

The Yaşar University Legal English Center: A Response to the Challenges of Providing Legal English and English as a Medium of Instruction in Law Courses

David Brody, Ian Collins, Tuğba Akdemir Kamalı

Faculty of Law, Yaşar University

Yaşar University, Üniversite caddesi, No:37-39, Ağaçlı Yol, Bornova,
İzmir 35100, Turkey

david.brody@yasar.edu.tr,
tugba.kamali@yasar.edu.tr

ian.collins@yasar.edu.tr,

Abstract

In 2015, the Yaşar University Faculty of Law adopted a model of legal education in which students must take 30% of their courses in English, comprising both English as the medium of instruction (EMI) courses and English for Specific Legal Purposes (ESLP) support courses. Previous research, although not extensive, has suggested that 30% English education programs like this may be problematic, and preliminary research by the authors into the implementation of this program in the Yaşar Faculty of Law bear this out. Among the problems identified by prior research in general, and confirmed to exist in the Yaşar Faculty of Law 30% English program in particular, are a low starting English level for many students, huge disparities in student language levels in the same classes, large ESLP class sizes, a lack of a coherent curriculum for EMI courses, and a lack of support for faculty in terms of teaching and assessing language. The authors propose to address these issues through the creation of a Legal English Center. This Center would provide a vehicle for conducting research into some of these problems, devising possible solutions, and sharing know-how and experience with other institutions experiencing similar challenges. The authors hope that students will benefit from this new Center both in terms of improved ELSP support courses and from EMI lessons in which language is coherently taught and assessed. The Center is intended to help instructors in the Faculty of Law to achieve these goals and to support the EMI community in Turkey more broadly.

Introduction

Education has seen huge growth in globalization over the last 20 years, with students and faculty having greater opportunities than ever before to travel abroad to study, conduct research, and teach. Initiatives, such as the European Bologna process, have striven to make qualifications portable and attempted to set baselines in quality, so that students and faculty can feel reassured when taking up these opportunities¹. In conjunction with these developments, the continued use of English by academics has consolidated English as the international language of academia.

Partly in response to these developments (though it also reflects the dominance of English in commerce and global communications), institutions of higher education all over the world have developed programs taught partly or 100% in English. Turkey is one of the countries that have embraced such developments, with more than 100 higher education institutions offering programs fully or partly in English². In addition to the most well-known state universities, the newer private foundation universities have particularly followed this trend, with most offering the majority of their degree programs taught in English. This extends even to degrees such as Law, where Turkish remains the language in which students will qualify to practice as lawyers but who study a certain proportion of their undergraduate degrees with English as the medium of instruction (EMI). The Higher Education Council, which is the central body responsible for university education in Turkey, has mandated that faculties that wish to offer such EMI Law degrees must adopt a mixture of 70% instruction in Turkish and 30% in English³.

Yaşar University Faculty of Law introduced its 30% English undergraduate Law degree in 2015 and all new students wishing to study for a Bachelor's degree in Law have been required to register for this degree since that date. In practical terms, this means 72 credits of the 240 required to graduate must be from courses taught in English. This

¹ European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and others, *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)* (EURASHE 2015)

² Julie Dearden, Mustafa Akincioglu and Ernesto Macaro, *EMI in Turkish universities: Collaborative planning and student voices* (OUP 2016)

³ Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Ve Yabancı Dille Öğretim Yapılmasında Uyulacak Esaslara İlişkin Yönetmelik, Madde 4, Resmî Gazete 23.03.2016, Resmî Gazete Sayısı 29662
<<https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=21475&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5>> accessed 26 February 2021

development happened almost overnight and, as can be imagined, was not without its problems. Not all faculty were able to teach in English and so the burden fell on a relatively small number of faculty who felt competent to do so. Student reaction was mixed to the development, reflecting some of the issues with EMI that will be discussed briefly later in this article. A scramble to offer a sufficient number of EMI courses meant curriculum development was characterized by fire-fighting rather than strategic planning. Traditional issues burdening Turkish higher education (high student numbers in classes, low student motivation and a lack of opportunity to develop critical thinking skills at school) exacerbated some of these issues.

