HiLL PUBLISHING

Translation and Foreign Language Learning, 2026, 2(2), 375-383
https://www.hillpublisher.com/Journals/tfll/
ISSN Online: 3069-0315
ISSN Print: 3070-3077

Teaching Maritime Regulatory English through CLIL: A Domain-specific Model

Jie Gu

Foreign Language Department, Shanghai Maritime University, Shanghai 200135, China.

How to cite this paper: Jie Gu. (2026) Teaching Maritime Regulatory English through CLIL: A Domain-specific Model. *Translation and Foreign Language Learning*, 2(2), 375-383.
DOI: 10.26855/tfll.2026.02.028

Received: December 20, 2025
Accepted: January 6, 2026
Published: February 28, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Jie Gu, Foreign Language Department, Shanghai Maritime University, Shanghai 200135, China.

© 2026 by the author(s).
This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC BY-NC-ND) license, which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not modified or adapted.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Abstract

Maritime regulatory English is often taught through specialist terminology, although professional work starts elsewhere. A reader has to find the governing source, work through its conditions and exceptions, relate the wording to available evidence, and deliver a conclusion in a usable professional form. This conceptual article develops a domain-specific teaching model for English majors at Chinese maritime universities. The design is anchored in ESP's task, needs, and genre-based orientation, while CLIL's dual focus on disciplinary content and language serves primarily as an organizational heuristic for sequencing learning. It draws on an integrative reading of work on ESP, CLIL, legal language, genre pedagogy, and maritime education, together with a comparison of genres and tasks associated with SOLAS, MARPOL, STCW, UNCLOS, the Hague-Visby Rules, and GENCON. Reading across the six instruments brought four problems into view: interpreting modality and conditional language, following connected sources, testing a rule against evidence, and reshaping an analysis for a particular professional reader. The proposed cycle turns those problems into six stages, beginning with a realistic decision and ending with revision of a workplace genre. It also specifies choices concerning sequencing, assessment, teacher collaboration, source currency, and implementation fidelity. By making explicit how ESP-derived professional tasks are organized through a dual content-language focus, the model is intended to be concrete enough to be used, challenged, and examined in later classroom research.

Keywords

Content and language integrated learning; maritime regulatory English; legal English; English for Specific Purposes; genre-based pedagogy; maritime education

1. Introduction

Conventions and codes do not operate in isolation. International shipping also depends on national measures and standard-form contracts, and much of this material is drafted in English. An English major preparing for maritime work must consequently do more than recognize technical terms. The work may begin with finding the controlling source, continue through a condition or exception, and end with a conclusion that another professional can act on. That sequence calls for close reading, factual judgment, and control of the genre in which the conclusion is delivered.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP), with its emphasis on the specific language, genres, communicative practices, and needs of particular professional communities (Hyland, 2002), provides an important foundation for maritime English education. However, regulatory and contractual texts create demands that cannot be addressed through vocabulary and grammar alone. In such texts, linguistic choices may affect substantive meaning: modality can indicate

the strength of an obligation, conditions may determine whether a rule applies, and exceptions may alter the outcome of a case. Students must therefore learn not only to understand individual provisions but also to use them in source-based professional reasoning.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is relevant here primarily because it offers a dual-focus framework for coordinating disciplinary content and language learning (Coyle et al., 2010). In the proposed model, however, CLIL functions as an organizational heuristic rather than as the main source of task content. The substantive curriculum is derived chiefly from ESP needs analysis, target professional tasks, genre specificity, and the language resources required for those tasks. The 4Cs and pluriliteracies perspectives are used to keep content, communication, cognition, and disciplinary meaning-making visible within that task sequence. This framing is also methodologically cautious: CLIL is interpreted in substantially different ways across educational settings (Cenoz et al., 2014), and longitudinal research has not shown unequivocal EFL advantages over mainstream instruction (Goris et al., 2019).

The curricular imbalance is particularly clear in maritime regulatory English. Maritime English courses have usually been organized around operational communication; the documentary work that English majors may later undertake has received much less attention. General CLIL principles establish the need to coordinate content and language, but they do not by themselves identify the regulatory tasks, genres, or source practices that learners will need. ESP supplies that specificity. The pedagogical problem is therefore to organize ESP-derived regulatory tasks within a dual-focus structure that requires students to work through a rule in English.

