研究ノート

Evolving Perceptions of English:
Investigating Contemporary International English Pedagogy

Daniel DEVOLIN

要　旨

　「現代国際英語専攻」（CIE）は比較的新しい専攻であり、設立時から方向性を探りながら発展してきた。現在、嘱託助教二人は多くの専攻科目を担当し、学生が卒業研究に力を発揮できるため、科目内容や教授法に工夫してきた。CIEのまとまりを維持するため、国際英語の役割、学生や大学にとってCIEの意義について教員同士が絶えず意見交換をする必要があると考える。それは担当する教員の入り替わりが多いため、共通認識を保つには欠かさないのだ。本稿では上記の課題の解決策としてコアの教授法の必要性について論じる。すでに応用されている二つのコンセプトTriple Bottom LineとRealm of Intelligibility、また二つの方法、つまりELF lensの応用と教員同士メンタリングについて説明する。教授法の質的維持や国際英語の最新情報の共有はCIEの発展につながる。

Contemporary International English (CIE) is a relatively new major (in the Faculty of Letters) still finding its feet. CIE currently has two short-term contract instructors shouldering the bulk of CIE courses that prepare students for one of three seminar instructors. Maintaining the contemporary nature of the program involves continuous, open, and frank discussions about what CIE is, the role of international English, and the value of the program to students and the university at large. The

impermanence of preparatory CIE instructors, highlights challenges to this dialogue and the need for CIE to have core pedagogy that accommodates faculty changes and maintains its 'contemporary' focus on international English.　This paper aims to discuss two CIE concepts, the *Triple Bottom Line and the Realm of Intelligibility*, and two CIE practices, applying an ELF Lens and Faculty Mentoring, that are flexible to faculty changes and maintain a contemporary outlook.

キーワード：Triple Bottom Line Analysis トリプルボトムライン分析, Realm of Intelligibility 明瞭性の範囲, My English 私の英語, ELF Lens 英語共通語レンズ,　Language　Identity　言語アイデンテテイ, Faculty Mentoring 教員同士メンタリング

Emerging Elements of CIE

In the Faculty of Letters, Contemporary International English (CIE) is a relatively new major that is still finding its feet. Since 2011, two seminar lecturers (three as of 2017-18) have been tasked with crafting and guiding a program investigating various aspects of International English. Under the guidance of the seminar lecturers, two short-term contract instructor positions are filled each year to teach 'set-up' classes aimed at preparing students for their seminar selection. The contract positions are for terms of one year renewable up to five years (originally four years).　Shouldering the bulk of the courses CIE students take, each short-term instructor teaches 10 lessons per week comprised of 6 to 8 courses per semester, not all of which are for CIE.

Short Term Contract Courses　*non-CIE courses
•　　Oral Comprehension
•　　Oral Strategies
•　　Preparation for TOEIC/TOEFL
•　　Listening Strategies
•　　Essential Grammar
•　　Basic Composition
•　　Current Issues 1

• Current Issues 2
• Current Issues 3
• Current Issues 4
• New Media English
• Principles of Foreign Language Teaching
• Communicative English 1*
• Communicative English 2*
• Communication Skill 1*
• Communication Skill 2*
• Communication Skill 3*
• Communication Skill 4*
• Advanced Reading 1*
• Advanced Reading 2*

Only one short-term contract instructor from 2011 to 2018, with eligibility to renew their contract the maximum number of advertised times (4-5), has elected to fulfill the maximum term. CIE hired its fifth instructor for 2018-19 and a sixth will be hired for the 2019-20 academic year, to fill vacancies in both short-term contract positions. CIE's short-term instructors are key to helping students grasp CIE concepts and their relevance to a student's chosen seminar. The transient nature of the short-term contract positions and frequent turnover however, impede thorough transmission of program developments and course pedagogy from one short-term contract instructor to the next. Furthermore, students may be negatively affected by faculty changes, causing diminished motivation or confusion through shifts in course and program direction. Finally, frequent faculty changes cannot assure CIE seminar instructors that students have acquired the knowledge and skills in the preparatory courses that are required for the respective seminars.