Recognizing the reality that more is needed to be done for students to get the most out of their 30% EMI Law degree, the authors have developed plans to effect change through the establishment of a Legal English Center at the university. Briefly stated, its objectives are to improve the English for Specific Legal Purposes (ESLP) support courses that are offered to students during their undergraduate degrees; to offer support and training to faculty teaching EMI courses; and to share know-how and resources with other universities facing similar challenges. The article will outline in more detail some of the key issues facing EMI Law degree programs, then describe how the establishment of a Legal English Center can help improve the status quo. It will also set out future plans in which the authors hope the Center can become a hub of support and know-how from which stakeholders in EMI Law degrees throughout Turkey (and internationally) can benefit.

Issues with EMI and EMI Law programs

EMI education has been the subject of a limited amount of research in recent years but Turkish EMI higher education was the subject of an extensive British Council report in 2015⁴. A number of issues were identified in this report. One observation bears quoting in full:

“[Department] faculty clearly take little responsibility for language support for their students; support, when it is given, is largely a matter of vocabulary, and mostly employs translation;

⁴ British Council, *The state of English in higher education in Turkey. A baseline study* (British Council 2015)

<https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/sites/default/files/he_baseline_study_book_web_-_son.pdf> accessed 18 February 2021

and faculty make it plain that they have no other language-support strategies.”⁵

The report goes on to highlight, amongst other things, the lack of training available to faculty giving EMI lessons, as well as the lack of communication between content specialists and language teaching experts. There is also some suggestion that 30% EMI may be the worst of all options for a number of reasons since such programs often lack a clear pedagogical basis for teaching partly in English and are hampered by low student engagement and comprehension.

It is not the intention in this article to give a comprehensive review of the literature concerning issues with EMI education. Nevertheless, it is germane to what follows to acknowledge that EMI is not just about translating content into English and replicating a lesson from another language⁶. In order to be successful, particularly in contexts where English is not the native language, course content needs to be balanced with the pedagogical principles of language teaching⁷. Yet, as the British Council report referred to above notes, this idea appears to be little understood, let alone applied, in Turkish universities. This is not by any means a criticism of faculty charged with delivering EMI lessons. Since they have received little or no training in EMI teaching, nor are EMI curricula designed with these principles in mind, there is little wonder that faculty are unaware of the reasons why EMI education is challenging for all parties.

The problems experienced in the EMI courses at Yaşar support the research findings outlined above. While Law students are usually amongst the most successful students in the Yaşar English Preparatory Class (where the majority of students from all faculties spend 9 months in an intensive pre-sessional general English program given by the School of Foreign Languages to prepare them for studying in their departmental courses in English), it is challenging to support their further English development within their undergraduate studies. The general ESLP courses provided by the Law Faculty (Legal English I and II) in the first year of students' degree programs are handicapped by enormous class sizes. It is not unusual for there to be 100 students registered in a class. This has meant that those students in the most need of additional support

⁵ Ibid 100

⁶ Phuong Le Hoang Ngo, 'English Medium Instruction (EMI) in Higher Education: A Case Study of an EMI Programme in Vietnam' (PhD thesis, University of Southampton 2019)

⁷ Lyn Mastelloto and Renata Zanin, *EMI and Beyond: Internationalising Higher Education Curricula in Italy* (Bolzen-Bolzano University Press 2021)

for their English tend to drift to the periphery of lessons. Moreover, the logistics of catering for such large classes has meant that effective assessment of productive skills (Speaking & Writing) has not been possible. It is axiomatic to language teaching that students actively engage and produce the target language. To date, however, it has not been possible to design many courses in which this has been achieved. Feedback received from the faculty suggests that many faculty believe a significant proportion of students lack the necessary skills in English to be fully successful in their courses.

One of the systemic issues compounding these logistical problems of class size is the fact that a great number of students arrive in the Faculty of Law with apparently low levels of English, despite having graduated from the English Preparatory Class at nominally B1 level⁸. The “gap” between the attainment of students in English Preparatory Classes within Turkish universities and the level needed in their faculty EMI classes is well known. Moreover, Turkey lags behind most industrialized countries in respect of English language attainment⁹, one of the reasons most likely stemming from a lack of genuinely communicative language teaching in secondary education¹⁰. Turkish education has traditionally been dominated by teacher-centered lessons with an emphasis on rote-learning. In English lessons, this has manifested itself through a concentration on grammar to the exclusion of productive/communicative skills. While the English Preparatory Classes in Turkish universities try hard to promote communicative language teaching, a proportion of students seem to be able to navigate their way through assessments without achieving mastery of the level necessary to take a full part in EMI classes at undergraduate level. As a result, a number of students join the Faculty of Law apparently incapable of engaging fully with their EMI lessons. Anecdotally, it is also interesting to hear from faculty giving lessons in Turkish that these same students also struggle to communicate effectively and appropriately in their native language. Many of the issues identified by EMI faculty in the faculty when discussing students’ language abilities – lack of ability to construct a coherent oral or written argument, inability to select appropriate discipline-specific vocabulary etc. – appear to apply both to their English and their Turkish. This is, perhaps, the inevitable consequence of a system of secondary education that prioritizes coverage of a very broad curriculum in which assessment is done primarily through

