

# 6

## “Well Mixed-Up”: Pressures on English Competence, Perceptions, and Identity

In Chapter 1, I discussed Korea’s complex and evolving relationship with the English language and specifically with English language teaching and learning. As I described, Korea has invested and continues to invest heavily in English as a nation and at the level of individual families, who at times extend themselves transnationally in bids to maximize educational and other social opportunities. But Korea also demonstrates ambivalence about the sociocultural effects of English learning, English proficiency, and associated social capital. Scholarly literature in applied linguistics and anthropology calls attention not only to the high social stakes of learning English but also to shifting definitions of “competence” in the language. That conflict is certainly present in Korea. As Korea has intensified its efforts to participate in a globalized economy, it has also intensified its investment in English, creating opportunities for teachers, translators, and others who can literally and figuratively capitalize. However, those opportunities can bring pressures different from studying for and passing traditional language tests. High-stakes English testing for school and university entry, course placement, and job interviews remains solidly in place, but Korea’s ongoing project of globalization injects uncertainty into what English proficiency means. While relevant scholarship has been developing a vocabulary for English competencies in Korea that is more expansive than the traditional native-nonnative speaker distinction, transnational education—just to name one emerging transnational industry in Korea—is laying an ever more diverse terrain as longstanding patterns of in- and out-migration to and from Korea change.

In this chapter, I focus on the perspectives and experiences of David, one of my student participants, whose history as a fluent bilingual speaker of Korean and English and as a U.S. citizen who had never entered the United States before attending the U.S.-based campus of my university, concisely encapsulates the current complexity of English-language sociolinguistics in Korea and at my own transnational site. David’s academic work as well as his reflections on courses, assignments, and interactions with peers and faculty members confirm a number of scholarly claims about Korean perceptions of domestic versus international English learning and about the pressures of English-language achievement among (ethnic and/or national)

Koreans. But David's case also adds nuance to existing understandings of the ways students position themselves as competent English users given the complexities both of his (and my) emerging university context and of his own identity. As David makes sense of his own position relative to peers, instructors, and the university, he implicitly highlights the pressures that Korea's cultural and educational evolution exert on conceptions of transfer, on teaching and learning, and on students' competencies and identities in this transnational experiment.

## "Semi-Forced": Conspicuous English Competence Among Peers

As I related in Chapter 1, a high level of competence in English is a cherished commodity in Korea, historically quantified as high standardized test scores. But as Cho (2015, 2017) observes among professional translators, English competence has really evolved to become a function of learners' adeptness at meeting shifting standards that are often implicit. So a *guknaepa* learner's formal facility with English acquired in Korean schools may seem static compared to a *haewaepa* learner's fluid, comfortable—even glamorous—competence acquired from travel and other foreign contacts.<sup>20</sup> Unlike Cho (2015, 2017) and the peers she discusses, David was not a professional translator, but his background, competencies, and interactions at the Asia Campus exemplified some of the same patterns Cho observes among *haewaepa* and *guknaepa* subjects. At the same time, David's identity did not fit neatly into either category—a characteristic that suggests additional contemporary complexity as Korea's self-fashioning as an English-speaking context evolves—in part through my university's transnational experiment.

David started at the Asia Campus in the Fall 2015 semester, and he graduated in Spring 2019 after moving to the U.S.-based campus. While he was born and reared in Korea, he is a citizen of the United States owing to his father's own citizenship, and his father spoke to him exclusively in English while David was growing up. He attended an international school in Korea through his entire 12 years of primary and secondary education before enrolling at the Asia Campus. He had travelled outside Korea to the Philippines on several occasions, but he had never entered the United States prior to his enrollment at the U.S.-based campus in Fall 2018. David

---

20 Again, *guknaepa* refers in this context to a Korean national who has largely learned English in domestic Korean schools and other programs, whereas *haewaepa* refers to a Korean national who has encountered English in more varied, typically international settings.

majored in psychology throughout his enrollment. As I did with other student participants, I met David for relatively extensive semi-structured interviews on annual visits to the Asia Campus in spring 2016, 2017, and 2018. And I met him on an additional occasion in December 2018, near the end of his first semester in the United States. I also collected numerous samples of his writing that included instructor commentary wherever possible, and I opportunistically interviewed professors and instructors he mentioned directly as well as others recommended to me by faculty informants, some of whose comments about their work with Asia Campus students have appeared in other chapters.