To accommodate and ameliorate the position's normalized turnover, short-term CIE instructors, thus far, in collaboration with CIE's seminar instructors, have engaged in open and frank discussions about CIE's past, present, and future pedagogical direction. From these discussions, transferable concepts and practices have started to emerge. This paper aims to investigate four emerging elements shaping the development and trajectory of CIE; the Triple Bottom Line (TBL), the Realm of Intelligibility (RoI), the ELF lens, and Faculty Mentoring.

The Triple Bottom Line in CIE

The *Triple Bottom Line* (TBL) is a concept that developed out of work exploring the shifts towards sustainable development and their effects on businesses and corporations (Elkington, 1997). TBL was originally an accounting approach that encouraged businesses to measure social, economic, and environmental prosperity. TBL critics such as Norman & MacDonald (2004) raised valid concerns about the approach, but the point to be taken from the TBL, as Pava countered, is that the TBL puts "the notion of accountability back into accounting" (2007:109-110).

The TBL approach requires comprehensive assessment and consideration of the benefits and harms in three spheres, the environmental, the social, and the economic. The assessment of an individual sphere results in a sum benefit/harm bottom line. Taken together, the bottom lines of the three spheres are used to inform and anchor corporate, small business, government, or individual decision-making processes. The aim of TBL accounting is to make the given entity sustainable.

Similarly, sustainability has long been a theme addressed in education manifestos and policy releases from the United Nations (UN), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Japan's Cabinet Secretariat, and the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (UN 1992, 2017; OECD 2018, Cabinet Secretariat 2014; MEXT 2013, 2016). As an education policy actor, Aichi University adopts and reflects the policy aims borne out of these policy releases and manifestos. The university's English advertising slogan, 'Imparting Wisdom for a Globalized World', is a reflection of MEXT's desire for learners to become "global individuals who will lead society in the future" (MEXT, 2016:8). In order to develop these globalized citizens, the UN prescribes "teaching and learning methods that motivate and empower learners" so learners can "change their behaviour and take action for sustainable development" (2014). For CIE, the TBL contributes to achieving these aims.

The TBL plays a significant role in developing media literacy and critical thinking skills, particularly in CIE's New Media, and Current Issues courses. Current Issues (I, II, III, and IV), as a set of courses, is the heart of CIE and embodies the major's name; the content is contemporary and international, and the primary language of research and communication is English. Current Issues presents several challenges for both instructors and students. For instructors, revealing a personal position on an issue may influence a

student's performance whereby a student caters to the instructor's viewpoint. Creating conditions that encourage free, safe and respectful debates and discussions, requires students to be informed and able to research a given topic. For students, often ignorant of the issues and wary of public conflict and disagreement with their peers, the challenge is voicing an informed opinion and engaging in the classroom and online discussions. The greatest challenge for students is accessing international resources and processing the information in English. Overcoming these challenges determines the success and enjoyment of the course for both students and instructors.

For two years, CIE students research, explore, discuss, debate, present, and predict, domestic and international current issues from the six TBL perspectives:

- Socially Harmful
- Socially Beneficial
- Economically Harmful
- Economically Beneficial
- Environmentally Harmful
- Environmentally Beneficial

The TBL approach, as used in Current Issues, follows a general pattern. The first issue is chosen by the instructor and students are assigned to groups. Each group represents one of the six TBL perspectives. Subsequent issues and TBL perspective groups are chosen by students. Students research and explore issues from the TBL perspective and prepare a digital presentation. Each group presents and leads part of a class; ensuring classmates are informed of a perspective. Following the presentations, students from the beneficial perspectives assemble and review the TBL benefits. Likewise, students from the harmful perspectives assemble and review the TBL harms. Students are then assigned debate groups containing one member from each of the six TBL positions. Following the smaller group debates, students engage in a plenary benefit/harm debate contributing arguments from their groups` perspective. Finally, small group and plenary debates are repeated with students free to discuss and debate from their personal perspective on the issue, if they choose. Students then reflect on, summarize, and submit their experiences and viewpoints using digital audio and digital word-processing formats.

