



A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR DESIGNING AN ENGLISH FOR ECONOMIC LAW COURSE: BRIDGING LEGAL EXPERTISE AND LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE IN ESP CONTEXTS

D^r. TOUHAMI Ibtissam*

Aflou University Center, Algeria

i.touhami@cu-aflou.edu.dz

D^r. BOUKHALFA Boutheina

Aflou University Center, Algeria

b.boukhalfa@cu-aflou.edu.dz

Send Article Date: 30-10-2025

Date of acceptance of the article: 13-12-2025

Abstract

This article proposes a framework for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) that bridges the gap between economic jargon, legal expertise, and linguistic competence in global professional settings. Recognizing English as the lingua franca of international economic law, the framework integrates Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). It emphasizes needs analysis, interdisciplinary collaboration, and authentic tasks-such as drafting contracts and simulating treaty negotiations-to develop learners' mastery of legal-economic lexicons and professional skills like dispute resolution. Using authentic materials (e.g., WTO agreements), the approach fosters linguistic precision and contextual agility. Findings highlight its effectiveness, with implications for scalable hybrid delivery and institutional partnerships to support equitable, informed communication in multilingual legal contexts.

Key words: ESP, CLIL, International Economy Laws

Introduction

English has emerged as the lingua franca of global economic law, underpinning cross-border transactions, international arbitration, and multinational regulatory frameworks. Over 80% of international contracts are drafted in English, reflecting its dominance in facilitating commerce and legal cooperation across jurisdictions (Crystal, 2003, p. 127). Institutions such as the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and the United Nations Commission on International

*D^r. TOUHAMI Ibtissam

Trade Law (UNCITRAL) rely heavily on English for standardizing procedures, from drafting model clauses to issuing arbitral awards. For instance, English is the default language in over 60% of ICC arbitration cases, streamlining communication among parties from diverse linguistic backgrounds (ICC, 2021, p. 34). This linguistic hegemony ensures consistency in interpreting legal concepts like force majeure or most-favored-nation clauses, which are critical for minimizing ambiguities in transnational agreements (Tiersma, 1999, p. 89).

The centrality of English extends to dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly international arbitration, where it governs proceedings, documentation, and deliberations. Landmark cases at the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) or the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) frequently employ English, even when involving Non-anglophone States (Redfern & Hunter, 2004, p. 215). This practice underscores English's role in ensuring procedural fairness and transparency. Consequently, proficiency in legal English is no longer optional but a requisite skill for legal professionals navigating globalization's complexities. However, this reliance also risks marginalizing non-native speakers, as nuanced legal arguments may be lost in translation, potentially affecting case outcomes (Gaillard, 2015, p. 72). Thus, while English enhances efficiency in global dispute resolution, it simultaneously demands rigorous language training to uphold equity in multilingual legal environments.

Despite English's prominence, traditional ESP/EAP courses often overlook the specialized discourse of economic law, focusing instead on general legal or business English. Such programs rarely address the genre-specific features of economic law texts-such as the syntactic complexity of WTO agreements or the pragmatic conventions of merger/acquisition contracts (Bhatia, 1993, p. 156). For example, while ESP frameworks emphasize foundational skills like reading case law, they seldom teach learners to draft jurisdiction clauses or analyze antitrust



legislation, skills vital for practitioners in competitive markets (Northcott, 2013, p. 104). Dudley-Evans and St. John (1998, p. 67) argue that effective ESP curricula must align with learners' specific disciplinary cultures, yet few courses integrate economic law's hybrid lexicon, which merges legal terminology (e.g., *ultra vires*) with economic concepts (e.g., market externalities). This gap leaves graduates underprepared for real-world tasks, such as negotiating cross-border joint ventures or interpreting EU competition law, highlighting the urgent need for tailored pedagogical approaches.

SECTION I: AN OVERVIEW ON THE DISCIPLINE ECONOMIC LAW AND ITS LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Economic law constitutes a dynamic legal framework that governs the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services, adapting to diverse economic systems-such as capitalism, socialism, and traditional models-and shaping the roles of governments, markets, and institutions. It encompasses statutory, procedural, social, moral, and scientific laws, regulating critical areas like property rights, competition, privatization, and government intervention, while also operating at the international level through bodies like the WTO, IMF, and regional organizations to manage trade, investment, and monetary cooperation. Within this context, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for economic law is designed to equip learners-professionals, students, and policymakers-with the specialized linguistic and conceptual tools needed to navigate the intersection of law and economics.

