

4

Grounding “Transfer”: Writing in Two Disciplines in a Transnational Ecology

Relevant literature on writing across the curriculum, writing in disciplines, and knowledge transfer can helpfully articulate how field-specific goals and expectations can translate to writing teaching, but there are gaps in that literature that must be filled in practice and on site—especially where faculty and students feel an acute need *both* to teach and learn a discipline *and* acclimate to various broader educational and social characteristics of the institution. My university’s transnational context is no exception. The small number of major degree programs offered at the Asia Campus represent that campus’—and the university’s—main academic identity to students and their parents. While staff members and even, at times, faculty colleagues and I felt a need to “sell” the concept of general education courses to potential recruits and their families (since there was little analog at established Korean universities), we felt equally strongly that students and families were looking to affirm what they believed true about the value of U.S.-based degrees—a belief reinforced by the Korean domestic marketing of the Incheon Global Campus. There seemed to be clear expectations among students about what the degree programs were supposed to set as targets for them—the production of peer-reviewable research reports, ethical and authoritative news stories, and actionable public relations campaigns.

At the same time, there is at least some ambivalence in the disciplines represented by student participants’ majors about the extent to which the teaching of writing is supposed to introduce and reinforce formal genres and styles on one hand and/or facilitate disciplinary thinking and socialization on the other. In addition, at the Asia Campus and at the U.S.-based campus to which students transition for roughly their final year of study¹⁰, faculty members demonstrate clear allegiance to their disciplines, but they also show clear attempts to anticipate and respond to the linguistic and intercultural complexities that mark both campuses of their transnational institution. Fur-

10 The original Asia Campus plans called for students to spend three years in Korea before transitioning to the U.S.-based campus, where they would finish capstone coursework and participate in commencement ceremonies. In practice, some students have negotiated earlier transitions in order to take a wider range of courses at the U.S.-based campus than is offered in Korea.

ther, my observations and field notes suggest that the Asia Campus itself was functioning as an actor: much more than a backdrop against which primarily academic activities were occurring, the evolution of the campus' and the surrounding city's own space seemed to shape faculty-student interactions and students' writing in nuanced ways.

This chapter focuses on ways students and faculty members participating in my study at the Asia Campus and U.S.-based campus oriented to one another and to the ecologies in which they were embedded—with particular focus on how that ongoing orientation influenced and is influenced by the role writing plays in disciplinary identities. As students write to learn and learn to write (predominantly for my student participants in the fields of communication and psychology), they arguably “transfer” knowledge and practices from one course to the next and from one campus (in Korea) to the other (in the United States). But transfer is never linear nor a matter of straightforward transport and reuse: instead, the knowledges and practices transferred are sticky. That is, they show evidence of a given writer's learning and emerging experience while also tracing what Kevin Roozen (2009) refers to as the ontogenesis of the “literate subject” (pp. 567-568)—a coming-in-to-being that cannot but include many of the ecological factors relevant to the kind of complex, emerging site my university represents.

Indeed, in such a site, transfer is unavoidably inflected by the dynamism, idiosyncrasy, cross-contextualization, rhetoricity, multilingualism, and transformation Michael-John DePalma and Jeffrey M. Ringer (2011) argue are especially characteristic of second language writing. Thus, this chapter counterbalances arguments about transfer and about WAC/WID in communication and psychology with ongoing grounded analysis of the data within the “transnational social space” (Faist et al., 2013) that extends across my university's two campuses.

Double Shift: Writing in Communication at the Asia Campus

At UAC, writing in the communication major emphasizes critical thinking, ethical action, and closely edited newsworthy text production. That balance reflects some of the broader field's interest in articulating a dual role for the communication degree, and especially the mass communication/journalism emphasis—both as an investment in liberally educating undergraduates and in training professional documenters of news and social trends. (See Blom & Davenport, 2012; Deuze, 2001, Eschenfelder, 2019, Massé & Popovich, 1998; Smith, 1997.) As do students in the journalism emphasis at the U.S.-based

campus, Asia Campus students take courses in newswriting and in feature/magazine writing as soon as practical after finishing general lower-division writing courses. Students also take required courses in media and society and in mass communication law. This range of courses and genres is apparent in faculty participants’ writing demands. For example, students in Professor W’s media ethics course were writing their own codes of ethics following guidelines and models from the Society of Professional Journalists—augmented by Professor W’s provision of explicit rubrics. However, Professor W did not provide rubrics for newswriting since, as he related, discussions about content and format occurred in class and editorial meetings (interview, May 2016).

