Correea, V. (1991). *Interactive Teaming*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Master, P. (1997). ESP Teacher Education in the USA. In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*, 22-40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Master, P. (2005). English for Specific Purposes. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. 99-115. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mellinkoff, D. (1963). *The Language of the Law*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Northcott, J. (2009). Teaching Legal English: Contexts and cases. In D. Belcher (Ed.), *English for Specific Purposes in Theory and Practice*. 165-185. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/mpub.770237>
- Northcott, J. (2014). Legal English. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Chichester: Wiley & Sons. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855.ch11>
- Northcott, J. & Brown, G. (2006). Legal translator training: Partnership between teachers of English for legal purposes and legal specialists. *English for Specific Purposes* 25, 358–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.08.003>
- Pieńkos, J. (1999). *Podstawy Juryslingwistyki: Język w prawie – Prawo w języku*. Warszawa: Oficyna Prawnicza. MUZA SA.
- Parker, G. M. (1990). *Team Players and Teamwork*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667220>
- Robinson, P. (1991). *ESP Today: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Schane, S. A. (2006). *Language and the Law*. London: Continuum.
- Ses̆ek, U. (2007). English for teachers of EFL – Toward a holistic description. *English for Specific Purposes* 26, 411-425. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2006.11.001>
- Sifakis, N.C. (2003). Applying the adult education framework to ESP curriculum development: an integrative model. *English for Specific Purposes* 25, 195-211. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906\(02\)00008-x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(02)00008-x)
- Taillefer, G. (2013). CLIL in higher education: The (perfect?) crossroads of ESP and Didactic Reflection. *ASp*, 63, 31-53 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/asp.3290>
- Taylor, M. (1994). How much content does the ESP instructor need to know? *TESOL Matters* 4, 14.
- Tudor, I. (1997). LSP or Language Education? In R. Howard & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*, 90-102. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Wu, H. & Badger, R.G. (2009). In a strange and unchartered land: ESP teachers' strategies for dealing with unpredicted problems in subject knowledge during class. *English for Specific Purposes* 28, 19-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.09.003>

““You teach them the English, Mrs. Howe, and we’ll teach them the law’
(Howe 1993, p. 148) – What is the model of legal English teacher?”
Halina Sierocka

APPENDIX A Questionnaire and interview questions for subject specialists

1. What is your education background?
2. Do you have any other qualifications?
3. How long have you been teaching law?
4. How long have you been teaching your subject in English?
5. Why did you start teaching in English?
6. How did you learn Legal English?
7. Who do you teach Legal English to?
 - a) law students /which year?
 - b) legal practitioners (judges, attorneys, legal advisors etc.)
 - c) translators and interpreters
 - d) academics (teachers of law)
8. Have you ever sought / Do you seek any assistance from language teachers while preparing the classes etc.?
9. How do you evaluate the university / faculty policy to teach languages for specific purposes?
10. Is background knowledge (of subject-matter content) indispensable to learn / teach Legal English?
11. What is the minimum language level to learn Legal English?
12. Mark the sentence which is true for you:
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English)
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the content (i.e. law in English)
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English) and the content (the law)
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English) and some aspects of law (indirectly)
13. Can you design and implement your own syllabus for Legal English course where you work? If yes, do you do that?
14. Do you design your own teaching materials? If yes, how often do you do that?
15. How often do you use authentic materials?
16. Do you prepare your own assessment tests? If yes, how often do you do that?
17. Do you conduct post-course questionnaire? If yes, how often do you do that?
18. Whose initiative is it (your own, the initiative of your department / faculty authorities / the initiative of the course organizer)?

19. How do you evaluate effectiveness of BLACKBOARD (e-learning platform) and other IT methods for teaching Legal English?
20. What is the most challenging/difficult aspect of teaching law in English?
21. What makes a good Legal English teacher? Enlist at least two/three features /skills.

APPENDIX B Questionnaire and interview questions for language specialists

1. What is your education background?
2. Do you have any other qualifications?
3. How long have you been teaching English?
4. How long have you been teaching Legal English?
5. Why did you start teaching Legal English?
6. How did you learn Legal English?
7. Who do you teach Legal English to?
 - a) law students /which year? _____
 - b) legal practitioners (judges, attorneys, legal advisors etc.)
 - c) translators and interpreters
 - d) academics (teachers of law)
8. Apart from teaching do you use Legal English for:
 - translating and court interpreting?
 - scientific work?
 - designing teaching materials?
 - other things?
9. Have you ever sought / Do you seek any assistance from subject-specialists while preparing for your classes?
10. How do you evaluate the university / faculty policy to teach languages for specific purposes?
11. Is background knowledge indispensable to learn / teach Legal English?
12. What is the minimum language level to learn Legal English?
13. Mark the sentence which is true for you:
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English)
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the content (i.e. law in English)
 - During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English) and the content (the law)

- During my Legal English classes I teach the language (i.e. Legal English) and some aspects of law (indirectly)

14. How often do you carry out needs analysis before your Legal English course?

15. Can you design and implement your own syllabus for Legal English course? If yes, do you do that?
16. Do you design your own teaching materials? If yes, how often do you do that?
17. How often do you use authentic materials?
18. Do you prepare your own assessment tests? If yes, how often do you do that?
19. Do you conduct post-course questionnaire? If yes, how often do you do that?
20. Whose initiative is it (your own, the initiative of your department / faculty authorities / the initiative of the course organizer)?
21. What type of syllabus do you exploit during Legal English classes:
 - Grammatical (focused on grammar)
 - Lexical (focused on vocabulary)
 - Grammatical-lexical
 - Situational (like ‘In the street’ etc.)
 - Topic-based (like ‘Food and drink’)
 - Notional (notions are concepts that language can express like ‘time’, ‘place’, ‘colour’ etc.)
 - Functional-notional (functions are things you can do with language like ‘promising’, ‘identifying’ etc.)
 - Mixed or ‘multi-strand’
22. How do you evaluate effectiveness of BLACKBOARD (e-learning platform) and other IT methods for teaching Legal English?
23. What is the most challenging/difficult aspect of teaching Legal English?
24. What makes a good Legal English teacher? Enlist at least two/three features /skills.