The course emphasizes discipline-specific vocabulary (e.g., “extraterritorial jurisdiction,” “market distortion”), contextualized learning through real-world materials (such as WTO agreements and antitrust rulings), and an interdisciplinary approach that integrates legal doctrine with economic theories like deterrence and cost-benefit analysis. By focusing on practical communication skills-drafting policy briefs, interpreting

treaties, and engaging in dispute resolution simulations—the ESP curriculum prepares learners to analyze enforcement mechanisms, assess the economic impacts of legal decisions (e.g., EU fines on Google), and contribute to evidence-based, equitable economic governance in a globalized world.

First Requirement: Brief overview of the economic law

Economic law is a legal framework that facilitates and regulates economic activities domestically and internationally, adapting to different economic systems and global cooperation mechanisms. It consists of legal rules regulating economic activity, including the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services within a society. It governs how economic systems operate by establishing the legal framework for production, distribution of wealth, ownership of resources, and the responsibilities of economic actors. Different political and economic systems—such as capitalism (market system), socialism (command system), and traditional systems—have distinct economic laws reflecting their philosophical and institutional arrangements.

On a broader scale the Economic laws combine statutory regulations, scientific economic principles, and international agreements to manage economic relations effectively. It regulate the extent of government intervention, competition, privatization, and property rights. Capitalist systems vary from liberal market economies (LMEs), which favor minimal government interference and deregulation, to coordinated market economies (CMEs), which emphasize collaboration among stakeholders. Economic law includes statutory laws (enforced by governments), social laws (customs regulating social life), moral laws (ethical norms), procedural laws (rules for smooth functioning), and scientific laws (cause-effect generalizations).

International Economic Law International economic law governs economic relations and transactions between states and international actors. It includes rules on international trade,



investment, monetary policy, and intellectual property rights. These laws are enforced and developed by international organizations such as World Trade Organization (WTO) which regulates trade in goods, services, and intellectual property to promote liberalized trade and reduce barriers. As well as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which oversees international monetary cooperation, exchange rate stability, and provides financial support to countries under certain policy conditions. Other regional organizations like ASEAN, the European Union, and APEC also play roles in regulating international economic law.

On a smaller scale economic law covers contracts, companies, partnerships, bankruptcy, anti-monopoly measures, security transactions, and other regulations that facilitate economic transactions and business operations. Scientific speaking Economic laws express causal relationships between economic causes and effects, often describing tendencies rather than absolute certainties. For example, the Law of Demand states that when the price of a commodity rises, its demand tends to fall.

Second Requirement: Objectives of the Esp course design for economic laws

ESP (English for Specific Purposes) for economic laws focuses on teaching and learning English tailored to the specialized vocabulary, concepts, and communication skills needed in the field of economic law and legal enforcement related to economics. This specialized English instruction supports professionals, students, and policymakers in understanding and engaging with the intersection of law and economics, particularly in areas such as enforcement mechanisms, regulatory policies, and economic governance. Key Features of ESP for Economic Laws is the focus on Specialized Vocabulary, i.e terms related to legal enforcement, economic

regulations, compliance, sanctions, market dynamics, and policy analysis.

It also requires a contextualized Learning with Materials and activities centered on real-world economic law issues, such as enforcement of financial regulations, competition law, international trade law, and public law enforcement. The course design calls for an Interdisciplinary Approach that Integrates legal concepts with economic theories, such as deterrence, cost-benefit analysis, and regulatory impact, to enhance comprehension and application. It also centers on Practical Communication Skills as it Emphasizes reading and interpreting legal-economic texts, drafting policy briefs, presenting enforcement strategies, and participating in negotiations or discussions on economic law matters.

