

How to Cite:

Kim, J. Y., & Hwang, Y. M. (2022). A learner-centred approach to writing education aimed at developing soft skills and a vision for a writing feedback system during the pandemic, crisis of public health. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S4), 1145-1165.

<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS4.6005>

A learner-centred approach to writing education aimed at developing soft skills and a vision for a writing feedback system during the pandemic, crisis of public health

Ji Yoon Kim

General Education Research Institute, Sookmyung Women's University, Korea

Young Mee Hwang

Sookmyung Women's University, Korea

Abstract--This study discusses the need to cultivate soft skills to avoid being marginalized in a rapidly changing data explosion era and implements new teaching and learning methods that meet digital natives' needs. It investigates the instructional effectiveness of writing education that embodies the innovation of the online writing centers through the case study of the online writing feedback system for university students in Korea. The online writing center was first launched to cope with the situation of COVID-19, but many universities in Korea are trying to make it an official center for new education after the pandemic. This paper utilized the Students Satisfaction Survey, which surveyed the students who participated in online writing counseling programs on the second semester 2020 to determine students' needs and satisfaction and analyzed their soft skills-focused on writing grading rubric used by operating online writing centers. The results were as follows. Writing centers should provide learner-centered and personalized counseling on writing and interpretation rather than mechanical correction to develop soft skills. Writing counseling can deliver mentoring, which is lacking in current university education. Therefore, non-face-to-face learning from online writing centers for soft skills development is suggested. This paper attempts to examine the case of the Sookmyung Women's University online writing center where the customized writing counseling goes online to explore the current trends and the future vision of writing education aimed at developing soft skills.

Keywords---soft skills, writing center, general education, digital native, writing feedback.

Introduction

In this age, "knowledge" has a different meaning than in the past. In *The Age of Discontinuity*, (Drucker 1969) defined the 21st century as a "knowledge-based economy." The knowledge-based economy concept emphasizes knowledge as a critical determinant of how the national economy performs and utilizes skills, technologies, and processes to reach the country's economic potential (Jagannathan 2016). In a knowledge-based society, it is essential to cultivate talented people who possess advanced knowledge and skills. With Web 2.0 and Web 3.0, learning has become easily accessible to all. While Web 1.0 was mainly for reading, 2.0 evolved to reading, writing, and publishing features. On the other hand, Web 3.0 is a personalized, customized web that can understand the content and provide personalized information (Castelluccio 2018). This means that someone can no longer earn the label of "expert" just for possessing much knowledge. In this rapidly changing era, new 21st-century capabilities are needed. Education can assist a knowledge-based economy, and the knowledge-based society depends on education to transform the population's brains into "knowledge minefields" (Hibner 2021). Higher education institutions play an essential part in yielding human capital to meet the requests and expectations of society by producing skills for the 21st-century (Pachauri et al., 2014).

This paper attempted to apply the need for new knowledge and competency-based soft skills to writing education. Soft skills boost competency and consequently upsurge one's ability in subsidizing communal progression and transformation (Duncan et al., 2012; Romedios 2012). Soft skills acquisition can transfer and create knowledge based on the requirements of the society (Tang et al., 2014). Various abilities, such as adaptability, autonomy, communication skills, cultural sensitivity, and critical thinking, can be classified as soft skills. In writing education, hard skills correspond to the technical aspects of writing, such as writing structure, grammar, and spelling. On the other hand, soft skills for writing include various abilities, such as listening, time management, and etiquette (Moore et al., 2017). If hard skills relate to building knowledge, soft skills require more fundamental skills, focusing on executive functions like thinking, taking action, and problem-solving. Writing education also needs to change in consideration of this point. Accordingly, a university writing curriculum that cultivates soft skills is needed. Many people still believe that writing centers teach hard writing skills. These opinions fail to consider the changing education paradigm. Various search engines are widely used today, and online content is constantly being updated. Knowledge accumulation is no longer significant in this media explosion era. The power of thinking and applying the knowledge is needed. The future society needs professionals with competencies such as effective communication and a capacity to think critically and creatively (Wikle et al., 2014). These abilities cannot be developed only by a simple mechanical correction in writing education.