Against this background, the article develops a domain-specific model in which ESP provides the needs analysis, task selection, genre specification, and explicit language focus; CLIL supplies the dual-focus organizational structure; genre pedagogy supports the production of recognizable workplace texts; and disciplinary literacy defines successful source-based reasoning. Three questions organize the discussion: (1) Which language, reasoning, and genre demands recur in the selected regulatory and contractual texts? (2) How can those demands be arranged as a teachable sequence for maritime regulatory English? (3) What forms of assessment and implementation would make the sequence usable in class and testable in later research?

What follows is a conceptual proposal, not a report of an intervention. The model is set out in enough detail to guide curriculum planning, make the division of theoretical labor between ESP and CLIL explicit, and expose its assumptions to subsequent classroom study.

2. Theoretical Background and Design Requirements

2.1 From ESP and CLIL to disciplinary literacy

ESP and CLIL enter the discussion from different directions. ESP asks what learners will actually have to do in a target setting, then traces those activities to particular tasks, genres, discourse patterns, and language resources. In the present domain, a compliance memorandum cannot be treated as interchangeable with an inspection finding, a cargo-claim analysis, or a charter-party briefing. Each is written for a different reader and purpose; each also handles evidence, structure, and certainty in its own way.

CLIL integrates disciplinary learning and language development through the use of an additional language (Coyle et al., 2010). The 4Cs framework links content, communication, cognition, and culture (Coyle et al., 2010), while later work on pluriliteracies foregrounds how disciplinary knowledge is constructed and communicated (Coyle & Meyer, 2021). In the maritime-regulatory context proposed here, this entails using English to investigate a compliance or legal problem rather than merely learning regulatory terminology. The use of authentic materials does not by itself ensure meaningful content-language integration. From a pluriliteracies perspective, authentic texts need to be embedded in structured pathways of conceptual development and supported meaning-making (Coyle & Meyer, 2021). An unadapted convention extract without such support may simply increase task difficulty. The relevant criterion is therefore whether language-focused work enables students to understand and apply the rule.

For this reason, maritime regulatory English is treated here as disciplinary literacy. Students are learning recognizable ways of reading sources, weighing evidence, qualifying claims, and communicating professional judgments. Content knowledge and linguistic control are therefore not separate outcomes that happen to be assessed in the same course. They operate together in the performance of a regulatory task.

Table 1. Complementary contributions of ESP and CLIL to maritime regulatory English

Dimension	ESP contribution	CLIL contribution	Position adopted in this model
Curriculum basis	Target-situation needs, genres, and language features	Disciplinary content and cognitively demanding learning	Professional regulatory tasks define both content and language outcomes
Role of source texts	Examples of specialized discourse	Vehicles for learning subject matter through English	Authoritative sources are examined for legal effect and used to support professional action
Language support	Explicit terminology, grammar, and genre instruction	Scaffolding that enables participation in content learning	Planned support for modality, conditions, definitions, evidence, and genre structure
Assessment	Language performance in specified tasks	Dual assessment of content and language	Related but distinct scores for regulatory accuracy, reasoning, genre, and language
Main risk	Content may remain superficial	Integration may be asserted rather than demonstrated	Implementation evidence must show that content and language were taught and assessed together

The comparison in Table 1 is not intended to replace ESP with CLIL. ESP is needed to identify relevant situations, genres, and language features; CLIL offers a way of organizing the learning of disciplinary content through English. In the model proposed here, ESP informs needs analysis and genre selection, CLIL shapes the teaching sequence, and disciplinary literacy defines what successful performance looks like. This combination also responds to a familiar problem in CLIL research: the label tells us little unless the actual classroom practices, scaffolding, and assessment procedures are described.

2.2 Maritime regulatory English as a source-dependent domain

Three features make maritime regulatory English unusually resistant to simplification. Much of the source material is authoritative, so a definition, duty, exception, or time limit cannot be freely paraphrased without checking whether its legal effect has changed. Meaning is also distributed across texts. A single provision may depend on a definition elsewhere in the instrument, an annex, an associated code, a national implementing measure, or another contractual clause. Finally, professional conclusions are constrained by evidence. They must be traceable to both the governing text and the legally material facts, rather than to a general impression of what seems reasonable.