⁸ By reference to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages levels – see <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>> accessed 27 May 2021

⁹ TEPAV and British Council, *Turkey National Needs Assessment of State School English Language Teaching TEPAV Project* (British Council/TEPAV 2013)

¹⁰ Ibid

standardized, high-stakes tests. Exactly what effect these first language weaknesses might be having on students' performance in English is currently unclear, but could be an area of future study.

Compounding these issues of the low starting level of many students is the fact that, despite what has been described above, a small proportion of students do arrive at the Faculty of Law with relatively high levels of English. Such students are often graduates of private high schools in which English has been prioritized throughout the curriculum and/or have travelled extensively or even lived abroad. Faculty of both ELSP courses and content-specific EMI lessons are then faced with the unenviable challenge of catering for classes of hugely mixed ability. The common outcome is a class in which both the strugglers and high-achievers are left dissatisfied and, more often than not, demotivated.

The issue of motivation generally in the Yaşar 30% EMI Law degree is also of relevance. As noted above, the demand for EMI programs is high all over the world and Turkey is no exception. In abstract, students understand the importance of English in a globalized world and can see how their career prospects would be enhanced if they were able to be able to do legal business using the language. Nevertheless, in reality, they often find it hard to see the point, particularly where they are being taught an area of Turkish law by another Turk. Understandably, they find it artificial to be discussing and asking questions in English, even more so when the topic is specifically one pertaining to the law of Turkey. This artificiality can be mitigated to some extent if the course in question has clear international links. This, however, would require a strategic approach to designing the curriculum that is not always apparent. In addition to this, students for whom English is a real challenge find it demotivating to be continually struggling in EMI courses, not because they cannot grasp the legal concepts being taught but because the language element has become a barrier. Such students are usually not under any illusion that a career advising international clients awaits them and so expect their 30% EMI degree to be no more than a certificate on the wall. On a day-to-day basis, it is not surprising that they lose heart and develop an aversion to the English language part of their studies.

As alluded to above, it is also fair to point out that the Yaşar 30% EMI undergraduate Law degree has not been carefully designed with the EMI program in mind. That is not to say that those who designed the curriculum did not spend many hours creating it or do not care how it fits together. However, the transition to 30% EMI had to be done very quickly

and, therefore, it was very challenging to redesign the curriculum in order for it to be delivered the following academic year. The result was that curriculum designers scrambled to offer sufficient EMI courses to satisfy the regulatory demands of the Turkish Higher Education Council. As mentioned above, this was made even more difficult because of the traditional pre-eminence of German in Turkish legal academia (a consequence of Turkey taking large amounts of its law from the Swiss and German legal codes at the birth of the Republic). As such, most senior members of faculty spoke fluent German but were not sufficiently prepared to teach in English. The result was that whoever spoke sufficient English to give an EMI course was corralled into service. In such circumstances, it was not possible to plan a coherent EMI curriculum. The available faculty each had their own specialisms and were prepared only to teach in their area of expertise. In some cases, these fit in quite logically with an EMI program. For example, Introduction to Common Law, which introduces students to the legal systems prevailing in most English-speaking countries, is based on sources written in English and is, therefore, ideally taught in English. Courses on international law, such as Human Rights law, which covers the European Convention on Human Rights, are also well suited to being taught in English. Other courses, however, have little or no connection with English. Overall, the EMI courses available seem rather random which does not promote communication between EMI faculty or the development of any common objectives. In addition, unlike students' core courses which often build on each other and/or have prerequisites, the EMI courses have no such coherence, resulting in students attending with little to no prior knowledge that can help them navigate their way through the course.