The assigned writing in Communication also reflected faculty-student negotiations in an emergent, multilingual “transnational social space” (Faist et al., 2013): language-related challenges combined with other characteristics of this small startup that was functioning as both part of an established university and as its own smaller-scale experiment. That is, as instructors and students negotiated the pedagogical scene, they were also negotiating material affordances and constraints that shaped their interactions and prompted creative responses. As scholarship on English education in Korea demonstrates, many students graduating from domestic secondary schools likely encounter substantial shifts upon entering U.S.-style introductory writing courses. My anecdotal familiarity with the communication major’s newswriting course (at least at the U.S.-based campus) and my knowledge of scholarship on mass communication pedagogy (see, e.g., Leggette et al., 2020; Massé & Popovich, 1998; Panici & McKee, 1996) prompted me to believe that students would have to shift *twice*—from narrative and even explicitly creative writing to the argumentative and expository writing featured in the university’s general first-year writing courses, and then once again to the specific generic and style exigencies of AP-formatted news reporting. When I expressed that concern to U.S.-native Professor W (interview, May 2016), he concurred briefly but then related that he had contacted several students he knew would be enrolling in his introductory newswriting course the following semester. Relating that he believed they were all “a little bit nervous about it,” he then described some specific details about his planned course scheduling and delivery in ways suggesting both his anticipation of some language challenges and also his creative thinking about the affordances of a small student cohort and relatively straightforward overall course scheduling.

W¹¹: I’ll just be teaching one, one class a week instead of two.

11 All transcriptions use minimal markup provided by the professional transcriber. Deletion of end punctuation indicates at least some overlap with the next utterance. Ellipsis on an otherwise blank line indicates the exclusion of at least one line of quoted transcribed speech.

And then Thursday, so I'm still deciding, I'm probably going to discuss with the students whether we do Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, but they'll have their class on, you know, the two sections will have their class on Tuesday, the other section will have their class on Wednesday, and then Thursday I'm just in the lab all day long. And I'm just going to say everybody has to come in here for at least two hours sometime during the day, I don't care when it is. You can split it up, you can come for an hour in the morning, hour in the afternoon. I've already been through all of the other schedules to make sure that everybody has a

Jay: There's a two-hour block there for

W: And everybody can fit in two hours those days. And I've already looked at, kind of, whenever all the other classes are, and there's no reason that you would have a schedule that wouldn't allow you to fit in two hours.

J: And you're just going to camp out in the lab.

W: I'm camping out in the lab. And the idea is you're working on your articles, you're making columns, you're doing what you need to do to make sure, and basically we have a newsroom type of setup.

Thus, students' relatively constrained course selection meant Professor W could identify "open" blocks for most, if not all students and could create "a newsroom type of setup," in which he would lead a traditional lecture-and-activity meeting one class day per week but then alternate with open time during which he would act as a newsroom editor. Such a setup not only approximates a paradigmatic social/professional scene in journalism—predicated on field-specific insistence on explicitly socializing students into journalistic practice (see, e.g., Smith, 1997)—but also permitted Professor W, in his words, to have "a little more of a capacity to oversee the work that's being done" given his concerns that students were synthesizing existing writing rather than writing their own reporting:

One of the things that I'm running into a lot right now is it's so hard to convince these students that they need to not just read a bunch of articles and then just sort of summarize it into their own article. That's not really what journalism is. But they do it over and over again. They say, oh, I said I ask them,

“where did you get that information from?” and they say, “oh I read it in an article.” So then it’s not cited right, and frankly, we really don’t, you really don’t want to cite to some other news article. That’s just not the way that journalism works.¹²

As Professor W implies, the more focused newsroom setup could facilitate time assisting students with the shift away from introductory academic synthesis and summary toward reporting. That time, in turn, would no doubt be facilitated by the built environment of the campus itself, on which living, recreational, and instructional spaces were only a brief walk apart from one another.

Magazine Writing, like the newswriting course, presents Asia Campus students opportunities for journalistic writing. Given the rapid evolution of the city-scale experiment in which UAC is embedded, there are certainly possibilities for creative reporting, including opportunities to write features, review new businesses, and profile students and faculty members. However, there were challenges in the course, similar to those in Newswriting, related to style, format, and teaching approaches. In a May 2016 interview, Professor M implicitly alluded to the same substantial shift from students’ academic to more professional writing that Professor W noted, claiming that students have “been taught to footnote everything, and you don’t footnote on articles: you just say it.” In fact, the double shift I noted above that Korean students often need to make from secondary-level writing to first-year expository and argumentative writing and then again to professional writing may be even more pronounced in the magazine course. In describing his approach to teaching students about diction and tone, Professor M related that he advised students to “focus on trying to write the way you speak”:

I tell them just, you know, you actually speak very well. And in fact, you’ve been talking since you were two years old. But writing in college for only about six months. So if your speaking ability has surpassed your writing ability for now. So if you just try to communicate that way, it’ll be easier, it’ll flow more smoothly, and this will be a good tool. So that’s been good. I

12 There are some strident claims in mass communication scholarship about the field’s protection and advancement of credibility, ethics, and free speech (Blom & Davenport, 2012; Smith, 1997). Those claims warrant wider claims about what Edward J. Smith (1997) refers to as the overlap between an ideally trained journalist and an ideally liberally educated student: identifying an exigent topic, developing a point of view, and contextualizing that perspective among others, in Smith’s view, are simultaneously the best ways to write a story and the best ways to achieve critical thinking.

tell that to people in the, um, in the American student body as well. . . . There is kind of learning curve to figure out that they can do that, it's safe and they'll be better.