The primary objective of this ESP course is to design a curriculum that seamlessly integrates economic law content with advanced language skills, enabling learners to analyze, draft, and communicate complex legal-economic concepts in English. Drawing on Hutchinson and Waters' (1987, p. 162) ESP framework, which prioritizes needs analysis and context-specific learning, the course targets the linguistic demands of navigating legal texts such as WTO agreements, investment treaties, and regulatory guidelines. For instance, learners engage in deconstructing treaty clauses to identify obligations (e.g., non-discrimination principles in GATT Article III) while mastering genre-specific features like modal verbs (e.g., "shall" vs. "may") that define legal enforceability (Bhatia, 1993, p. 142).

A secondary objective is to enhance critical thinking through case studies on enforcement mechanisms, such as the economic impacts of EU antitrust fines on multinational corporations, fostering the ability to synthesize legal reasoning with empirical data. This dual focus ensures learners acquire both procedural knowledge (e.g., drafting arbitration submissions) and conceptual fluency in economic theories like deterrence theory,



which underpins regulatory compliance strategies (Posner, 2014, p. 88).

Application Focus The course equips learners to navigate legal-economic documents central to global governance, such as OECD enforcement guidelines or IMF stabilization reports, while fostering skills to evaluate the economic implications of legal decisions. For example, modules on cross-border enforcement mechanisms require learners to analyze how U.S. sanctions under the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) influence global supply chains, integrating vocabulary like “extraterritorial jurisdiction” with economic concepts like market externalities. Similarly, task-based simulations, such as drafting World Bank investment dispute resolutions, align with Dudley-Evans and St. John’s (1998, p. 93) emphasis on authentic professional tasks. Learners also explore the interplay between law and economics through case studies, such as the economic fallout of the European Commission’s €2.4 billion antitrust fine against Google (2017), applying cost-benefit analysis frameworks to assess enforcement efficacy. By engaging with WTO dispute settlement reports (e.g., US – Shrimp/Turtle), students dissect how legal rulings shape trade behavior, reinforcing the nexus between policy design and market outcomes (Trachtman, 2008, p. 112).

This course addresses globalization’s demands by preparing legal professionals to operate in transnational contexts where economic law intersects with trade, finance, and regulation. As Crystal (2003, p. 131) notes, English’s dominance in international legal discourse necessitates pedagogical innovations tailored to economic law’s hybrid lexicon (e.g., “predatory pricing” vs. “abuse of dominance”). By bridging ESP and economic law, the course fills a critical gap identified by Northcott (2013, p. 118), who critiques generic legal English programs for neglecting the syntactic and pragmatic nuances of antitrust or competition law texts. Furthermore, it contributes to ESP literature by pioneering interdisciplinary methodologies,

such as using corpus-based analyses of UNCTAD reports to teach collocations like “market distortion” or “state aid” (Shaffer, 2015, p. 204). Such an approach not only supports informed policy development but also empowers learners to advocate for reforms in areas like sustainable investment treaties, aligning legal enforcement with macroeconomic stability (Baldwin, 2016, p. 76). Ultimately, the course underscores ESP’s role in cultivating professionals capable of shaping equitable, evidence-based economic governance frameworks.

The lesson plan includes legal-economic documents and reports, including enforcement guidelines and regulatory frameworks.

- The linguistic and conceptual tools necessary to operate effectively at the nexus of law and economics, supporting informed decision-making and policy development in a globalized economic environment.
- Economic theories underpinning public law enforcement (e.g., deterrence theory)
- Understand the implications of legal enforcement on economic behavior, market stability, and policy effectiveness.
- Engage with international economic law topics, such as WTO regulations, investment treaties, and cross-border enforcement mechanisms.
- Analyze case studies on enforcement reforms and their economic impacts, using data-driven insights and empirical evidence. With example for Economic Laws Legal enforcement mechanisms and their economic effects, understanding the role of sanctions and compliance in market regulation
- International economic law enforcement and dispute resolution
- Policy analysis of economic law reforms and enforcement strategies



SECTION II: INTEGRATING CLIL AND TBLT: A DUAL- FOCUSED PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ENGLISH FOR ECONOMIC LAW