The six instruments used in this article cover different areas of maritime practice and expose learners to different discourse problems. SOLAS (International Maritime Organization, 1974), MARPOL (International Maritime Organization, 1973/1978), and STCW (International Maritime Organization, 1978) combine technical standards with mandatory regulatory wording. UNCLOS (United Nations, 1982) organizes rights, duties, zones, and jurisdiction in public international law. The Hague-Visby Rules (Visby Protocol, 1968) and GENCON (BIMCO, 2022) concern private-law obligations and the allocation of commercial risk. Table 2 links each instrument to language and reasoning demands that can be developed through classroom tasks.

Across the six instruments, four demands recur. Learners must distinguish deontic force—what a source requires, permits, prohibits, or recommends—from epistemic qualification—how a proposition is presented as presumed, established, uncertain, or dependent on evidence—and must also trace the conditions under which a provision applies. They must navigate beyond the sentence in front of them, consulting definitions, related provisions, annexes, and contractual options. They must then connect the operative wording to evidence in the case rather than merely repeat the rule. Finally, they need to recast the analysis for a particular reader, such as an inspector, ship manager, lawyer, client, or training department.

The teaching implication is straightforward. Vocabulary work on its own is too limited, but a general lesson about maritime content is also insufficient. The useful unit of instruction is a rule-governed professional decision expressed in an appropriate genre. Source reading, legal reasoning, and professional communication should therefore be taught as parts of the same process.

Table 2. Language and reasoning demands across selected maritime instruments

Instrument	Regulatory or commercial focus	Recurring language and reasoning demands	Example of a professional product
SOLAS	Ship safety, certification, navigation, and control	Deontic modality; technical definitions; scope; conditions; cross-references; identification of duty holder and compliance evidence	Safety-compliance memorandum
MARPOL	Prevention and control of pollution from ships	Prohibition and permission; thresholds; measurements; geographic scope; exceptions; causal and procedural explanation	Inspection finding and corrective-action note
STCW	Training, certification, competence, and watchkeeping	Competence descriptors; performance criteria; mandatory Part A and guidance Part B; evidentiary language	Training-gap analysis
UNCLOS	Maritime zones, navigation rights, jurisdiction, and duties	Definitions with legal effect; classification; balancing rights and duties; enumerative and jurisdictional structures	Jurisdictional advisory note
Hague-Visby Rules	Carrier obligations, cargo care, exceptions, limitation, and time bar	Causation; burden and evidence; due diligence; exception language; temporal clauses; qualified legal argument	Cargo-claim liability analysis
GENCON	Voyage-charter performance, freight, laytime, demurrage, and risk allocation	Defined terms; conditional obligations; clause interaction; commercial shorthand; negotiated alternatives	Clause briefing or negotiation note

2.3 Research gap and design requirements

A prominent institutional reference point for maritime English education is the IMO Model Course 3.17, which places substantial emphasis on the communicative English required for maritime training and operational safety (International Maritime Organization [IMO], 2015). Within the literature considered for this article, comparatively limited attention has been paid to English majors who may later translate, explain, or draft compliance, advisory, and contractual documents. As a distinctive learner population, these students require a dedicated needs analysis drawing on relevant stakeholders, target tasks, and multiple sources of evidence (Serafini et al., 2015). Chinese research on marine-related ESP has likewise identified insufficient integration between language skills and disciplinary knowledge, weak coordination between theory and practice, and limited alignment between teaching models and educational technology (Yang & Shi, 2026).

CLIL is defined and interpreted in considerably different ways across educational contexts (Cenoz et al., 2014). University CLIL implementations may also lack systematic language support and collaboration with ESP specialists (Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015). For the purposes of the proposed model, however, these general frameworks do not explicitly account for the authority, intertextuality, evidentiary constraints, and amendment status of maritime rules, as exemplified by instruments such as SOLAS, MARPOL, STCW, and UNCLOS. At the same time, a narrowly language-focused implementation of ESP may not provide sufficient structure for students to develop regulatory reasoning through English. Properly understood, however, ESP emphasizes the specific literacies, genres, and communicative practices of particular professional communities (Hyland, 2002). A domain-specific model integrating these complementary strengths is therefore needed.

The preceding discussion suggests four requirements for such a model. It should require learners to identify and navigate relevant sources; connect linguistic analysis with regulatory meaning; relate rules to factual evidence; and communicate the resulting analysis through an appropriate professional genre. These requirements provide the basis for the framework developed in the following section.