The advice to “write the way you speak” may seem to Professor M like an intuitive way to reduce students' anxieties about composition in the profession, but it was not as likely to evoke the same colloquial knowledge of English among Asia Campus students as it would at the U.S.-based campus. Indeed, given what I related in Chapter 1 about pre-university English education in Korea, many Asia Campus students are more familiar with formal, less colloquial expression. Student participant Jane's discussion of learning magazine writing, for instance, revealed some concerns about her own transition:

Jane: Formats, kind of, I have to . . . it's kind of hard for me. Like, we have to start with capital letters but the larger box, and I have to write in three columns, and I have to like blurb.

Jay: Yeah, write a blurb, like a really short statement.

Jane: And I have to, mm, umm, I don't know how to say, but I have to write in my own ideas except like, citation thing.

Jay: So you said citation thing, but you put your fingers up to show quotation marks. Do you mean quotations, like you're . . .

Jane: Not the quotations but citations.

Jay: So what kinds of citations are you supposed to do in magazine article writing?

Jane: Um, like someone says something like, actually I'm doing a restaurant review right now, but I went to a restaurant with my friend . . . and I put some kind of decorations and like, pictures, and my picture as well.

Jane's description of her writing tasks was relatively disjointed, but it was evident that she found challenges both in understanding some of the particular formatting requirements (which are less constrained by a standard such as AP than they are in newswriting) and in understanding how sources (in this case, a friend) might be represented in relatively informal writing. Again, Professor M's advice that students can and should write the way they speak did not seem natural to Jane.

At the same time, student participant Alice's response to journalistic writing and editing made visible some different kinds of familiarity and suggested

nuance among students’ levels of comfort with rhetorical demands of the field. In a visual editing course taught by Professor W, Alice was one of the editors—responsible for selecting, polishing, and including stories written by fellow students in what she described in a May 2016 interview as “my newspaper.” Despite her position as a class editor, though, she expressed discomfort resulting from her perceived abilities with formal written English:

J: What does the editing consist of? What are you doing when you are editing?

A: So, grammatical mistakes, and news stories have to have some important elements. For example, leads. So for the first paragraph, we are supposed to um, have like five W’s, like *where when why who, why*, something like that. So, we try to edit that when we read other students’ stories. If that’s missing, we edit that. We add leads, and also try to edit the entire, like, flow.

J: Okay, so like flow, cohesion, so you add like transitions and stuff like that.

A: Yeah, it’s really difficult. Especially when it’s second language. I don’t even know if I’m writing it like, correcting right or not.

In other ways, however, Alice was demonstrating much more confidence as she moved between genres, reflecting the field’s attempt to balance formal/academic and informal/popular generic expectations. In two versions of her news article about U.S. President Barack Obama’s 19 September 2015 weekly radio address, for example, Alice clearly adopted the succinct AP style she mentioned in her in-class editing role. In a terse, single-sentence first paragraph, Alice concisely reported the “five W’s” of Obama’s speech, relating that the president “discussed the remarkable economic growth of the United States following the 2008 financial crisis and called for the Republicans in Congress to pass a responsible budget”—a sentence that she had revised from an earlier two-sentence paragraph. Between versions, there was more evidence of very close editing for AP style, including the reduction of participial phrases (“in his September 19 weekly address” for “in his weekly address given on September 19”) and inversion of attribution phrases (“said Obama” for “Obama said”).

Even more of Alice’s genre sensibility emerged between her newswriting and her magazine feature writing, as her article about Korea’s high-stakes

national university entrance exam exemplified. In keeping with Professor M's advice to "just say it," Alice's style and tone were far more conversational than in her newswriting:

On November 12, 2015, South Korea came to a grinding halt due to a singular event. Suneung, the life-changing college exam. Many parents were praying for their sons' and daughter's success in the exams in front of exam halls. As 631,100 high school seniors were taking the most important exam of their lives, even the skies above Korea have gone silent. Even the skies above Korea went silent.¹³ The government stopped flying aircraft to reduce noise, and it ordered public offices, major businesses, and the stock market to open an hour later than usual Thursday for students to avoid traffic jams. . . .

That's right, all of this happens for test, specifically, Suneung, the life-changing college exam given to Korean students in their senior year of high school. The exam comes around just once each year, and nearly everyone in Korea is impacted. Many parents (stand?/kneel?/linger?) outside of the exam halls, praying for their sons' and daughters' success.

Here, on a topic Alice and most other Korean students would find personally relevant and highly memorable, Alice used a combination of vivid and adjective-laden description, repetition, and conversational strategies ("That's right") to emphasize the importance of *suneung* and attempts to maximize the resources of writing for a popular feature.