From a recent preliminary needs analysis project conducted into English-medium courses within Yaşar's Faculty of Law, it is also clear that content specialists in the faculty who give classes in English have received little or no training on how to integrate content instruction with language learning support. There is, it must be said, some academic debate as to whether EMI should include any emphasis on language rather than simply teaching content using English¹¹. However, in the light of some of the issues outlined above, the authors strongly believe that some sort of language support is essential in the Yaşar EMI program if students are to achieve their full potential.

As such, the Yaşar program should adopt some of the principles of content and language integrated learning (CLIL, corresponding broadly to

¹¹ John Terry Dundon, 'Cross-Examining English-Medium Legal Education' (2019) <<http://tesolal.columbia.edu/>> accessed 10 February 2021

content-based instruction, or CBI, in North America¹²). Communicative language teaching is premised on the idea that language learning is most effective when done in a context that is meaningful¹³. In a university EMI program, that means students master language best when they use it for a clear, academic purpose that contributes to their overall studies. CLIL is based around the idea that authentic content will be taught in the target language, with language instruction primarily taking place within the context of the content class¹⁴. CLIL lessons are an interwoven part of each content course's curriculum rather than separate support courses focused on raising the language level of students. At any given time in a course, the emphasis may be primarily on content or primarily on language, depending on the particular learning objective being covered, but one goal is to include linked components of both content and language. This dual approach requires faculty to have knowledge and awareness of both their academic subject and language teaching content and methodology.

In order to do this, Law faculty need extensive support in a number of areas. First, course design currently pays minimal attention to student learning outcomes related to general or discipline-specific English language attainment. This is not surprising since with one exception, none of the faculty giving EMI content courses, as opposed to ESLP, is a language teacher nor has had any training in designing language courses or teaching languages. Some of the faculty expect certain productive elements from their students. For example, presentations on various legal concepts form part of a number of the EMI courses. Likewise, participation grades are given for contributing to class discussions etc. However, students are given no support in achieving adequate performances for such requirements despite faculty complaining how badly many of their students perform in such tasks. Likewise, students are expected to master extensive technical vocabulary in some courses and then use that vocabulary appropriately throughout the course, both to understand the concepts being studied and to complete assignments and assessments. There are, however, no clear strategies for teaching such vocabulary other than translating them on a word-for-word basis, which is largely ineffective and prevents students from grasping the key

¹² There is some debate as to whether CLIL and CBI are the same thing. This article discusses this issue in more depth: Gene Thompson and Jim McKinley 'Integration of Content and Language Learning', *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (Wiley Blackwell 2018)

¹³ Marguerite Ann Snow, Myriam Met and Fred Genesee 'A Conceptual Framework for the Integration of Language and Content in Second/ Foreign Language Instruction' Vol 23 No 2 (1989) *TESOL Quarterly* 201

¹⁴ Gene Thompson and Jim McKinley 'Integration of Content and Language Learning', *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (Wiley Blackwell 2018)

ideas in texts used for the course. The ESLP support courses are designed to try to bridge the gap between what content-specialists would like from students and what those students can deliver. However, these ESLP courses are electives themselves and feature mostly in the 1st year of classes. Students have at most just 4 hours per week of such support, which is insufficient in the absence of any other language work, particularly in the light of some of the other issues identified above.

Second, the EMI faculty themselves do not necessarily see their role as teaching any language objectives in the course. If forced to do so, they may well decide that this lies outside of their field of expertise and/or academic interests and try to give up the course. Such a development would contribute even more to the issues surrounding curriculum design already mentioned. Even if amenable to including some form of language support, such support would have to be consistently applied across courses to have much effect, requiring some sort of coordination between faculty and those responsible for curriculum design. Currently there is no structure to facilitate the coordination of language learning objectives across courses and, even if there was, nobody in place to ensure consistency of approach. Any kind of piecemeal solution to such problems are, therefore, likely to be ineffective, causing more work for faculty with little result.

Third, the assessment of student achievement of language objectives is currently inconsistent and unclear. For the most part, EMI courses involve no formal language component in their assessments since no language objectives are expressly set out. However, many faculty concede that some sort of assessment is made of students' language capabilities as part of the assessment of courses. For example, some faculty give points for students' English in essay answers in exams, though this appears to be applied somewhat randomly. Moreover, rubrics are seldom used to mark such essays, and students are rarely expressly informed how they are being graded. Other faculty have an informal system whereby students are encouraged but not required to give academic presentations in English as part of the course. This may result in them earning a "bonus" for the overall mark, though again this is not formalized nor graded in accordance with a rubric. Nevertheless, content and language are taken into account. Only one teacher spoken to has express language elements in her exams, which relate to vocabulary. Likewise, students' written answers on exam papers are generally graded taking their language into account but again without using any rubric or set criteria for the allocation of marks.