3. Framework Development

The paper was developed as a conceptual design study. It brings together selected work on CLIL, ESP, genre, legal language, and maritime education and combines that literature with a comparative analysis of tasks and genres

associated with six maritime instruments. The aim is to formulate a coherent teaching model, not to estimate an instructional effect. For that reason, the literature review is integrative rather than systematic: sources were chosen for their relevance to the design problem, not through an exhaustive and reproducible database search.

The six instruments were selected to represent different areas of maritime regulatory and commercial practice while supporting realistic classroom tasks. SOLAS, MARPOL, and STCW represent safety, environmental, and competence regulation; UNCLOS introduces questions of public-law jurisdiction; the Hague-Visby Rules provide a basis for cargo-liability analysis; and GENCON introduces standardized commercial contracting. The selection is illustrative rather than comprehensive.

Framework development proceeded iteratively. Each instrument was first considered in relation to the professional decisions it supports, the users involved, and the genres through which those decisions may be communicated. Representative provisions were then examined for features relevant to regulatory interpretation, including modality, conditions, exceptions, definitions, cross-references, evidence, causation, and temporal scope. Comparison across the six instruments led to the four learning demands identified in Section 2: interpreting obligations and qualifications, navigating related sources, connecting rules with evidence, and reformulating analysis for a professional audience.

These demands were then translated into teaching tasks with ESP needs analysis and genre specificity providing the substantive task design and CLIL providing an organizing dual-focus heuristic. The 4Cs are not mapped one-to-one onto the six stages. Instead, they operate across the sequence: content is the governing regulatory or contractual problem; communication is the professional genre through which the analysis is expressed; cognition is the interpretation, source navigation, and rule application required by the task; and culture is represented through institutional roles, audience expectations, and norms of professional accountability. Pluriliteracies similarly informs the movement from source interpretation to disciplinary meaning-making and genre production. Tasks were retained when they required substantive use of the regulatory or contractual source, made the relevant language demand teachable, produced a recognizable professional text, and allowed content and language performance to be diagnosed separately as well as together. The resulting sequence was organized around the movement from a professional problem to source identification, interpretation, application, genre production, and revision.

No students, teachers, or classroom data were involved in this stage of the work. The article therefore makes no claim about effectiveness, preference, or causal impact. That limitation is deliberate. As Mettewie et al. (2024) demonstrate, differences between CLIL and non-CLIL groups may partly reflect prior proficiency or selection. The model is presented as a set of design propositions that require testing, not as a record of established effects.

4. Proposed Teaching Model

4.1 Design principles and instructional cycle

The proposed model is based on several practical principles. Each unit specifies both what students should understand about the relevant regulation or contract and what they should be able to do with English. Students work with genuine provisions and clauses, while the amount of text, annotation, visual support, and sequencing is adjusted to their prior knowledge. Interpretations must be supported by the wording of the source, relevant definitions and cross-references, and the facts of the case. Source reading should lead to a professional product rather than end with comprehension questions. Feedback should distinguish problems in regulatory reasoning from problems in language before bringing the two together in revision.

Table 3 turns these design choices into a six-stage cycle. It is a route through a problem rather than a script for one lesson. A short compliance question might pass through the cycle in two classes, whereas a cargo-liability problem could occupy several weeks. In either case, the intellectual movement is the same: from a decision to its governing source, from the source to a workable rule, and from that rule to a professional response that can be defended.

The first three stages prevent students from treating an isolated sentence as the complete rule. Scenario activation gives learners a reason to consult the source, while authority mapping directs attention to status, scope, definitions, and related provisions. Clause decoding then focuses on linguistic features that affect interpretation, including deontic force, epistemic qualification, conditions, reference, and exceptions. Language work at this stage is therefore part of disciplinary reasoning rather than a separate grammar exercise.

At Stage 3, modality is treated as an operational coding problem rather than a general grammar label. Students classify the deontic force of relevant wording into five instructional categories: absolute obligation (shall/must), qualified duty (should/ought to, subject to the status of the source), permission (may), prohibition (shall not/may not),

and recommendation (for example, it is advisable). These categories are used as a comparison map, not as a universal legal hierarchy across all instruments. Epistemic markers are recorded separately because expressions such as it is presumed, it is considered, or unless evidence shows concern evidential status or certainty rather than the addressee's duty. When both types occur, students record deontic force and epistemic status on separate lines before reconstructing the rule.