As Alice's and Jane's work illustrate, writing in communication courses at the Asia Campus was a balance among students' adaptation through a double shift—from "creative" secondary school writing to prototypical "academic" writing in introductory composition to complexly multi-register proto-professional writing in the major. It was also a balance negotiated by faculty members, who clearly demonstrated allegiance to in-field ideas about journalistic writing as well as writing for other academic/professional purposes in communication, but who also felt the exigencies of their multilingual and

13 In Chapter 1, I related information about Korea's exam-heavy educational culture. My critical narrative in Chapter 2 as well as my and my research assistants' observation notes from research visits include numerous mentions of sound—large trucks and other construction/earth moving equipment, wind, and popular music coming from loudspeakers at a construction site next to our campus. Seoul, where research assistants, colleagues, and I often traveled, always seemed loud and rushed in many locations. So Alice's repeated description suggests how remarkable enforced silence on exam day can be.

transnational context. In a May 2017 interview, Professor M mentioned that he had shifted his focus in Magazine Writing to emphasize visual design over equivalent time on close language editing since the new focus seemed more fun and more familiar for students and since “even the best students are really not going to be real top of the line writers in English.”¹⁴ In the same interview, Professor M also discussed a mass communication law course that he and Professor W, both attorneys by training, regularly taught. While both faculty members were aware of the university’s and department’s directives to make the Asia Campus curriculum closely mirror the U.S.-based campus’, they recognized the limitations of teaching U.S. case law in Korea. But since neither was an expert on applicable Korean law, they defaulted to textbook-heavy instruction predicated on the U.S.-based law with which they were more familiar, and which the vast majority of communication majors overall would be expected to know anyway. Their attempts to adapt in both journalistic and more theory-heavy courses exemplified the push and pull necessary to build a curriculum grounded in academic and professional considerations and simultaneously responsive to local resources and constraints.

High Stakes and Affective Investments: Transnational Writing in Psychology

As in the communication curriculum, psychology students and faculty members were balancing disciplinary goals with the need to account for everyday linguistic and cultural differences in their transnational setting. Students’ writing in the psychology major at the Asia Campus before their transition to the U.S. campus reflected disciplinary and faculty expectations about personal interest in relevant topics tempered with an emerging understanding of the field’s dominant genres and styles. It also reflected anxieties about linguistic performance in writing under at least some pressure from perceived expectations of the U.S. campus—a campus that, as I related in Chapter 2, was

14 Professor M’s approach reminded me of experiences colleagues and I had had teaching the small initial group of students during the Asia Campus’ first year of operation. In the global citizenship course I taught, my co-teacher and I integrated assignments requiring students to use their ubiquitous smart phones to take photos of objects they owned as part of an audiovisual presentation about the globalized supply chains that supplied those objects to them. We also engaged students in using their phones virtually to “tag” images of places on and around campus as part of an assignment on global street art and activism. While Professor M did not explicitly scaffold his shift to visual design the same way colleagues and I scaffolded the smart phone-based assignments in the other course, the similarity exemplifies this transnational social space’s interrelationships between teaching/learning and the broader ecology.

symbolically present at the Asia Campus in the curriculum as well as in the images and icons that consistently oriented students and faculty to the broader university. In a May 2016 interview with Jane, I asked about differences she perceived between her magazine writing course and the psychology research methods course she and other students were taking—a course required for all psychology majors and an elective for all students.¹⁵ In contrast to the informal—even conversational—writing she and Alice reported in communication courses, writing for her research course immediately seemed more explicitly thesis driven: as she reported,

we have to do, writing headings, subheadings, and everything. Introduction, methods, and results. We have to write three parts and within those things we have to write a participants, measurements, and how, yeah, how are we going to recruit participants and compensation.

In several interviews with multiple students and faculty members at both the Asia Campus and the U.S.-based campus, the themes of writing as a means to learn to think like a psychologist and of writing as a means to record and display research results were pervasive—and reflective of claims in psychology’s literature about the utility of WAC/WID-based “writing to learn” and “learning to write” approaches. (See, e.g., Friedrich, 1990; Goddard, 2003; Hettich, 1990; Jolley & Mitchell, 1990; Madigan & Brosamer, 1990.) Students paid significant attention to the requirements of the introductory research methods course Jane discussed. Similar to the communication major’s news-writing course, this course seemed intended to expose students to preferred research genres, styles, and formats as soon as possible after first-year writing. Indeed, a social work professor who was one of the inaugural faculty members at the Asia Campus assigned significant low-stakes writing in both her introductory psychology and sociology courses but also insisted that students learn and practice APA format¹⁶ and include explicit introduction and conclusion

15 There was significant crossover of student enrollments during and after my own year at the Asia Campus: it was common, given the small faculty complement and relatively limited course selection, for psychology students to take communication courses and vice versa.