Beginning with our first interview in May 2016, I noted, among other topics that began emerging, that my conversations with David turned fairly consistently to group work. In that earliest interview, which focused in part on a general education course on global citizenship all students are required to take, David related a division of group labor in which he believed he occupied the role of English-language expert compared to his peers. A recent change of instructor in the course meant that a faculty member was teaching who was an expert on global public health but who had previously worked exclusively with small groups of graduate students. In some ways, this faculty member’s relatively nondirective group-based approach and insistence that students should identify their own topics relevant to global citizenship and urbanism seemed to appeal to David, while positioning him as a highly competent peer:

Justin<sup>21</sup> W. (JW): You said that you have been sort of volunteered to take the role to be the synthesizer, the editor. And uh, it sort of goes to the person that maybe has the best, or is really fluent in English. How did the group know that you were really good at English? Did they just hear you talk?

David: Um, mostly uh, we did a lot of presentations and peer reviews, so there’s that, students know who’s good at English, or not.

JW: Through the classes?

D: Through the classes.

JW: Like in your classes, ah, okay, so they just heard you speaking English. What about the writing, did you ever share your

---

21 Justin traveled with me to the Asia Campus as a graduate research assistant in May 2016.

writing with the people, or was it all in talking?

D: Peer reviews, we did peer reviews, and those students who got my writings, they spread the news.

Jay (J): Yeah, cause news travels fast.

JW: Go talk to him, he's got the answers.

D: If you have any problems with writing, just go to him, stuff like that.

David related here a phenomenon similar to the one Cho (2015) noted among professional translators, in which language learners who are similarly highly motivated to continue learning English at a high level, similarly driven by grades/other measures of performance, and similarly keen to identify different levels of competence among themselves quickly spot those who have “got the answers,” as Justin mentioned in the interview. And David's observations also resembled Fraiberg et al.'s (2017) depiction of “lords of learning,” Chinese students at their U.S. university site who consciously or unwittingly acquire reputations for abilities or study habits that leap quickly between face-to-face classroom interactions and online social platforms (pp. 114-146).

In the small-enrollment, somewhat insular, and still inchoate Asia Campus environment in particular, news of David's own abilities as a “synthesizer” and “editor” certainly would have spread fast, and that familiarity showed in ways that prompted classmates to hail him as a kind of translator with at least some expertise. Again, while educated in English solely in Korea, David attended international schools, and—as some colleagues who have also taught in Korea attest—international school students not only speak and write in English in markedly different ways compared to peers from Korean domestic schools (Jon, 2012, 2013), they also seem to orient more comfortably to the kind of classroom the Asia Campus intended to import from the United States—small, friendly, interactive, participatory (where “participation” typically refers to something like spontaneous speech in critical response to specific questions or invitations to debate). For many students coming from domestic schools where English-medium teaching was in service of distributing “English” as a discrete, commodifiable, acquirable target, the shift from English as a rigorously corrected language act to English as a somewhat more negotiable medium was going to take time. For David, it seemed more familiar both in speaking and in writing. In a first-year writing course “literacy narrative” sample he shared with me, he

showed considerable fluency in relating his childhood memory of learning to read English with a school tutor whom he described in the narrative in vivid written detail:

There stood a tall, white old man (when I said white, I meant white including his hair and beard), wearing like a southern country man. His blue jean and checkered shirt well fitted him along his belt with [a] buffalo mark graved in. . . . He took a book out and told me to sit next to him. The couch was red as if I am supposed to sit on a devil’s chair.