Table 3. Six-stage instructional cycle

Stage	Content and cognitive purpose	Language and instructional support	Expected learner performance
1. Scenario activation	Frame a credible problem, identify the actors, and specify the decision to be made	Case file, timeline, opening question, and selective activation of key terms	Anticipate likely issues, possible sources, and facts still needed
2. Authority mapping	Determine the applicable instrument, its status and scope, and any controlling definitions	Source map, mandatory/guidance labels, and a cross-reference trail	Locate the governing provision or clause and explain why it controls the problem
3. Clause decoding	Reconstruct the rule and make its conditions, exceptions, and relationships visible	Text chunking; a five-category deontic map (absolute obligation, qualified duty, permission, prohibition, recommendation); separate tagging of epistemic markers; conditional-chain syntax display; bilingual terms where useful	Represent the rule together with its conditions and exceptions
4. Rule application	Test the case facts against the rule and compare defensible readings	Issue-rule-fact matrix, evidence prompts, and counterexamples	Reach a provisional conclusion grounded in both the text and the facts
5. Genre production	Recast the analysis for a named professional reader and purpose	Model text, move structure, phrase bank, and explicit audience and length limits	Draft a memorandum, finding, advisory note, report, or clause briefing
6. Dual-focused reflection	Diagnose and revise content reasoning and language performance	Analytic rubric, error log, peer-review protocol, concept map	Revise legal accuracy, evidence, genre, and language, then explain the changes

The later stages move from interpretation to professional use. Students compare the reconstructed rule with the available facts, identify the evidence supporting a conclusion, and consider alternative interpretations where appropriate. They then reshape the analysis for a particular reader and purpose. The final stage separates regulatory, evidentiary, genre, and language problems before students revise the product as a whole.

Consider a SOLAS unit built around a port State control file on the availability and documentation of navigational equipment. The file does not tell students at once which provision resolves the matter. They first identify the people involved, the pending decision, and the facts still missing. They then locate the relevant provisions, distinguish mandatory wording, and determine who bears the duty. Clause work is tied to that inquiry: deontic force, epistemic qualification, definitions, conditions, and cross-references are examined because each can change the rule that will be applied. Students finish this stage by stating the rule with its qualifications and listing the evidence needed to establish compliance.

The vessel facts are then tested against the reconstructed rule. Students mark a conclusion as supported, unsupported, or dependent on information that the file does not yet supply. Their response takes the form of a brief memorandum to a ship manager, with the authority, material facts, analysis, conclusion, and recommended action made visible to the reader. Feedback first addresses mistakes that would change the regulatory meaning and then deals with language that obscures the advice. During revision, each student accounts for one substantive change and one language change. The integration can thus be seen in the path from source to decision and from decision to genre.

4.2 Curriculum sequencing and assessment

A semester course can move gradually from basic source literacy to tasks involving several instruments. Early units

should introduce the functions and relationships of conventions, codes, annexes, standard contracts, and national implementing measures, together with the language of definition, scope, duty, permission, and recommendation. SOLAS and MARPOL are suitable early modules because obligations, prohibitions, thresholds, and compliance evidence are relatively visible in their technical contexts. STCW extends this work to competence descriptors and assessment evidence. UNCLOS introduces classification, rights, duties, and jurisdiction, while the Hague-Visby Rules and GENCON are better placed later because they require more complex reasoning about causation, exceptions, time limits, and clause interaction.

Sequencing should therefore reflect conceptual and discourse difficulty rather than simply follow a conventional list of instruments. Early tasks may use shorter extracts, bilingual glossaries, diagrams, and partly completed rule maps. As students gain experience, these supports can be reduced, cross-references can become denser, and competing interpretations can be introduced. The aim is not exhaustive coverage of maritime law but the development of transferable strategies for locating, interpreting, and applying sources.

Assessment should capture integrated performance without concealing the source of an error. A single "legal English" score cannot show whether a learner selected the wrong provision, misapplied a rule, used an inappropriate genre, or expressed an otherwise sound analysis inaccurately. Qin et al. (2021) similarly argue that evaluations of integrated learning should attend to both content knowledge and language knowledge.