16 Psychology’s sense of ownership of American Psychological Association (APA) styles and formatting is on display in relevant literature, in which a students’ APA adherence might seem to be a close analogue to their field-specific reasoning ability. In a report of a psychology professor’s collaboration with a writing center consultant (Miller & Andrews, 1993), both tutor and instructor consistently direct a focal student back to an APA handbook for authoritative guidance ranging from the length of an abstract to the actual content of a discussion section.

sections—anticipating the more closely formatted research articles students would read and begin to write. Overall, then, students in the psychology major consistently encountered writing assignments geared toward their early intellectual and professional development; however, those developmental goals were at times inflected with the dynamic histories and cultural/linguistic investments that critical transfer theorists observe.

One required psychology course—Research Methods—was especially noteworthy for the academic and professional stakes it held and for the reactions it evoked. During my academic year at the Asia Campus, the course was not taught. With additional faculty hiring the next academic year (2015-16), the course came online—and it quickly acquired a reputation for rigor. The centerpiece and the major assignment of the course was an IMRAD-formatted research paper¹⁷ on topics students were permitted to choose but for which the instructor provided fictional data. Through the semester, students submitted, revised, then resubmitted each discrete section, beginning with an introduction that included references to literature. In successive interviews, Professor A, the Korean- and U.S.-educated faculty member who taught the course at the Asia Campus during my study, described her approach as well as her perceptions of student work in terms emphasizing a combination of disciplinary and idiosyncratic expectations—the combination of which revealed very high and even personal stakes for Professor A’s identification with her students’ ongoing language acquisition. In May 2016, Professor A observed a range of problems with student writing:

A: not only the grammar, grammatical errors I had to keep on telling what to do but also about overall structure. How you develop your idea of message. Because you need to use the backup research saying probably it’s not ready about your topic of interest. And then you should have the section of what is not known, so that your research can contribute. But then they were not getting that.

J: Yeah

A: But the biggest points off was from the quoting.

J: Mm

A: They were quoting. In psychological research, we don’t quote, we cite.

17 Following an organization that includes discretely labeled sections for an introduction, methods, results, analysis, and discussion.

J: Yeah, you're just citing, you're just paraphrasing, summarizing, and citing, right.

A: In terms of the ideas and findings. But they were missing that part, a very huge part.

J: That's interesting, they do

A: They were just quoting the results.

J: Yeah

A: Like, depressed people were doing this. Quoting, just no no no.

. . . A: So it is the curriculum, right, learning about it is what we need to do during the course of study so I shouldn't worry too much. But then the papers were shockingly disorganized.

In ways similar to many U.S.-based faculty as reported in literature and through anecdotes, Professor A discussed several generic, conceptual, and stylistic considerations that overlapped. While concerns about grammar arose several times during my interviews with her, Professor A was quick in this excerpt to note apparent problems with “overall structure,” by which she meant a common and privileged arrangement in research article introductions through which a writer reviews “backup research,” observes a gap in that research, and turns to their own contribution. Her attention to structure was consistent with psychology literature that advocates for teaching empirical report writing to introductory-level students as an opportunity to “help [them] see that this style communicates the logic of the scientific process” and that the preferred report organization “mirrors the ideal research process” (Goddard, 2003, p. 28; also see Miller & Andrews, 1993).

Indeed, Professor A's qualification that “learning about it [research and writing in psychology] is what we need to do during the course of study” represents her implicit recognition that students continue to learn psychology-based literacies throughout their majors. And in a comment that was unusual among faculty participants in my study, she alluded in a May 2018 interview to a broader need to coordinate with first-year writing instructors and the campus' writing center, reflecting a shift from the initial faculty cohort's relative disinterest in such coordination that I reported in Chapter 2:

We [UAC faculty] don't have the agreement on the level of expectations. From writing center, and writing courses, as well. So my expectation for the persons who have completed suc-

cessfully, by getting A from Writing 1010 and Writing 2010, would be this [gestures with flat palm parallel to floor], but they are here [makes same gesture slightly lower to floor]. I mean, I’m talking about those who got A’s, right? But then, where is this discrepancy from? So we need to communicate from within our faculty members first, so that we could channel students to get the proper help, or assistance, or guidance in the proper timing.

However, beyond that implicit curricular criticism that is relatively common in WAC/WID literature and in anecdotal experiences, Professor A’s comments were also sharply evaluative and even carried attributions of emotional states to students. Beyond observing that students’ apparent lack of conventional organization and their tendency to quote from literature were generically inappropriate, Professor A related her feeling that “depressed people were doing this.” While I did not ask her to elaborate and would not want to speculate on what that statement could mean, it is clear that Professor A’s response to at least some student writing carried a strong affective charge. As a U.S.-educated Korean national and native Korean speaker herself, Professor A was unique among faculty participants, and she suggested her background and experiences prompted her to identify with the Korean students who were in the vast majority at the Asia Campus. Thus, the disciplinary goal in which Professor A was clearly invested—namely, to teach students empirical logic through writing—and the institutional imperative to prepare students for upper-division coursework with primarily native-speaking faculty members at the U.S. campus were arguably sharpened for Professor A by her high personal investment in preparing these particular students at this campus.