In this assignment, which David labeled for me as his first piece of university-level writing, he used such details to exemplify his explicit first-paragraph claim that he used to hate reading books but that “things started to change” as early as first grade, when he met this memorable tutor. As the instructor’s written summary comment made clear, David at this early stage after his enrollment met the expectation that he foreground a claim about his own literacy and use engaging narrative detail to back it up. While the instructor noted “a few minor grammar issues,” including some marked instances of dropped articles and the potentially mistyped “man” for “hat” in “wearing like a southern country man,” David’s instructor cast them in his written commentary as problems that could be caught with last-stage proofreading. No doubt, as in the academic/social/professional crossovers that Cho (2015, 2017) and Fraiberg et al. (2017) note, David’s early success in and comfort with this common assignment in a U.S.-style writing course would have circulated among peers.

But while David took understandable pride in his (technically imperfect but very fluid) facility with English speech and writing, he also evinced some of the anxiety and even annoyance about that facility sometimes noted in relevant literature. That anxiety emerged in David’s comments about how workflow in groups tended to orient around him and how he felt compelled to assume certain tasks because of other group members’ relative language proficiency:

J: How do groups, or the groups that you’ve worked in, how have you decided who writes what? Does everyone just write a piece of the overall report?

D: Um, well, uh, for my group, I usually would be the one to merge them all for free, and do all that stuff.

J: So that’s your job you feel like. You’re the one that takes what

everyone else has written and you put it all together and—

D: Yes. I tell other members to write part of the writing, such as I'll give them kind of assignment or job to do. You write introduction, or you write this topic, you write about this topic, you write conclusion, and stuff like that. But of course, when it comes to me, it's all different as it flows and transition, and all of the stuff, so I need to just fix all of that.

J: So that's what you work on mostly is flow from section to section, or from—

D: And I do write most part as well.

J: Oh, so you do most of the writing as well. Okay, okay, that's interesting. So, I guess a couple of questions about that. What, um, you referred to this really briefly before. But I'm wondering how you got that job. Like, how you got the job of being the one who it seems like you're putting the stuff together, but you're also taking a lot of the lead on writing the document, even though it's a group assignment. How did that happen do you think? Did you volunteer, were you elected?

D: Semi-forced, I would say. I don't know if you've seen other students' paper, but to be honest, they aren't really um, good at grammar and stuff like that. So, somehow I tend to be the better one, so students tend to rely on me grammar wise and punctuations and just fixing and stuff like that as well as to write.

David's references to his "job" in group work are telling indications of his sense of obligation. And so is David's mention of feeling "semi-forced" to lead much of the process and editing of documents/assignments. That language colored David's other comments about being the one to "go to" for writing problems/questions, suggesting that there was indeed a very fine line between his role as a prestigious *haewaeŋa*-like language model and a role in which he feels pressed into service to coordinate and edit for the sake of his and his classmates' grades. Elsewhere in this interview, the combination of course content, writing demands, and David's own responses to his position among other students came to a fine point: he related that he had heard that students in an earlier iteration of the course wrote much less and that the current course's workload and group work were "complex and intimidating,"

potentially positioning him even more among classmates as the kind of exotically competent English speaker/writer Cho (2015, 2017) describes among peers in translation courses.

## From Hobby to *Haewaepa*?: Expanding Competence and Perspective

As David wrote his way into his major, psychology, he encountered assignments that were at least as complex as his writing for general education courses—writing that was constrained by professional and academic domains in his chosen field—and he continued to exemplify shifting competence and shifting perceptions. In Spring 2017, he was taking the same introductory psychology methods course other student participants have discussed extensively—a course taught by a U.S.-educated faculty member, Professor A, who was herself a Korean national. In the course, David did not consistently or entirely own a position as a local language expert. Indeed, he was clear in subsequent conversations about his sense of English-language writing as an element of psychology that required time to understand. David related that the semester-length IMRAD writing assignment in the methods course was foreign to him from the start:

For the introduction paper, I got lower grade than I expected. There were more critiques. The one major thing that was kind of surprising to me, is that actually, actually, not really. I can't really explain what I get, what I did wrong. I couldn't fix it, because I don't have any knowledge in that specific area, or how to write in the sense that I've never written a research paper in my life, it's my first time, I don't have much knowledge of the materials that I'm writing about. The variables, and all that stuff. And in that sense, I tried my best, but still, as an expert seeing the paper, she tells me that you should include that, exclude that, move this, things around, stuff like that. So I expected those kinds of feedback for my paper.