Table 4. Analytic assessment dimensions for a case-based task

Dimension	**Weight**	General descriptor	Guidance for interpretation
Regulatory accuracy	35%	Identifies applicable authority, scope, duty holder, deontic force, rule, conditions/exceptions, and relevant qualification without material error	Meaning-changing errors, including misreading shall/may, a condition precedent, or an exception, are scored here; source and amendment status must be traceable
Reasoning and evidence	25%	Connects facts to provisions, addresses conditions and exceptions, and explains uncertainty	Recall alone is insufficient; conclusions must show rule-fact-evidence links
Professional genre and audience	20%	Uses an appropriate structure, stance, detail, and recommended action for the intended reader	A generic academic essay does not satisfy a workplace genre
Language control	20%	Uses precise terminology, grammar, reference, cohesion, and readable sentence structure without altering an otherwise sound regulatory analysis	Errors are scored here only when correction would not change the substantive regulatory conclusion

A clear boundary is applied when an error could plausibly be coded in both regulatory accuracy and language control. If correcting the language would change the legal or regulatory conclusion, the error is scored under regulatory accuracy; if the conclusion remains substantively unchanged, it is scored under language control. Thus, misreading shall as may, misidentifying a condition precedent, or misstating an exception is a regulatory-accuracy error. By contrast, awkward syntax, imprecise vocabulary, reference problems, or cohesion problems that do not alter the rule or conclusion remain language-control errors. This decision rule prevents double counting and should be included in rater training and benchmark scripts.

The percentages in Table 4 are design weights, not validated thresholds, and a course team should alter them to match its aims. Evidence gathered during the semester may include clause maps, short oral explanations, terminology retrieval, evidence matrices, and peer comments. For a summative judgment, a timed source-based problem could be paired with a portfolio text that has undergone feedback and revision.

Reliable marking will require more than detailed descriptors. Markers need benchmark scripts, a shared understanding of what counts as a material error, and, where possible, moderation between language and maritime-law specialists. Feedback should tell a student whether to return to the source, repair the reasoning, recast the genre, or revise the wording. Raters should apply the meaning-change decision rule consistently and record each error in one primary category; disputed cases should be resolved during moderation using benchmark examples.

4.3 Implementation and treatment fidelity

The model assumes a degree of collaboration between language and disciplinary expertise. Ideally, an instructor

would combine advanced language pedagogy with sufficient maritime legal knowledge to recognize interpretations that are materially incorrect. Chinese work on marine-related ESP identifies precisely this mismatch between language expertise and disciplinary knowledge as a persistent curriculum problem (Yang & Shi, 2026). Where one teacher cannot cover both areas, a language specialist and a maritime-law or shipping specialist should collaborate on source selection, case design, model answers, and assessment. Full team teaching may not always be practical, but jointly designed materials and periodic moderation provide a realistic alternative.

Students will not enter the course with the same resources. Some may need shorter extracts and closer help with shaping a professional genre. Others may know shipboard routines but have little experience of legal sources; English majors may display the opposite profile. A baseline check should therefore cover general English as well as basic maritime and legal knowledge. The same information is needed when outcomes are evaluated, since an initial difference in proficiency must not be mistaken for an effect of the model.

Every classroom source also has a date. Conventions are amended, and standard forms are revised. Extracts should identify the edition, amendment status, and source used, while the course team keeps a simple record of later updates. Asking whether a provision remains current is part of regulatory literacy, not clerical housekeeping.

Finally, any empirical evaluation must show that the model was actually implemented as intended. Relevant indicators include the balance between regulatory reasoning and language work, the extent to which students navigated sources, the cognitive demands of tasks, the professional genres produced, the feedback provided, and the opportunities for revision. Without such evidence, a comparison between “CLIL” and “ESP” would reproduce the construct ambiguity already identified in the literature.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The model contributes a concrete account of content-language integration for maritime regulation. Here, the subject is not a stock of technical terms but a practice: readers locate authority, decide what the wording permits or requires, test the rule against evidence, and state a qualified judgment for someone who needs it. The six stages make that practice teachable by separating source navigation, clause interpretation, rule application, genre production, and revision without treating them as unrelated skills.

This account does not force a choice between ESP and CLIL. ESP keeps the course answerable to professional needs and recognizable genres. CLIL helps arrange disciplinary content, language, and cognition within the same task. Their connection is especially close in regulatory work: a modal verb or condition may alter the force of a rule, while a learner's understanding becomes visible only when that rule is explained, used in advice, or incorporated into a document. The useful contrast is thus between a disconnected language-and-content curriculum and one in which source use, reasoning, and communication depend on one another.