Again, it must be stressed, such observations are not criticisms of the faculty concerned, all of whom expressed frustration with the status quo and a desire to adopt new methods to assist students to get more from their EMI courses. Assessing language objectives is a specialist task and should not be left to faculty without formal training or experience. Nevertheless, if language objectives are to be assessed, and it is the view of the authors that they should be, faculty need to be supported with training and assistance to achieve this. Help with developing language objectives and tying them clearly to assessment instruments needs to be given. Training in designing such instruments to effectively assess student learning outcomes must be provided. The grading of written and oral production using rubrics or criteria is a difficult skill that requires instruction and practice. Giving grades for ‘class participation’ is likewise a minefield where student production is not tied to a clear learning outcome, such that the grade evolves into a subjective mark for ‘hard work’ or a ‘good attitude’ that is very hard to measure, subject to unintentional bias, and not an indicator of attainment.

Some of the issues identified above may be specific to the Yaşar Law Faculty but are very likely to apply to many 30% EMI programs in Turkey and possibly elsewhere. Some of these problems may well be insoluble in the short term or subject to factors over which the Law Faculty has no control (for example, the level of English with which students arrive in the program). Nevertheless, by adopting a strategic approach and making a clear commitment to supporting language achievement by students, the authors feel measurable improvements can be made. The next section describes an initiative that is designed to address some of the problems.

The Yaşar University Legal English Center

As with most things, it is usually easier to spot problems in an educational context than to develop solutions. However, the establishment of a Legal English Center at the university will provide a vehicle for conducting research into some of these problems, devising possible solutions, and, importantly, sharing such know-how and experiences with other institutions experiencing similar challenges.

The objectives of the Center are quite simple. A principal aim is to create a repository of EMI and ESLP research so that all initiatives undertaken have a solid academic foundation. In fact, there is not an extensive body of literature in these areas and, ultimately, it is hoped the work of the

Center can contribute to the research available. Nevertheless, the Center will begin by collating existing relevant materials and will establish an easy-to-consult library of relevant work on the subject.

In short order, the Center will also conduct an extensive overhaul of its ESLP support courses to try to ensure students get as much help as possible to be successful in their EMI courses and, later, in their professional lives. Urgent action has already been taken to ensure class sizes are dramatically reduced, with the faculty administration agreeing that the existing groups will be split up into much more manageable sizes, enabling the faculty to conduct ESLP courses where students have the chance to participate actively and produce language. A needs analysis project is underway to establish key learning objectives for the students in all language skills. Extensive consultations will be held with all faculty teaching EMI courses to identify the key areas of focus. This will be an iterative process because, as will be described below, the Center will work with faculty to try to incorporate some formal language objectives into their syllabi and formalize their assessment. The ESLP courses will support this process. By way of example, if it is established that a particular format of essay will be used in some EMI assessments, the teaching of this structure will be incorporated into the ESLP curricula, as well as being a component of those EMI courses. As part of this exercise, an extensive review of materials is being carried out, though it is anticipated many materials will need to be produced in-house since the textbooks produced by international publishers do not fit the Turkish undergraduate context very closely.

In addition to redesigning the ESLP courses, the Center will work with EMI faculty with regard to incorporating language objectives and assessments into their courses. It should be stressed that this will be a cooperative process. No system or idea will be imposed on EMI faculty. The Center will act as a resource that the faculty can use to improve their courses and better support students' language development. This will include giving input on course design, assessing language components, and on pedagogical approaches that can be used to help students attain language outcomes. Assistance can be given on writing measurable language-based student learning outcomes and on how to use/develop materials to support them. It will also give assistance on the various ways in which such learning outcomes can be assessed, not only concentrating on formal summative assessments but also through using formative assessments during the course.