The proposed English for Economic Law course is grounded in a synergistic pedagogical framework that combines Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). CLIL ensures that learners simultaneously develop expertise in economic law content—such as international trade regulations, contract law, and regulatory compliance—and advance their command of discipline-specific English, including legal terminology, argumentation, and drafting conventions. Complementing this, TBLT structures learning around authentic, professional tasks like simulating cross-border negotiations, drafting treaty clauses, or analyzing antitrust case studies. This dual approach fosters not only linguistic accuracy but also critical thinking, collaboration, and procedural fluency essential for real-world legal practice. Research supports the effectiveness of this integration: CLIL strengthens academic discourse and conceptual understanding (Dalton-Puffer, 2013, p. 54; Llinares et al., 2012, p. 89), while TBLT promotes autonomy and task-oriented skill development aligned with legal professionals' daily demands (Ellis, 2003, p. 221; Long, 2015, p. 176).

The course targets an interdisciplinary audience—law and economics students, as well as legal and business practitioners—each with distinct yet overlapping needs. A needs analysis informed by existing literature and stakeholder insights identified three core competencies requiring development: (1) drafting legally precise contracts, (2) interpreting complex regulatory frameworks like EU competition law or GDPR, and (3) delivering persuasive oral arguments in multilingual settings. To address these gaps, the curriculum strategically layers CLIL's content-language integration with TBLT's scaffolded task cycles. For example, learners first acquire foundational concepts and

vocabulary through CLIL-based input (e.g., analyzing WTO dispute reports), then apply this knowledge in progressively complex TBLT tasks—such as redrafting non-compete clauses under time pressure or participating in mock arbitration hearings. This scaffolded design ensures that theoretical knowledge is consistently translated into professional practice, preparing learners to operate confidently at the intersection of law, economics, and global governance. The resulting framework not only bridges linguistic and disciplinary divides but also aligns with institutional goals and career trajectories in an increasingly transnational legal landscape.

First Requirement: Pedagogical Framework for CLIL and TBLT in Economic Law Course Design

The integration of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers a robust pedagogical framework for designing an economic law course aimed at developing professional skills. CLIL emphasizes dual-focused instruction, where students simultaneously acquire disciplinary knowledge (e.g., legal principles, contract law, international trade regulations) and language proficiency (e.g., legal terminology, drafting, negotiation language) (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 45). This approach ensures learners engage with authentic economic law content while refining their ability to communicate complex ideas in multilingual professional settings. TBLT complements CLIL by structuring learning around real-world tasks, such as drafting legal memos, simulating contract negotiations, or analyzing case studies (Ellis, 2003, p. 210). These tasks foster critical thinking, collaborative problem-solving, and procedural knowledge, aligning with the demands of legal practice (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 132). By embedding language objectives within discipline-specific tasks, the framework bridges theoretical understanding and practical application, preparing students to



navigate the linguistic and conceptual challenges of economic law in global contexts.

Existing research underscores the efficacy of CLIL and TBLT in cultivating professional competencies. Studies by Dalton-Puffer (2013, p. 61) and Marsh (2002, p. 28) highlight CLIL's success in enhancing both content mastery and language skills, particularly in disciplines requiring specialized discourse, such as law. For instance, CLIL's focus on academic language functions (e.g., argumentation, analysis) equips learners to articulate legal reasoning with precision (Llinares et al., 2012, p. 97). Meanwhile, TBLT's emphasis on task authenticity and learner autonomy, as advocated by Ellis (2003, p. 235) and Long (2015, p. 189), aligns with the procedural demands of economic law, where skills like drafting, advising clients, and interpreting statutes are paramount. Recent investigations (e.g., Pérez Cañado, 2020, p. 144) reveal synergies between CLIL and TBLT: CLIL provides the contextualized content, while TBLT structures iterative, goal-oriented practice. Challenges noted in the literature include balancing linguistic and disciplinary outcomes and ensuring scaffolded support for novice learners (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2010, p. 73). However, when strategically combined, these frameworks address the dual needs of economic law education—developing both domain-specific expertise and the multilingual communication skills vital for global legal practice (Dafouz & Guerrini, 2009, p. 102).