For students, the TBL involves finding the source of information, filtering out fake news, synthesizing facts, reflecting on social, economic, and environmental values, and exploring how individuals, businesses, and governments can change or be held accountable

for their environmental, social, and economic choices. Through these activities, students acquire contemporary English language, diversify their domestic and international perspectives, and foster their sense of empathy. The realization of the extent of international English content, available beyond their preconceived notion of English speaking countries (U.S., U.K, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland), also occurs at various points in the course. Students notice the English used in a news source from China and a news source from India are similar to that of the UK or the US, but the content and perspectives are different.　Students appreciate how English is an international medium of information dissemination. Finally, students become aware of how TBLs are manipulated. For example, a company may focus resources and media on contributions to sports, the arts, and environmental stewardship, in order to distract from its tax avoidance or product recalls.　The TBL approach in CIE, provides students with life-long analytical skills that empower them to address issues and push for more sustainable solutions.

For instructors, the TBL frees them from unconsciously revealing their positions on topics because students lead the research and discussion.　Instead, instructors can focus on scaffolding the TBL with empowering skills such as critical thinking, primary and secondary research, assessing the quality of information, information synthesis, debate language, discussion approaches, presentation skills, and any harms/benefits possibly overlooked or less developed by a given group's presentation.

The TBL approach prepares students for the discussions and debates through the six presentations designed to inform and the peer support from a given group's assigned perspective.　The nature of the assigned or chosen position on an issue provides a more comfortable environment for students to build their skillsets. The final free discussions and debates become less intimidating and devoid of ignorance and awkwardness.　Most importantly for CIE, the TBL concept is transferable to other courses and provides a scaffold for incoming short-term contract instructors to build on.

The Realm of Intelligibility

Realm is widely defined as a kingdom, a field, or a domain. *Intelligibility* is widely defined as the quality of being *intelligible* which itself means clear, understandable, or comprehensible. The Realm of Intelligibility (RoI) then, could be defined as the domain of being understandable.　This domain is fluid and the keys to the kingdom lay in the

skillsets of those who are engaged in an effort to understand.

A communicative event is an interaction between individuals, usually with the intention of being understood. Two or more individuals attempting to understand each other engage in communicative activity. Communicative activity is comprised of one or more communicative events. When actors in a communicative event engage skills that accomplish the desired communicative outcome(s) of its participants (mutual understanding) the RoI is established. If none of the actors understand each other, the Realm of *un*Intelligibility is established (RoIx). Both the RoI and RoIx exist for the duration of a communicative event and are changed by the engaged skillsets from one communicative event to another.

If actors continue successful communicative activity, meaning all participants or a knowledgeable observer can confirm that the involved parties understand each other, or activity becomes successful through accommodation (Beebe & Giles, 1984), the skills engaged to achieve the communicative outcome(s) are within the established RoI/establish the RoI. If actors continue communicative activity that is unsuccessful or becomes unsuccessful, meaning all participants or a knowledgeable observer can confirm that the involved parties do not understand each other, the skills engaged that result in the negative communicative outcome(s) are outside the RoI and maintain or establish the RoIx.

In a communicative event, one participant may not understand the other(s). This possibly leaves one or all participants questioning the communicative abilities of the other(s) and/or themselves, or worse, one participant thinks they understand when the reality is that they do not. The same participants however, may have different outcomes in a similar communicative event context with different participants. Different participants have different skillsets at their disposal thereby redefining the parameters of the RoI.

The RoI may be broad or narrow depending on the collective communicative L1 and L2/L2+ skillsets of the participants. For participants using a common L1, the likelihood of accessing the RoI is quite high, though by no means guaranteed. The RoI for L1 actors would likely be broad since common L1 skillsets could be harnessed by all participants. For L2/L2+ participants the focus is on transferring relevant L1 skills to the L2 and acquiring the necessary L2 skills to more frequently access the RoI.