As mentioned above, support will also be given to EMI faculty on pedagogical approaches to language teaching. Incorporating well-designed language objectives into a syllabus is only a part of the process. EMI faculty have received almost no pedagogical training in their careers. They have certainly never received any training on how to teach English. Again, the Center will not be dictating to faculty how to design their lessons, what materials to use, or which approaches to adopt in their teaching. Nevertheless, the Center will be able to help faculty get the most out of their syllabi. For example, all faculty agree that they are responsible for supporting students learning discipline-specific vocabulary yet have never been trained in techniques to help students achieve this. The Center can help them adopt strategies for teaching that will make it easier for students to learn important vocabulary. Likewise, rudimentary discourse and genre analysis can help EMI faculty introduce required written work to students beyond pure content. The Center can help faculty with teaching such forms. The same is true for academic presentations. Until now, the most students could hope for in their EMI courses was modelling from the teacher or examples to copy. The Center can help faculty develop more effective strategies for supporting students in these areas. In summary, the Center aims to offer training in developing, teaching and assessing language objectives, which is also very likely to improve the overall performance of faculty in the classroom.

A further key aim of the Center, and one that is considered fundamental to its mission, is the notion of sharing the know-how developed with other institutions and programs. While the Center does house some expertise in the field of language teaching and ELSP, much of the research is relatively new. The concept of language teachers working closely with EMI faculty has often been suggested but rarely implemented, certainly in Turkey. Therefore, the Center has not been established to try to dictate best practice to anyone. Rather its goal would be to share the knowledge and experience of going through such a process and learn from other programs' experience in such regard. While the research and details of initiatives emanating from the Center will happily be shared, it also hoped it will act as a hub for the know-how of others that can be shared nationally and, possibly, internationally for the benefit of all students and EMI faculty. The result should be a repository of good practice that can benefit all stakeholders. This is not just a utopian dream, it is a way of establishing the teaching of EMI Law as an academic discipline in its own right and in creating quality benchmarks for the benefit of all.

There are other targets for the Center once it has established itself. Yaşar has not traditionally supported its students taking part in such events as

international moot court competitions etc. The Center can act as a focal point for encouraging student participation in such events. This will help establish a culture in the faculty in which internationalization is seen as important. This will also reinforce the notion of speaking English being a core competence. It might even be possible to publish a legal journal in English and to start providing courses in Legal English for practitioners.

Outcomes of the Legal English Center

The success of the Center will lead to many benefits for the Yaşar Law Faculty and, hopefully, the teaching of ELSP and EMI Law courses in Turkey generally. Students will benefit from more robust ELSP support courses, which will help them cope better in their EMI lessons. In addition, language will be a more clearly-embedded aspect of their EMI courses, coherently taught and assessed. Upon graduation, they will be better prepared to take part in the international legal community and play a full role as global citizens. Faculty will be supported more effectively in their EMI courses, with access to pedagogical know-how that will help them deliver courses more successfully. Syllabi will contain clear language objectives that are more effectively presented and assessed. Through fostering cooperation both between the faculty and the Center and amongst the faculty themselves, it will be easier to develop a coherent EMI program that fits into a strategically-designed curriculum. Taken all together, this should result in students and academics who are more motivated and confident to teach and learn in English. Finally, a successful Center can act as a hub of research and good practice and as a forum for the exchange of ideas and knowledge amongst all members of the EMI Law community.

Conclusion

The problems of the Yaşar University 30% EMI Law degree are almost certainly common amongst similar programs in Turkey, and probably around the world. Many students start their degrees with barely adequate English yet receive little support from the ELSP courses available owing to large class sizes and the mixed abilities of cohorts. EMI Law courses forming part of the undergraduate degree have a sense of being just bolted on to the core program, without a coherent reason for them being there, other than the faculty member teaching the course being proficient in English. Faculty members themselves are unsure or unaware of their responsibilities, if any, for language objectives in their courses. Any

language work done tends to be ad hoc and inconsistent. Assessment of language similarly lacks coherence and is largely unclear to students. Moreover, faculty have no training or experience in supporting students studying in English. The result is dissatisfaction on the part of all parties, which in turn leads to a loss of motivation.

The Legal English Center is a plan to try to address some of these issues by creating a hub for sharing good practice and know-how. Its establishment should lead to ESLP support courses that are more fit for purpose; better support for faculty teaching EMI courses in terms of assistance with curriculum and assessment design; and pedagogical training for EMI faculty to get the best out of their courses. Through the successful implementation of these initiatives, the level of Law Faculty students' English should rise, leading to a culture of success and increased motivation for using English to study Law. Through sharing such knowledge and experience, the Center can facilitate an improvement in EMI Law teaching within Turkey and possibly internationally. This can only be of benefit to the international legal profession and the academic discipline of Law.