As other students (and Professor A) also implied, David related that the transition from his introductory general education courses—especially first-year writing—into the methods course was difficult owing to the difference he and other informants perceived between relatively general expository/argumentative writing about topics of free choice on one hand and discipline-specific writing that requires synthesis of existing literature with new findings in a particular professional format on the other.



However, as in his general education courses, David went on to assert expertise and familiarity despite the different challenges in psychology. In our Spring 2017 interview, David revealed his longtime “hobby” of reading psychology research, which he suggested had predisposed him at an earlier age to relevant contextualizing concepts. While David had not traveled at the point he started that hobby, the availability of English-language materials in his Korean household created for David conditions similar to those that *haewaeŋpa* encounter as they build transnational English proficiency.

J: Are you feeling more—we’d talked about the writing, obviously, which is what we’re most interested in, but the writing and the reading are connected very closely. So do you feel, how do you feel about reading research in psychology now, compared to when you started in the major? Do you feel more confident and about the same?

D: Actually, I’ve been reading, one of my interests is reading as a hobby is to read research articles. So I started that when I was in middle school.

J: Really?

D: Like, reading different articles and stuff like that. So basically, for that, I have nearly no psychology knowledge, so I just read it and, oh, interesting. Stuff like that. Now, since I do know the terms, more terms, and stuff like that, I do see what they mean in the details. So, I think that’s a major difference.

Confidence with new psychological concepts and terms may not have been the only familiarity David acquired through his avocational reading in the field. In an extra credit-bearing writing assignment in his abnormal psychology course, David wrote a mock assessment and initial diagnosis of Alan Turing as portrayed by Benedict Cumberbatch in the film *Imitation Game*. The document was separated into discrete sections providing objective and subjective comments about the character’s symptoms (of obsessive-compulsive disorder, autism, and other conditions), explicit connections to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*, and APA-formatted references. Given his perfect score on the assignment, and recalling the range of psychology writing assignments that emphasize adherence to APA style and generic expectations, David’s pre- and extracurricular reading may have helped his facility with genre.



Indeed, as the reputation of the methods course grew quickly among students, David was primed to expect the course to be hard. And he soon found it to be. But as difficult as the adjustment to writing in the field was proving to be, David was nevertheless apparently able to transfer at least some of what he had acquired on his own from previous reading. As I reported in Chapter 4, other student participants in psychology and communication majors were arguably transferring knowledge and practices from previous education and experience as they adapted to expectations of their chosen fields and of individual faculty members. But that transfer was not occurring in traditionally defined ways. Transfer among these students was less a matter of carrying knowledge/practices from one domain and applying it in another discretely different domain, and more a matter of adapting those previous experiences in creative and often idiosyncratic ways. Learning, according to the socio-culturally inclined literature on transfer I discussed, occurs as learners consciously and unconsciously recycle/adapt what they know and do across what Yrjö Engeström et al. (1995) refer to as “intersecting social worlds” (p. 393). As Roozen (2009) argued in the case of his informant, a longstanding practice of Angelica’s personal literacy—journaling—became academically and professionally relevant and useful as she persisted through journalism courses. So Angelica developed as a “literate subject” not solely through vertically integrated school subjects/courses but also through interactions of “home” and “school” literate practices (Roozen, 2009, pp. 567–568). Similarly, David’s early habit of reading research articles was, for him, a sticky enough practice that it gave him some generic framing for the new concepts in the methods course.