Students too were highly invested, concerned, and at times frustrated—especially with the research course—as they encountered different/contradictory feedback while they worked their way through the curriculum. In May 2016, Jane related the clear difference between her first-year writing class and the research class, noting that while the earlier course required students to write proposals for papers and support theses, it was comparatively “lenient” because their theses did not have to be “valid” and because every sentence they wrote did not have to “sound perfect and professional.” In a May 2016 interview, student participant John responded to my question about feedback he was receiving in the course by describing what he called “harsh” responses:

Like, grammatical mistakes, like punctuation errors, um, when we were missing something like a page number for APA format. Like, that would deduct points. Um, some people, er, in

my case too, I forgot part of an introduction completely and that would, like the title page, I forgot to do that. So the grading is not—I wouldn't say necessarily on the content but on the formatting issue.

David's May 2017 response to a similar question about feedback focused more on the content of his writing than on grammar and formatting, though he also suggested that the course was exacting:

[Professor A] assumes that she doesn't know anything, so she'll be like, explain to me more, in detail. She likes, she likes details and to be more specific, and giving examples, and stuff like that. She usually doesn't give an answer but kinds of leads students to find an answer by themselves. . . . For example, if a student say, um, "household status," for example, that is sort of vague. But for the students, they already know what is household status to them. But Dr. [A] assumes she doesn't know anything about what they mean.

While students' and Professor A's responses about effective writing in the research course's high-stakes major assignment ranged from clear conceptual information to organization to page numbers and other format details, that range does reflect to a large extent disciplinary investment in writing. Using writing as a way to teach students how to "think like psychologists" is a common goal in psychology pedagogy (Boice, 1990; Dunn, 1994; Goddard, 2003; Miller & Andrews, 1993; Zehr, 1998; Zehr & Henderson, 1994), and the balance of concept, argument, support, synthesis, formatting (especially in APA), and style that was apparent in Professor A's responses to writing showed her interest in writing as a technology for making students' emerging thinking vividly apparent, as she stated:

Knowing the whole research process, and by writing, meaning, in their writing, it should be conspicuous that they understand the whole process, and that they have concluded, in that process, to have the outcome, right? . . . as a writer, as any writer, the reader should follow their thought processes, and that should be integrated in their writing. (May 2017)

Professor A's grading rubric assigned 30 points to "organization and structure," 30 to "APA style," 30 to "language," 70 to "improvement" from initial to final drafts of each research article section, and 40 to "originality." Students reported that they were more or less free to select topics, which tended toward

Korean issues: in the research course and then in a summer group research project facilitated by Professor A, Jane focused on physical child abuse in Korean families and on Korean student stressors, respectively. In fact, Jane explicitly discussed her positionality—and specifically her motivated topic choice—in her group project, writing that “as a Psychology BS majoring student, I wanted to study why particularly college students in South Korea have more job seeking stress.”

However, aside from brief mentions of topic selection in interviews about and/or writing samples from the research methods course, “originality” (with respect, for instance, to topic choice) rarely emerged in collected data despite the relative weight that criterion had in Professor A’s rubric. There definitely appeared to be more emphasis on conforming to generic conventions and deploying field-specific terms. Jane’s introduction to her final draft research methods paper began with a United Nations definition of “child abuse” complete with APA-formatted reference. After mentioning the recent emergence of several new protective laws, Jane shifted in the second paragraph to what she saw as a gap in child protection in Korea, noting that “investigations into factors of child abuse performers and therapeutic intervention towards them are insufficient.” In her portion of the group-based summer research paper on students’ stress, Jane followed a similar organization, including some literature review/synthesis in the introduction. She also adopted some preferred stylistic conventions in her brief report about methods, though the shift from her author-evacuated statement that “participants of this research will be recruited within the [Asia Campus]” to her more personalized claim that “my participants’ inclusion criteria will be very specific and international” showed evidence that her familiarity with the subgenre of the methods section was still developing.

Beyond the introductory methods course and related writing projects, psychology majors encountered assignments that allowed them to work somewhat more creatively and personally, though faculty expectations that they use the assignments as opportunities to “think like a psychologist” remained consistent. A social psychology course at the Asia Campus included a “research paper” assignment that combined reinforcement of textbook psychology concepts (for instance, conformity, obedience, and persuasion), critical review of relevant experiments from literature, and an opportunity for students to speculate about further research on the topics—all within a highly structured assignment that required APA formatting and style. A cognitive psychology course, also at the Asia Campus, required a similar structure but encouraged students to reflect on how their thinking was changing through new concepts: Jane’s “thought paper” on language, for instance, included her experiences with patterns of interaction among students from Korea and the

US interspersed with references to concepts from intercultural communication. I had personally witnessed a broader conversation among students who were debating the utility of an “English only” policy on campus to ameliorate what they believed to be low proficiency and a lack of English-language interaction, so Jane’s paper was evidence of disciplinary practice tied to sensitivity to the linguistic complexities of her surrounds.