The proposal also has clear limits. It has not been tried in a classroom, so it offers no evidence of gains in interpretation, English proficiency, motivation, or retention. Its six instruments leave large parts of maritime practice untouched, including collision regulation, salvage, marine insurance, sanctions, and domestic implementation. The intended learners are relatively proficient English majors at Chinese maritime universities; seafarers, law students, and learners with less English would require different materials and support. Delivery further depends on current sources and access to disciplinary expertise. Finally, the literature was selected purposively. The discussion may justify design choices, but it cannot show how common particular practices or findings are across the field.

Classroom evaluation is the necessary next step. A multi-site study could compare the model with existing practice while keeping materials, contact time, assessment exposure, and teacher preparation as comparable as circumstances allow. Baseline measures should cover both English proficiency and maritime-law knowledge, and a delayed post-test would give retention a fairer test. Outcomes need to include rule application as well as professional writing. Process evidence matters too: classroom interaction, learner strategies, task demands, and implementation fidelity would help explain any observed difference. Because learners are grouped within classes and institutions, the analysis would need to account for that nesting rather than rely on a simple comparison of post-test means.

Evaluation should also ask whether every stage earns its place. Authority mapping, clause reconstruction, evidence-based application, and genre production may burden learners in different ways. Locating where support is most needed would allow the sequence and its assessment scheme to be revised instead of treating the model as a fixed package.

A maritime regulatory English course should leave students able to do more than paraphrase a convention or contract. They should be able to find the controlling words, explain how those words apply, and present a conclusion in

a form that another professional can use. The proposed model offers one organized route toward that goal. Whether it works better than current practice remains an empirical question; its stages and assessment principles are explicit enough for that question to be tested.

References

Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *37*, 63-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.007

BIMCO. (2022). *GENCON 2022: General voyage charter party*. BIMCO.

Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, *35*(3), 243-262. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Coyle, D., & Meyer, O. (2021). *Beyond CLIL: Pluriliteracies teaching for deeper learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Goris, J. A., Denessen, E. J. P. G., & Verhoeven, L. T. W. (2019). Effects of content and language integrated learning in Europe: A systematic review of longitudinal experimental studies. *European Educational Research Journal*, *18*(6), 675-698. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904119872426

Hyland, K. (2002). Specificity revisited: How far should we go now? *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*(4), 385-395. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00028-X

International Maritime Organization. (1974). *International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), as amended*. IMO.

International Maritime Organization. (1973/1978). *International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), as amended*. IMO.

International Maritime Organization. (1978). *International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), as amended*. IMO.

International Maritime Organization. (2015). *IMO model course 3.17: Maritime English* (2015 ed.). IMO.

Mettewie, L., Van Mensel, L., De Smet, A., & Galand, B. (2024). A longitudinal test of the impact of CLIL on language emotions and learning motivation. *System*, *123*, Article 103355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103355

Protocol to amend the International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law Relating to Bills of Lading (Visby Protocol). (1968). Brussels.

Qin, L., Ouyang, X., & He, Y. (2021). Neirong yuyan ronghe jiaoxue moshi xia xuexizhe neirong zhishi yu yuyan zhishi de neihua yanjiu: Shehui wenhua lilun de yuyan biaoda linian shijiao [Internalization of content and language knowledge in content-language integrated instruction: A languaging perspective from sociocultural theory]. *Zhongguo Waiyu* [*Foreign Languages in China*], *18*(1), 81-90. https://doi.org/10.13564/j.cnki.issn.1672-9382.2021.01.021

Serafini, E. J., Lake, J. B., & Long, M. H. (2015). Needs analysis for specialized learner populations: Essential methodological improvements. *English for Specific Purposes*, *40*, 11-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.05.002

United Nations. (1982). *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*. United Nations.

Yang, Y., & Shi, X. (2026). Xinwenke beijingxia gaoxiao shehailei zhuanyong yingyu kecheng youhua lujing [Optimizing marine-related ESP courses in higher education under the New Liberal Arts initiative]. *Hanghai Jiaoyu Yanjiu* [*Maritime Education Research*], *43*(2), 59-65. https://doi.org/10.27021/j.cnki.hhjyyj.2026.02.008