But the effects of David’s experiences, background, and prior education arguably extended beyond his generic familiarity with research-based texts in psychology. David’s reflections about his status among peers and about his interactions with faculty members/support staff at both campuses suggested broader, ecological, and affective connections and investments similar to those that emerge in the transnational sites and studies I reviewed in Chapter 1. And those connections may have worked synergistically to affect David’s work, the transfer of his knowledge and practices, and his perceptions of himself, peers, and the emerging transnational context. In the same interview in which David discussed the difficulty of writing his psychology paper’s introduction, he also related the challenges of other sections of the research article assignment. In doing so, he revealed complexities in his identification with peers:

In the case of the methods section, there wasn’t much of, a lot of interaction or feedback going on, so in that sense, I think

that students will have a hard time, difficulties, in writing the methods section. Cause they're new. If they want to know how to write the methods section, they probably have to Google it, or visit the writing center, or something like that.

...

[on literature reviews] Well, if you procrastinate . . . you're pretty much doomed, and a lot of students do, so they expect sort of two days or three days, where actually, they have a month to write. So, if they do that, it's going to be really bad. For me, the hardest part was to identify as many articles related to my topic, and reading those articles, trying to get all this information, because I'm new to them. . . . I think you can never have enough, so by the time I ended my introduction paper, I think I had like 30 references, something like that. Other students had maybe like ten references.

Unlike his discussion of the introduction section, in which he exclusively referred to himself and his own difficulties, David here represented what he takes to be the challenges *other students* will likely have with their relative unfamiliarity with the methods section—novelty that would require their seeking support outside the course and instructor. David went on in comments about literature reviews to focus on his peers somewhat more critically, ascribing to them a tendency to procrastinate, which in turn caused them to collect far fewer sources than seems appropriate. In contrast, David renewed some of his concern about this material's being new to him but expressed confidence at the same time that he had more than enough sources from which to work—that the nature of his challenge was managing the information he had dutifully collected rather than putting off the assignment altogether. Taken together, his perception of his competence and that of his peers revealed interanimations of transfer, teaching and learning, and his and peers' competencies and identities.

Even though David balanced his sense of competence against the challenges of research-based writing in psychology, he was feeling comfortable enough with his emerging subject matter knowledge to think about graduate school. And more immediately, he was continuing to connect his writing and more general language competence both to his peers and to his own complex linguistic and educational background. At this point in his career, he was also connecting his experiences more explicitly to the faculty, academic support, and transnational institution more broadly and critically. Echoing Profes-

sor A’s concerns about faculty coordination around writing, which I cited in Chapter 4, David made some critical comments in our May 2017 interview about the campus writing center’s small capacity and lack of expert support for writing in psychology. But he reserved even sharper critical comments for what he perceived to be the university’s differential treatment of students. As he did so—here in a spring 2018 interview—he again distinguished himself from peers in terms of competence and nationality:

One thing I kind of have been suspicious about this is while I take these courses throughout the semesters, is I feel like they [faculty members] are treating these students as if they’re not an American institution. And this is an American institution—they’re publicly announcing that. But the professors didn’t quite seem like they’re treating the students as if they’re studying in an American institution. For instance, if we write the same paper on the same topic, and I’m an American, and the other student is a Korean, feels like the professor gives a slight advantage to the Korean students, over the foreign students. . . . I’m usually the one that’s peer reviewing other students’ papers. So I grade them, I help them, I provide feedback, I proofread their papers and all that stuff. And I’m not a professional, but I can say I’m quite better than the other students here.

Facing his summer 2018 transition to the U.S.-based campus, David here put his explicitly stated identity as an American in play with his emerging familiarity with his field and with his progress as a student in an institution still coming to terms with how best to respond to linguistic and cultural juxtapositions. This is an “American” university invited and financed to operate in English in Korea. And Korean students and their parents are attracted to enrolling there because it is a well-regarded U.S.-based university, but one that nevertheless locates itself no farther away than a few hours’ train ride or drive from students’ homes. While the U.S.-based campus regards many enrollees at the Asia Campus as “international” students, they are in large part “domestic” students at the Asia Campus. David might well have felt more “international” at the U.S.-based campus than Korean citizens who have already studied there, but he claimed U.S. national identity and some measure of internationalized English competence. On the basis of that competence, David strongly implied that his labor in assisting peers’ writing development and even language acquisition was undervalued, and he implied that some of the ways faculty members were attempting to accommodate students (as

I also reported in Chapters 4 and 5) may have seemed to David like laxity, if not discrimination.