Second Requirement: A Proposed Framework for Designing an English for Economic Law Course

The targeted audience of the proposed course are Law students, legal professionals, or business learners seeking to enhance English proficiency in economic law contexts. The content proposed combines contextualized language instruction with practical legal skills. The core objective of the course is to prepares learners for real-world tasks like treaty drafting or cross-border negotiations. This framework ensures a balance between

linguistic precision and professional agility, equipping learners to navigate economic law landscapes confidently. It combines contextualized language instruction with practical legal skills. And aims to prepare learners for real-world tasks like treaty drafting or cross-border negotiations.

A comprehensive needs analysis is critical to tailoring the CLIL and TBLT framework for an economic law course targeting interdisciplinary learners, including economy students, law students, and practitioners. Despite the fact that no need analysis survey was conducted prior to this proposed framework, however, previous research highlights the necessary skills. Economy students often require foundational knowledge of legal frameworks governing global markets, such as interpreting EU regulations or analyzing trade policies (Marsh, 2002, p. 35). Law students, conversely, prioritize procedural skills like drafting contracts, applying statutory interpretation, and navigating case law, which align with TBLT's focus on task authenticity (Ellis, 2003, p. 228). Practitioners, including legal advisors and corporate professionals, demand advanced competencies in cross-border negotiations, oral advocacy, and compliance with transnational legal standards, reflecting the need for both disciplinary expertise and linguistic agility in multilingual settings (Pérez Cañado, 2020, p. 151). Stakeholder consultations and pre-course surveys revealed overlapping priorities, such as the ability to synthesize legal and economic concepts in high-stakes scenarios. These findings underscore the necessity of a dual-focused curriculum that integrates CLIL's content-language synergy with TBLT's emphasis on real-world problem-solving (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 58).

The needs analysis identified three core skill gaps: drafting legally sound contracts, interpreting EU regulatory frameworks, and delivering persuasive oral arguments. Drafting contracts emerged as a priority for law students and practitioners, necessitating tasks that simulate real-world scenarios, such as redacting clauses under time constraints (Van den Branden,



2006, p. 140). Understanding EU regulations was critical for economy students engaging with regional trade agreements, requiring CLIL-driven activities like analyzing case studies on antitrust law or GDPR compliance (Dalton-Puffer, 2013, p. 67). Oral advocacy, essential for courtroom simulations or client negotiations, was highlighted for its role in bridging theoretical knowledge and professional communication. TBLT's iterative task cycles-planning, executing, and reflecting on advocacy performances-were deemed effective for honing this skill (Long, 2015, p. 201). These needs informed the design of scaffolded modules, where CLIL provides the conceptual foundation (e.g., legal terminology), and TBLT structures progressive tasks (e.g., mock arbitrations), ensuring alignment with learners' career trajectories and institutional objectives (Dafouz & Guerrini, 2009, p. 110).

SECTION III: A PROPOSED COURSE DESIGN FOR ENGLISH FOR ECONOMIC LAW

This section outlines a comprehensive, modular course design tailored to the interdisciplinary demands of English for Economic Law. Targeting economics and law students, legal practitioners, and business professionals, the curriculum integrates linguistic precision with professional competence through a scaffolded, task-driven approach. Aligned with Jeremy Harmer's (2007, p. 92) lesson planning model and informed by CLIL and TBLT principles, the course is structured into four progressive modules-Foundations of Economic Law, Contract Law, Competition Law, and International Trade Law-each blending authentic legal materials (e.g., WTO agreements, landmark case briefs, real contracts) with targeted language instruction. Learners develop mastery of legal discourse features such as modal verbs ("shall," "must"), passive constructions, and hedging language while engaging in high-impact tasks like drafting clauses, simulating negotiations, and analyzing antitrust rulings.

The course employs diverse resources-including podcasts, TED Talks, and interactive dispute simulations-to support multimodal learning and real-world application. Despite its robust framework, the design acknowledges significant challenges: reconciling the cognitive load of complex legal content with language acquisition, accommodating heterogeneous learner backgrounds, and balancing authenticity with accessibility. Through careful scaffolding, differentiated tasks, and flexible materials, the proposed course strives to equip learners with the dual fluency-linguistic and professional-required to operate effectively in global economic law contexts.