As participants in communicative events in their L1 and L2/L2+, CIE students examine sensory and non-sensory aspects that might expand or contract the RoI. Aspects include a participant's education, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, speed, intonation,

L1, L2/L2+ experience, other lingua franca, negotiation of meaning, clarification style, culture, TBL perspectives, and motivation to achieve understanding. Students are essentially relieved of the perceived requirement to communicate with high degrees of accuracy in their L1 or L2/L2+.

A CIE goal is to produce students that are functional in several language scenarios by arming them with enough skills to increase the likelihood of accessing the RoI. This requires students to focus less on accurate grammar and vocabulary production, and more on the communicative event itself. Understandably, students who, prior to joining CIE, have been inculcated with the idea they must use the prescribed absolute, pure, authoritarian, or nativist approaches to language, are shoved outside of their comfort zones.

The introduction and development of the 'My Language' concept, particularly as it is addressed by Widdowson (1994, 2003), Norton (1997, 2013) and Kohn (2012a,2012b, 2018), eases the transition away from high accuracy language production and demonstrates the importance of accessing the RoI. If a language is defined by the sum of its users, each language user will use a version that is different, by varying degrees, to that of another user. The more a language has users the more My Language versions and the likelihood of a language's diversity. The aim is to use My Language in a way that can access the RoI with as many other users of a given language as possible. CIE students come to realize that if everyone is using their version of a language, sensitivity to their interlocutor's version of a language, and the skills they engage, is necessary to access the RoI. When participants engage the same skills in a communicative event, a skill spectrum is created to which users will have to adapt to varying degrees, in order to have successful communicative events. The more knowledgeable of a skill spectrum, the more comfortable CIE students become. By the end of the program, CIE students should expect language that is not part of their preconceived or prescriptive notion of a language. For CIE, the languages are English, Japanese and any other L1s, L2/L2+s CIE students encounter.

Students develop a wider sense of motivation and culture analyzing the RoI. CIE students learn to identify what skills motivate them and where in a skill spectrum they would like to be. The RoI allows students to define their goals and determine what successful communication is for them. Students are more creative in the ways they can communicate and the new-found approaches to communicating are often counter to their prescriptive textbook language teachings, and represent a parallel language reality to

explore.

For CIE instructors, the RoI is a transferable concept used in several CIE and non-CIE courses. For example, Listening Strategies, Essential Grammar, Current Issues, or Oral Comprehension, address the RoI and the skills and skill spectrums possibly engaged in a communicative event, from the perspective of the course title. Through various CIE courses, students identify relevant sensory and non-sensory information and skills that they can engage to access the RoI, and how to recognize or apply any communicative accommodations. For CIE students the RoI becomes a journey of self-reflection, noticing, and communication skill assessment. Students identify aspects of their communicative abilities they can improve, those they are proficient in, those they are satisfied with, those that they can accommodate, and those that others will need to accommodate. For CIE short-term contract instructors, the RoI contributes to maintaining program and content continuity between instructors by providing a framework in which instructors can address their academic specialities.

Applying an ELF Lens

The author conceptualizes language, for CIE students, as a fluid multidimensional spectrum of means of communication that is artificially divided by time, space, and users. English and Japanese, for example, are far enough apart on the language spectrum to be ascribed their own language segments. Language segments have perceived or prescribed user centers, for example Japanese → Japan, Portuguese → Portugal, French → France, English → England. The constructed centers are fluid; shifting in space (e.g. borders), time (e.g. variation), and users (e.g. sustainable populations). The temporary, sustained, or historic ties of one segment with another, forms a segment spectrum fringe between ascribed segment centers. Centers and fringes can expand, contract, envelop, or separate from other language segment spectrums.

Every communicator is a My Language user. Collectively, My Language users form the fluid multidimensional spectrum that is Language. Each user primarily identifies with an ascribed language segment whose center would be referred to as their L1. If, for example the identified L1 is Japanese, then the user is a My Japanese user. Not every user will apply their identified L1 in the same way. As a result, all users identifying their L1 as being from the same segment center, influence the ascribed center spectrum for that

language segment. No real center, or prime example of a language user exists; not because the user population affecting the spectrum and multidimensional nature of any language segment is in constant flux, but because the entire segment and spectrums are subjectively ascribed by its '*My* Language' nature. When L1 users form or establish ties with another language segment, the user adopts that My Language segment's center moniker. For example, the My Japanese user that establishes ties with the English segment is also a My English user.