## “American” and “Korean” Across Campuses

After his transition to the US for his final semester of study in 2018, and at the end of his first full semester of coursework there (late fall 2018), David seemed to complicate his assessment of faculty responses to students, pointing to even further nuance about his experiences in and perceptions of the transnational university. While his pre-transition comments quoted above focused on different treatment of “American” (seeming) students, such as himself, and “Korean” students by faculty members at the Asia Campus, his post-transition comments suggested a clear difference *between* the Asia Campus and U.S.-based campus:

J: What else about how do you think the transition from the Asia Campus to this campus has gone? And you can get into that if it’s with regards specifically to, you know, working in a pretty writing intensive major or more broadly about the experience. Because those two might relate, you know?

D: I heard from other students as well as my experience as well, is that Asian campus instructors, professors, strict, work harder than the main campus professors. And this also for the psychology classes as well as the other classes, I heard less stress management as well as just general other classes where professors are strict less, less hard than the Asian campus. And I do believe so, because especially for these two classes [his final courses in the major], the professor was very kind in terms of my gradings, and all that stuff. So that’s what really caught me, because I expected them to be—the main campus professors would be much harder in their gradings. Much more professional for some reason. That I wasn’t ready for this.

J: How do you mean professional?

D: Well, the main campus professors were . . . more calm and easy going whereas Asian campus professors, they’re really strict, they’re on the appointment, they follow the rules, they really have to, stuff like that. That was kind of interesting.

The novelty of the Asia Campus and its role in providing general education and foundational major coursework to students who then go to the larg-

er and much more established U.S.-based campus imply, as David suggests, more pressure on Asia Campus faculty members to be strict in managing coursework and relationships with students—pressure perhaps best exemplified by Professor A’s reputation among students as well as by her interview comments reported in Chapter 4. So David seemed primed to expect that the strictness he encountered would carry over to the US. And he also seemed primed to expect that such strictness was synonymous with professionalization, in contrast to psychology literature and in contrast to the priorities of other faculty members I reported in Chapter 4.

David’s self-awareness and self-fashioning as a kind of *haewaepa*—a transnational English speaker—is also relevant to his perceptions of the two campuses. The differences David attributed to himself and *guknaepa* classmates cut two ways. Other students saw David as a highly proficient English user on whom they could rely for close language work in high-stakes assignments. David saw himself in explicit terms as someone whose proficiency and experience gave him a comparative advantage among students—but one that imposed additional work and responsibility. In implicit terms, David’s status, perceptions, and experiences may have positioned him to be especially sensitive to the cultural and linguistic dynamics of both campuses of the transnational university, including complex faculty responses to diverse students. Indeed, it is possible to reconcile the apparent contradiction in his comments about the comparative rigor of the campuses by recognizing the fluid nature of his national/cultural/linguistic identity. At the Asia Campus, David relied on previous familial, educational, and travel experiences to identify as an “American,” which gave him a lens through which to view potentially different expectations between himself and “Korean” students. At the U.S.-based campus, David’s identity as a Korean student just arrived from the Asia Campus gave him a lens through which to view culturally inflected differences between the campuses. In effect, David was transferring not only his knowledge and practices, but also his perceptions of this still-inchoate transnational university. His ambiguous position as a domestically educated student with *haewaepa* sensibilities as well as a somewhat reluctant “lord of learning” leveraging past experiences to build and assert competence personalized and concretized the ecologies of language development characterizing such a transnational scene.