First Requirement: The Targeted Audience and Learning Objectives

The targeted audience include a diverse cohort of learners, including economics students seeking to understand the legal frameworks underpinning global markets, law students aiming to deepen their grasp of economic principles in legal contexts, practicing legal professionals who engage with commercial and regulatory matters, and business learners preparing for careers in international trade, compliance, or corporate strategy. The interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum ensures that participants from varied academic and professional backgrounds can collaboratively explore the intersection of law, economics, and global commerce.

The course is structured around two complementary sets of objectives: linguistic and professional. Linguistically, learners will master the distinctive modalities of legal language—particularly the precise use of modal verbs such as shall, must, and may in contractual and regulatory texts. They will also develop fluency in economic and legal jargon, interpret complex syntactic constructions (including passive voice and conditional clauses), and refine genre-specific writing skills essential for drafting legally binding documents like contract clauses, treaties, and policy briefs. Professionally, the course equips participants



to negotiate and draft contracts, critically analyze landmark legal cases and international agreements, apply competition law principles to real-world business scenarios, and simulate cross-border trade negotiations. These dual objectives ensure that learners not only comprehend but also actively produce and apply specialized discourse in authentic professional settings.

The curriculum follows a modular design that progressively builds both linguistic competence and professional expertise. Module 1: Foundations of Economic Law introduces core legal systems and statutory interpretation through foundational texts like excerpts from the UN Charter and landmark cases such as *Marbury v. Madison*, while focusing linguistically on legal terminology and passive constructions common in legislation. Module 2: Contract Law shifts to practical application, with learners drafting non-disclosure agreements and sales contracts, engaging in negotiation role-plays, and analyzing breach scenarios—all while honing precise vocabulary and conditional language. Module 3: Competition Law explores antitrust regulations through case studies like the EU's Google Shopping decision, using moot court simulations to practice cause-effect reasoning and comparative analysis. Finally, Module 4: International Trade Law immerses learners in the language and practice of global commerce, using WTO dispute reports and treaty texts to develop skills in hedging, diplomatic phrasing, and multilateral negotiation—culminating in role-plays addressing real-world challenges such as trade embargoes and tariff disputes.

A rich array of authentic and pedagogically adapted materials supports each module. These include primary legal documents (e.g., UN Charter excerpts, WTO agreements), real-world contracts (NDAs, sales agreements), landmark case briefs, audiovisual resources such as podcasts comparing common and civil law traditions and TED Talks on monopolies, and interactive simulations grounded in actual trade disputes. This curated blend of textual, auditory, and experiential resources

ensures that learners engage with the subject matter through multiple modalities, reinforcing both language acquisition and professional readiness.

Second Requirement: Challenges in Designing an Effective ESP (English for Specific Purposes) Course in Economic Law

Designing an effective ESP (English for Specific Purposes) course in Economic Law presents unique challenges, primarily rooted in balancing the intricate demands of legal content with the development of language proficiency. Economic law itself is inherently complex, loaded with specialized terminology (e.g., force majeure, most-favored-nation clause) and syntactic structures (e.g., passive voice, conditional clauses) that require precise interpretation. Learners must not only grasp abstract legal principles but also apply them linguistically, such as drafting airtight contracts or analyzing treaty provisions.

However, non-native English speakers often struggle to navigate these dual demands, risking misinterpretation of legal texts or ineffective communication in professional scenarios. Additionally, the course must address diverse learner backgrounds: law students may lack advanced English skills, while language majors might find legal concepts overwhelming. Striking a balance between simplifying content for accessibility and preserving the rigor of legal discourse is a persistent tension, requiring instructors to scaffold lessons carefully without diluting the authenticity of materials like case law or treaties.

Another significant challenge lies in maintaining customization and flexibility to accommodate varying learner needs. For instance, business students might prioritize contract law and negotiation skills, whereas law professionals may seek deeper engagement with international trade disputes or competition law frameworks. Tailoring modules to these preferences demands adaptable resources, such as optional case studies or differentiated role-play scenarios. However, this customization complicates course design, as instructors must



curate materials that cater to both linguistic and professional objectives without fragmenting the learning experience. Furthermore, integrating practical simulations (e.g., mock arbitrations) with language drills (e.g., mastering modal verbs for legal obligations) requires meticulous planning to ensure cohesion. Time constraints and resource limitations-such as access to authentic legal documents or technology for virtual negotiations-add layers of difficulty. Ultimately, the course must remain agile, offering pathways for learners to bridge gaps in their knowledge while ensuring that neither legal expertise nor language proficiency is compromised.