Far short of conducting a global survey of second language course textbooks and instructors and basing assertions solely on language learning experiences in 5 languages and informal perspective surveys of past and present students, the author speculates a very high percentage of second language textbooks and instructors currently apply a native speakerism approach to second language acquisition. Second language textbook publishers and instructors applying a native speaker approach are trying to define and make static a language segment center that does not exist; a centrist approach. This centrist approach focusses primarily on communicative efficiency and intelligibility relative to a nondescript L1 user model. Students A and B are led to believe they must follow the prescribed ABAB model (e.g. A communicates something, B responds, A concurs, B acknowledges the result) to be understood in a given communicative event or any communicative activity. What seemingly fails to be addressed or answered is what students A and B are to do if A, B, or both A and B, deviate from the model. What if A and B use different L1s? What if A and B use different cultural reference points? What if A and B have different communicative motives? What if A or B are located at different positions on the English spectrum? What if C joins the communicative activity and reshapes the RoI skillset for better or worse? If students are only exposed to a nativist language model, how can textbook publishers and instructors, as learning facilitators, help learners overcome the pressures, whether institutionally mandated or self-inflicted, of attaining a native/centrist proficiency level? Considering the infinite variability of possible combined skillsets My English users could engage in a communicative event, and the resulting spectrums of skills affecting the spectrum of English, publishers and instructors could be forgiven for choosing centrist examples for the sake of ink and paper. However, the examples ignore the whole of the English spectrum and are injustice to users. For learners the narrowed examples reinforce the myth of a native or centrist ideal. The message is that access to the RoI requires learners to become the native or get as close as possible to the segment center; not My

English but Their English.

What centrist second language textbooks and instructors ignore, the academic field of ELF addresses directly; the entirety of the English spectrum from its elusive center to its numerous fringes. An oft cited definition of ELF is "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011: 7). In a more recent incarnation, Jenkins (2015) broadens the ELF definition to include multilingual contexts. Jenkins' English as a Multilingua Franca (EMF) is "Multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen" (2015: 73).

The field of ELF has amassed corpus, analyzed a range of skills, and provided insights into communicative events from a variety of My English user perspectives and skillsets. The work of ELF academics is creating awareness of the breadth and flexibility of English use. Research focussing on the spectrum of English such as the minimum skillset composition of non-L1 My English users that have successfully accessed the RoI, for example Jenkins' phonology related work (2000), and complex compositions of My Language user skillsets, locations, and L1s, in communicative events where English may or may not be part of the primary means of communication (Seidlhofer, 2011; Mauranen, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2014), are pushing boundaries of the English spectrum.

CIE approaches the English world with an ELF Lens, exploring the English segment from its center(s) to its fringes. The ELF Lens refocuses instructor approaches to the English language and English CLIL components of the program. Instructors are tasked with taking a wider and less prescriptive position towards English than current norms. In CIE, ELF could be defined as one My English user communicating with other My English users to access the RoI. For CIE seminar and short-term contract instructors, the ELF Lens is both practical and necessary. The approach is practical for developing My English skillsets for international communication and necessary to stay abreast of temporary, sustained, and historic language ties influencing the English spectrum to maintain program contemporariness.

The journey for CIE students might go something like this. A student joins CIE. Some join still hanging on to their nativist indoctrination or wondering how on Earth they can communicate intelligibly and efficiently without the prescriptive ABAB model. When CIE students realize the skills and skill spectrums involved in successful communication, via the RoI, and the international scope of information dissemination using English, via

the TBL, English as a Lingua Franca becomes the 'attain native proficiency' pressure release valve. Students shift their approach to English from the narrow ABAB, to what is possible when A or B or both A and B deviate from the centrist model. Students come to understand that users choose to use My English, or not, as an L1 or L2/L2+, based on the given skillsets of My English users participating in a given communicative event.