## Discussion

In such a complex transnational arrangement, and for a student like David, terms such as *guknaepa* and *haewaepa* are initially helpful to account for Ko-

rean English users' identities, but they quickly meet a limit as heuristics for mapping language proficiency and educational trajectories onto "domestic" versus "foreign/well-travelled" categories. Similarly, the "learning quadric" meme Fraiberg et al. (2017, pp. 123-124) identify, on which students locate themselves and others along continua from low to high achievement and low to high effort, does not explain David's situation fully. They argue that the labels "learning lords" and "scumbags," circulated among Chinese students through their dense online social networks, provide a limited and limiting typology for student identities even as students cross national boundaries. Asia Campus students certainly used social media to communicate, study, and pursue leisure, but it is likely that the far less dense and still-inchoate social environment of the campus coupled with its public identity as a U.S. campus in Korea precluded at least some of the academic cliquishness Fraiberg et al. (2017) observed. And David himself, through interviews and writing assignments, resisted settling firmly on anything like a label. In a very personal reading response assignment for his cross-cultural psychology course, David related frustration with the comparative scholarship he was encountering:

Since people nowadays have been influenced by several different cultures, their thinking process has probably been affected. . . . As myself being a multicultural and bilingual and raised in two different environments, American institution and Korean homeland, I have two cultural perspectives well-mixed up. When we have done an activity in class about different views toward different images, some images I have Korean perspective and other, American perspective.

David was "domestic" in the sense that he grew up in Korea, traveling out of the country only for short periods. He was phenotypically "Korean" to classmates and faculty members but quickly distinguishable because of his comfort with English—an effect of both his international school-based education and the multilingualism of his home, which included his U.S.-born father. He was a high-performing student who, as a psychology major, encountered pragmatic, collaborative expectations about writing and editing similar to those that other student participants encountered—expectations that ran somewhat counter to the individual-focused, appointment-driven pedagogy that he saw to be common at the Asia Campus. Arguably, he was sensitive to the way his phenotypical identity was perceived as he crossed borders to arrive at the U.S.-based campus, where the Asia Campus is an increasingly noteworthy part of an overall strategy of attracting "international" students.

As David related his experience, the novelty and, perhaps, exoticism attaching to him and his proficiency may have translated to “*haewaepa*”-style higher academic expectations for him among both peers and faculty members at the Asia Campus. And his “Korean” identity at the U.S.-based campus may have prompted faculty members there in David’s estimation to apply less strict standards in the service of helping him and other “international” students transition. But the various peer and faculty responses to David’s representation of language diversity—and his perceptions of them—are not surprising. The university, after all, is a transnational one in which both the “distribution” and “spread” (as Henry Widdowson [1997] would have it) of English as the major language of instruction are occurring, regardless of the country in which a given campus is operating. At the U.S.-based campus, university-level presidential initiatives to increase international enrollments to approach those of peer/aspirational institutions are attracting students not only to historically popular majors in engineering and business but increasingly to majors in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Economic and social mobility in countries such as Kazakhstan and Vietnam are further diversifying international populations on campus, thus diversifying varieties of/practices with English speaking and writing. Those trends combine with opportunities and pressures of grant writing and other academic/professional publications in ways that can enlist even undergraduate students: as psychology students related in Chapter 4, and as other WID-related research has discussed, generalized textbook correctness in WID contexts often plays a secondary role to field-specific conventions and to getting things done as collaboratively and efficiently as possible. So the traditionally fixed assessments of English competence that Cho (2015, 2017), Lo and Kim (2012), and Park (2012) believe to be obsolescing in Korea are obsolescing more globally as well. In short, preparing students to shift to the U.S. campus may have far less to do with ensuring technically correct English expression and more to do with flexible strategies of adaptation.

But emphasizing and teaching such adaptive strategies will likely compete with the pressures on the Asia Campus, since it is not only a campus of a U.S.-based university but also a visible element of Korea’s significant investment in internationalization and “soft power.” The educational hub of which the Asia Campus is part represents *both* an opening to international trade, education, migration, and competition *and* a desire to reaffirm and project Korean national identity and pride. To the extent that pride trades off with still-prevalent beliefs about “bad” Korean English proficiency, anxiety among students and at least some faculty members and



administrators about producing “competent” English speakers/writers will persist. And students like David will continue to model English’s constant and complex “spread” while they also contend with the ongoing pressures of its “distribution.”