As students transition to the U.S. campus, the combination of personal/academic/professional motivation and their emerging disciplinary knowledge becomes even more vital. Interviews with U.S.-based campus faculty participants revealed an expectation that advanced undergraduate students begin to specialize in the field, shifting from class-based proto-professional writing assignments to higher-stakes tasks—an expectation that seemed to prompt both students and faculty to contact one another across the campuses in order to establish relationships and explore options. However, even more attention to writing does not necessarily translate to more attention to the close stylistic and formatting expectations students would have focused on extensively through Asia Campus coursework. In an April 2018 interview in her office at the U.S.-based campus, Professor K related that she was in consistent contact with pre-transition students interested in human factors-related study and work¹⁸ and that she was advising them to take a specialized writing course with her while they were connecting with potential faculty mentors:

It’s more of the technical writing, so they’ll have to sometimes write amendments to our ethics board. So, really having to kind of follow a very specific structure of these different sections, and then they write a—what ends up being a five-page, single-spaced conference paper. . . . They are actually submitting data, analyzing data. I mean, it depends on what the project is, and the nature of it, but basically we want to be able to say by the end of that project that they have human factors experience from start to finish. Here is a writing sample that I can offer to potential jobs or graduate schools.

At the same time Professor K was facilitating advanced writing in the discipline, students had ideally identified a mentor from among psychology faculty and had attached to the project and lab that mentor leads. That connection then involved students in submitting study-related documents to the

18 The APA describes human factors and engineering psychology as a specialization that “focuses on improving and adapting technology, equipment and work environments to complement human behavior and capabilities” (see <https://www.apa.org/action/science/human-factors/education-training>).

Institutional Review Board (IRB) and in creating actual conference proposals. At that stage, students’ writing as well as their interactions with mentors began to reveal the graduate student-faculty mentor interactions Jay Jordan and April Kedrowicz (2011) noticed in engineering labs, in which significant time and attention were devoted to quick-turnaround publications, such as research articles, conference proposals, and grant applications, intended to advance specific academic projects and even support the labs themselves.

Interestingly, as students’ writing after their transition to the U.S.-based campus aligned more closely with faculty/lab projects, the attention faculty members such as Professor K paid to formatting and style was somewhat attenuated by broader goals of socializing all psychology students into a community of psychologists—goals that seemed to position writing as a medium through which students could and should circulate their ideas, seek responses, and build relationships:

We don’t expect people to have done this type of writing very often. So we try to really prioritize in that upper division [writing course] a lot of feedback. Like, don’t sit there and beat your head against the wall for an hour. Write something, give it to me, and I will say like what’s on track and what isn’t.

To be sure, as Professor K also related to me, she was concerned that students adopt recognizable professional styles early, and she found herself advising students to prune writing that may show their personal investment in and understanding of relevant topics but that was too conversational. Professor B, also in a 2018 interview but at the U.S.-based campus, introduced similar concerns about students’ overly informal tone and also about their tendency to include too much written “filler.” For her, there can be a particular premium on conciseness when writing for academic and professional journals: hard limits on word counts and space can mean the difference between the acceptance and rejection of article submissions, despite their overall quality.

Thus, U.S. campus-based faculty members I interviewed, generally aware of disciplinary standards and individually aware of the constraints on their own professional writing, counsel students to write “correctly,” but they do so in view of the role writing plays not only in training students to “think like psychologists” but also in view of the socialization necessary to sustaining psychology communities. That is, despite some of the pressure Asia Campus faculty and students seemed to feel about connecting technical correctness in writing to disciplinary knowledge, U.S.-based faculty participants seemed at least as interested in writing as a way to facilitate necessary relationships with more expert psychologists.

Discussion

Students in my study learned and adapted dynamically and even idiosyncratically as they negotiated language contact in an academic and broader transnational scene that pushes and pulls. Adapting to the same transnational scene, their faculty members established and enacted disciplinary expectations through writing but also through a range of activities with which writing interanimates. So both faculty and students reflected Leki's (2007) conclusion that writing may be most important not as the academic/disciplinary coin of the realm but as an important though not unique means of "disciplinary socialization" (p. 245)—a finding of Leki's that is sharpened by the particular kinds of socialization and ecological development of my site. Communication students often encounter news/magazine writing courses that require them to write in explicitly journalistic styles on tight deadlines designed to reflect the pressures of a newsroom environment or editorial collective. However, those environments are also laboratories for students to socialize, trying identities, routines, and habits of critical questioning that are key skills for reporters—but also key to what many communication scholars believe is the process of learning how to be civically engaged. And psychology students may become collaborators on research projects and associated IRB protocols, articles, conference papers, and grant proposals even as undergraduates, but literature on psychology pedagogy also values students' writing that is personal, exploratory, and experimental for its own sake. Indeed, an additional faculty informant in my study, Professor E, related that he asks students in his U.S. campus-based introductory cognitive science course (which enrolls students who started at both the Asia and U.S.-based campuses) to analogize between visible structures (such as a sculpture in the university's art museum or the traffic patterns along a major off-campus thoroughfare) and the brain structures he teaches.