The ELF Lens, as it is applied in short-term contract instructor courses, aims to highlight the spectrum of English communication. Listening Strategies, Oral Strategies, and Oral Comprehension, for example, draw attention to the varieties of language in both Japanese and English. Examining selections of My English and My Japanese users courtesy of the students themselves, online accent tags, and various corpuses, students learn the more exposure they have to a user's listening or speaking styles the more attune they become to the range of My Englishes. Accommodation techniques, such as clarifying or asking for repetition, are also examined. Students are exposed to flipped scenarios where students try to understand various examples of the instructor's non-prescribed My Japanese grammar and pronunciation. The goal is to demonstrate how correct, perfect, native, or centrist notions of language are not necessary to communicate a message effectively. For example, the instructor says and writes, "say tah he rooh E on ahkah kah ooh ya suey key no." Students who do not immediately understand the example are accommodated by those who do. Eventually, all participants decipher the non-prescribed Japanese to a version of:

kinou no hiru, Aeon de, yasui no aka seetaa o kaimashita
昨日の昼, イオンで安いの赤セーターを買いました。
Yesterday afternoon, I bought a cheap red sweater at Aeon.

Following the activity students reflect on the process of understanding non-prescribed Japanese. Students discover the irrationality of thinking a My English interlocutor will not be as flexible as the students were with the instructor, when students use My English outside the classroom. Students often shift the discussion to whether katakana pronunciation falls within the RoI. The students form a consensus that for those familiar with Japanese, katakana pronunciation would more likely fall within the RoI; ELF with a Japanese flavour. Students also realize most people are unfamiliar with the Japanese language and katakana pronunciation would likely fall outside the RoI in many communicative events, requiring greater accommodation to access the RoI. Students often place katakana pronunciation in the My English spectrum but at the fringes.

The ELF Lens is also applied in Essential Grammar, a course addressing, language accommodation, and the RoI. Students examine textbook examples of English used by Japanese, considered errors by their prescriptive publishers, from the perspective of accessing the RoI. With the help of the instructor, students discuss the degrees to which accommodation would be necessary to access the RoI. Furthermore, the students, most of whom are Japanese, become aware of a concentration of users on the English spectrum that is identified as Japanese English.

An example of Japanese English is the use of the word 'live'. Commonly used as an adjective or adverb in centrist English, Japanese English also uses 'live' as a noun. For example:　　　A: What did you do last night?

B: I went to a live.

A: Who did you see?

B: A local band.

In the example above, A is likely to be familiar with Japanese English. A conversation with someone unfamiliar with Japanese English may proceed as follows:

A: What did you do last night?

B: I went to a live.

A: A live what?

B: What do you mean? / looks confused

Essential Grammar asks students to consider the degree of importance each individual places on the various skills involved in English communication. Students must address what the minimum requirement is to access the RoI in a given communicative event if everyone is using their own My English? Taking the 'live' example, students often minimize the exchange to:

A: Last night?

B: Live.

A: See? /(gesture)

B: Local/City band.

The ELF Lens as it is applied to CIE's course set, enables students to grasp the scope of the English language segment through exploration outside centrist notions of language. In conjunction with the concepts of the RoI and TBL, student perceptions of English are evolving. The TBL expands global awareness of English use, the RoI broadens the notion of understandable English, and an ELF Lens removes the pressures of achieving unrealistic

language goals.

Faculty Mentoring

The Faculty Mentoring of today lays the foundation for the human resource development and knowledge creation legacies of tomorrow. As the norm of impermanent instructors pervades, rather than viewing short-term contracts as token positions to be filled, institutions are best served by investing in these instructors. An instructor's status should not preclude their engagement in research, program development, or exchanges of ideas and opinions. Engagement contributes to a person's job satisfaction and motivation to invest in oneself and their place of employment.