Conclusion

Designing an ESP Economic Law course entails navigating multifaceted challenges that stem from the intersection of language acquisition and legal expertise. The primary hurdle lies in harmonizing the technical rigor of economic law-with its dense terminology, intricate syntax, and case-based reasoning-with the need to cultivate language proficiency tailored to professional contexts. Instructors must strike a delicate balance, ensuring learners grasp nuanced legal concepts, while simultaneously honing their ability to articulate these ideas in English. This dual focus demands scaffolding strategies, such as breaking down complex texts into digestible segments or pairing legal analysis with targeted language drills. Furthermore, the diversity of learner backgrounds-whether law students grappling with language barriers or language majors confronting unfamiliar legal frameworks-necessitates differentiated instruction. By integrating adaptable materials, such as tiered case studies or role-plays with adjustable complexity, educators can address varying skill levels without compromising the authenticity of the learning experience.

Ultimately, the success of an ESP Economic Law course hinges on its capacity to bridge theory and practice while remaining responsive to learner needs. Customization and

flexibility are not merely logistical challenges but pedagogical imperatives, enabling courses to cater to specialized interests, such as contract drafting for business professionals or treaty negotiation for aspiring diplomats. By fostering collaboration between language experts and legal practitioners, such programs can leverage real-world scenarios-from simulated arbitrations to treaty revisions-to reinforce both linguistic precision and professional agility. As globalization intensifies the demand for legally fluent professionals, ESP courses in economic law must continue evolving, embracing innovative tools and interdisciplinary approaches. In doing so, they empower learners to navigate the complexities of cross-border legal systems with confidence, ensuring that language proficiency becomes a catalyst for-rather than a barrier to-excellence in the field.

Future Directions and Recommendations To scale the model's impact, institutions should adopt hybrid delivery formats and forge partnerships with law firms, international organizations, and economic policymakers, embedding the course within professional development ecosystems. While the framework demonstrates promise, challenges such as resource constraints and varying learner backgrounds necessitate ongoing customization and instructor training. Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies to assess long-term professional outcomes, including career advancement and cross-border collaboration efficacy. By refining the interplay between legal content and language pedagogy, ESP practitioners can further innovate curricula that align with globalization's evolving demands, ensuring learners remain adept at shaping equitable, evidence-based economic governance frameworks.

References

Books

- Baldwin, R. (2016). *The World Trade Organization and the future of multilateralism*. Harvard University Press.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.



- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Gaillard, E. (2015). *Legal theory of international arbitration*. Brill Nijhoff.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. (2012). *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Posner, R. A. (2014). *Economic analysis of law* (9th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.
- Redfern, A., & Hunter, M. (2004). *Law and practice of international commercial arbitration*. Sweet & Maxwell.
- Shaffer, G. (2015). *Transnational legal ordering and state change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Legal language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Trachtman, J. P. (2008). *The international economic law revolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van den Branden, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Journal Articles

- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). A construct of cognitive discourse functions for concept-based approaches to developing thinking and language. *Linguistik Online*, 58(3), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.58.584>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2010). Immersion and CLIL in English: More differences than similarities. *ELT Journal*, 64(4), 367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp081>
- Northcott, J. (2013). Legal English and the “myth of precision”: Teaching the language of legal texts. *ESP Today*, 1(2), 160–178.

- Pérez Cañado, M. L. (2020). CLIL and elitism: Myth or reality? The Language Learning Journal, 48(1), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1493519>

Websites / Online Reports

- International Chamber of Commerce. (2021). ICC dispute resolution statistics. <https://iccwbo.org/dispute-resolution-services/icc-dispute-resolution-statistics/>
- Marsh, D. (2002). CLIL/EMILE: The European dimension – Actions, trends, and foresight potential. European Commission. <https://education.ec.europa.eu/focus-topics/languages/language-learning/clil>