An artwork or roadway that invokes a brain structure, a classroom-turned-newsroom that creatively manipulates contact hours in the ways Professor W did, the shift to more visual composition/editing as a way to reduce students' anxieties about correctness in Professor M's class—all may work for students as instances of the boundary objects or cultural tools Kevin Roozen (2009) and Elizabeth Wardle and Roozen (2012) discuss. In making sense of his focal student's trajectory of writing, Roozen (2009) observed that Angelica held onto longstanding personal and expressive literate practices despite negative feedback about her application of those practices to academic writing about literature. Her persistence paid off in a journalism course, in which a teaching assistant (TA) advised her that all good writing is actually

revision of existing text and practices. In addition to appreciating Angelica’s own perseverance, it is useful to appreciate the persistence-in-evolution of her literate activity itself in ways Roozen (2009) suggests: the “object” (to use the sociocultural vocabulary circulating in at least some transfer literature) remains sticky enough as it is “handed” across contexts that it facilitates literacies while it also traces an ontogenesis of the “literate subject” (Roozen, 2009, pp. 567–568). Thus, the tendency of some traditional transfer research to imply that individuals carry knowledge/practices from one context to another and reapply them in predictable ways is insufficient to net the wide range of potential actors/objects, including the anticipatory actions and adaptive reactions of faculty, programs, majors, and institutions (cf. Yancey et al. [2014], p. 10).

The need for such an ecological perspective to trace the ontogenetic characteristics of literate action is especially clear in the transnational site of my own study. As I relate elsewhere in this book, it quickly became impossible for me to disentangle my own embeddedness in the overlapping material and metaphorical ecologies of the Asia Campus from my intention to study writing across the curriculum: in grounded theory-inflected terms, that embeddedness was a “sensitizing concept” (Blumer, 1954; Charmaz, 2003) that may have operated as a boundary object for my own writing. Relevant to thinking about the ways faculty members and students in communication and psychology were building and replicating literate communities, I see patterns of literate development that cannot but reflect transnational complexities. Similar to the negotiations Soomin Jwa (2019) observes her Korean focal students making as they shift from first-year to advanced business writing, I noted students’ making “educated guesses” based on their perceptions of a “broad range in application of the concepts and skills” they learned earlier (p. 116). Even though Professor W warned students about what to expect in journalistic writing courses, they still needed to adjust on the fly, with varying degrees of comfort: Jane found some of the generic conventions of magazine writing unusual, and Alice expressed clear discomfort as a second language “editor.” But Alice applied her personal investment in Korea’s exam-heavy culture to vivid writing about national testing, and Jane arguably developed some genre meta-awareness because she was constrained to take both newswriting and psychology methods courses owing to the small number of courses offered at the time. While several students found writing in psychology highly challenging and at times exacting, they tended to use the opportunity to write for formal and less formal purposes as ways to make sense of daily concerns around the campus and community, such as language/interactional differences with other students and the stresses of academic achievement among Korean youth.

Faculty (re)oriented themselves around these literate actions as they applied field-specific writing pedagogies reflected in literature and, in many cases, in previous experiences teaching at the U.S.-based campus. But they also revised and refined those approaches as they recognized transnational complexities. The still-small student population and limited course offerings afforded Professor W the chance to block “newsroom” time each week in his course, and Professor M refocused work in his magazine writing curriculum to visual design, thus temporarily reducing his more usual emphasis on close language editing. While Professor A’s comments pointed to significant affective charge around her reactions to psychology students’ writing, that investment arguably showed her keen awareness (as a native speaker of Korean herself) that Korean-speaking students may have a higher bar to clear with written expression as they work toward capstone courses at the U.S.-based campus. However, Professor K expressed more interest in Asia Campus students’ socialization into lab settings and into collaboration with mentors over drafts in progress than she expressed in grammatical or format correctness on arrival.

It is difficult to conclude with specific instances of *what* transferred and *how* from course to course and campus to campus. Rather, my analysis of specific details around the writing of student participants majoring in communication and psychology reinforces Jwa’s (2019) call for attention to the *ways* of transfer. That kind of attention is not only qualitative in nature but necessarily open to the list of characteristics DePalma and Ringer (2011) assign to “adaptive transfer”: dynamism, idiosyncrasy, cross-contextualization, rhetoricity, multilingualism, and transformation. That list resists direct programmatic or curricular direction, instead prompting research and teaching that hold in balance the exigencies of academic and professional genres, students’ histories and rhetorical work, instructors’ nimbleness and investments, and the ecologies in which all those considerations interrelate.