CIE's Faculty Mentoring includes all its instructors engaging in open and frank discussions about CIE's pedagogical direction. In more involved CIE Faculty Mentoring a CIE seminar instructor working with a non-faculty member invited one short-term CIE instructor to join their research group. Participation in the research group provided the short-term contract instructor several opportunities to develop their research, publication, and international presentation portfolios. The seeming success of this collaboration lead to the inclusion of both short-term instructor positions in the research group. The short-term contract instructor first invited to join the research group and the CIE seminar instructor that initiated the invitation, have moved on from CIE however they both remain involved with the research group and current CIE faculty.

Aichi University's current English slogan, *Imparting Wisdom for a Globalized World*, is not limited to its students. CIE's Faculty Mentoring has benefitted the program through its exchange of ideas, perspectives, and curriculum development. The university has also benefitted through CIE's faculty presence and research contributions at academic conferences. The continued involvement of past CIE faculty is the potential beginning of a human resource and knowledge legacy.

The Future of CIE

The very nature of short-term contracts forces instructors to constantly have an eye on academic opportunities elsewhere. The turnover of such positions affects a program's course content delivery and continuity to various degrees. CIE needs short-term contract

instructors to maximize their eligible contract renewals to ensure smooth faculty transitions, program continuity, and contribution to research. The contributions of CIE's impermanent preparatory instructors thus far, highlights both the strengths of current practices and the challenges of maintaining the developed momentum of core pedagogy. Without Faculty Mentoring, the TBL, the RoI, and the ELF lens elements would not have developed to their current extent. These elements contribute to maintaining CIE's program continuity during faculty transitions and, most importantly, evolving student perceptions of English. Before short-term faculty leave Aichi University and achieve varying degrees of global success, it is imperative Aichi University invests in their development to claim its contribution to the legacies and assert achievement of its English slogan.

References

Beebe, L. M., & Giles, H. (1984). Speech-accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second-language acquisition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 46, 5-32. Retrieved from doi:10.1515/ijsl.1984.46.5

Cabinet Secretariat (Japan) (2014). Released *The United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development – Japan Report*. Retrieved from https://www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/kokuren/pdf/report_h261009_e.pdf

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. Oxford: Capstone.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2015). 'Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca.' *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49–85. Retrieved from doi:10.1515/eip-2015- 0003

Kirkpatrick, Andy. (2014). The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism?. *Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 1. 4-15. Retrieved from https://www3.caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/23

Kohn, K. (2012a). 'My English': Second Language Acquisition as Individual and Social Construction. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yCfpD49YhSg& feature=youtu.be

Kohn, K. (2012b), My Language – My English. Towards a Lingua Franca Pedagogy. Retrieved from http://www.sprachlernmedien.de/my-language-my-english-toward s-a-lingua-franca-pedagogy/

Kohn, K. (2018). MY English: a social constructivist perspective on ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), pp. 1-24. Retrieved from doi:10.1515/jelf-2018-0001

Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-native Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2013). *ESD Quest*. Retrieved from

http://www.esd-jpnatcom.mext.go.jp/pdf/ESDQUESTstorybook.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2016). *Overview of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology*. Retrieved from
http://www.mext.go.jp/en/about/pablication/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2017/02/15/1374478_001.pdf

Norman, W. & MacDonald, C. (2004). Getting to the Bottom of "Triple Bottom Line". *Business Ethics Quarterly* ,14(2), 243-262. Retrieved from doi:10.5840/beq20041 4211

Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409–29. Retrieved doi:10.2307/3587831

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2018). *The Future of Education and Skills: Education 2030*. Retrieved from
http://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E 2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf

Pava, M. (2007). A Response to "Getting to the Bottom of 'Triple Bottom Line'". *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 17(1), 105-110. Retrieved from doi:10.2307/27673160.

Seidlhofer, B (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations (1992). *Agenda 21*. Retrieved from
https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/c ontent/ documents/Agenda21.pdf

United Nations. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. (2014). *What is ESD?* Retrieved from
http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco-world-conference-on-esd-2014/resources/what-is-esd/

United Nations. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. (2017). *UNESCO Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable development*. Retrieved from
http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002462/246270e.pdf

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* Vol. 28, No. 2 (Summer), pp. 377-389. Retrieved from doi:10.2307/3587438

Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. OUP. Chap. 4: The ownership of English.