In addition, personalized education must be provided according to the characteristics of each person to enhance individual abilities, so personal counseling is necessary. Individual counseling about writing and interpretation is an effective way to develop soft skills. Writing centers can deliver mentoring, which is lacking in current university education. Many Korean universities

currently operate a writing center that supplements their writing course curriculum to meet this need. It is difficult to provide personalized writing counseling to many students during a regular university course. Providing students with individual feedback lies at the core of the writing center's function. Feedback motivates students to learn and helps them grow through self-assessment.

The first goal of this paper focuses on writing education within general education, examines how it can cultivate future competencies based on soft skills, and verify the result through educational assessments at writing centers. To this end, Korean writing center's educational services and the assessments they utilize are examined. Writing education in many countries is currently being reconstructed based on learner-centered theory, regardless of national differences, responding to learners' needs. Since education that focuses on developing hard skills is often unilaterally delivered, such education is designed to center on instructors. However, interaction is essential to cultivate soft skills, which are necessary in utilizing what one has learned. Writing centers aim to cultivate soft rather than hard skills, focusing on learners rather than instructors. This paper examined educational methods that enable students to measure the effectiveness of their writing education through personal achievement. This promotes soft skills, which can serve as an indicator of thinking and applying knowledge. The paper also explored the positive effects of writing feedback on learners. By examining the education writing centers' offer and method of educational assessment, this paper aims to confirm that writing centers' teaching and evaluation model can be a valuable tool for checking students' progress through writing counseling and that the cultivation of soft skills is essential in writing education to produce future talent. Soft skills can be developed through individual counseling about writing and interpretation, rather than mechanical correction.

The second goal is to discover the necessary innovations for the digital-native generation of students by understanding who new-era learners are. Recently, technology-enabled educational innovation to drive the transformation of learning methods has attracted significant attention. Korea has a high digital capability and Internet penetration rate and has recently implemented digital competency enhancement education projects. Currently, writing centers in Korea provide online feedback systems and digitize classrooms. Through examining Korean writing centers' history and current status, this paper shares a vision for establishing an online feedback system. The online writing center was first launched to cope with the COVID-19 situation, but many universities in Korea are trying to make it an official center and utilize it as an educational writing counseling system for new education even after the pandemic. This paper attempts to prove that it could effectively provide customized education to students if it goes online. To verify the effectiveness of the online writing center's feedback system, this research used the Students Satisfaction Survey to determine the students' needs and satisfaction. Korea's case can provide an effective plan for other countries' reference.

Korean writing centers' educational assessments consist of a growth or competency reference evaluation, which looks at how much learners have developed against the aims of the curriculum (Koo et al., 2015). It determines students' achievement by comparing the pre-curriculum achievement level with

after curriculum implementation, rather than choosing the final achievement level using the final evaluation (Choi et al., 2017). Determining the last group of achievement based on the final review does not reflect individual differences, such as differences in majors, interest in writing, proficiency, and grades. Since considering individual differences is essential in the constructivist approach, the growth reference evaluation is effective in learner-centered education. By examining the education writing centers' method of educational assessment, this paper confirms that writing centers' teaching and evaluation model can be a valuable tool for checking students' progress through writing counseling and that the cultivation of soft skills is essential in writing education to produce future talent.

The Theoretical Framework

Background: History and Status Quo of Korean and North American Writing Centers

This section explores the North American and Korean writing centers' history, goals, and vision and examines how education and evaluation are carried out. North America and Korea were selected as target research areas because the experience of working at a Korean writing center can be utilized, and the writing centers at universities in Korea have adapted the American writing center model to suit the Asian context. Thus, American and Korean writing center models are closely related.

In 1981, (Flower et al., 1981) studied experienced writers' composition practices and proposed the cognitive process model. This model illustrates a complex interaction between the writer's knowledge, writing context, and various aspects of the writing process. Historically, this model greatly influenced writing centers and how they conceived their work (Taylor 2021). Taylor has asserted that the cognitive process model has led writing centers to develop into the form they take today. Today, writing centers' teaching methods and curriculums are diverse. However, they share a common belief that writing is not a simple task and that writing strategies are learnable. The writing center instructors acted as facilitators, helping students set their lesson objectives; recognize their strengths and weaknesses, and identify writing strategies. Taylor has evaluated writing centers in North America as student-centered, based on communication with students.

With their initial design, writing centers at Korean universities were often modeled on American writing centers, but they differed from the American model and were constructively accepted. An external system was established in modern liberal arts education in Korea by adapting the general American education model after Korea's liberation. (Kim 1999) translated the "writing center" in the United States into "sentence counseling center," introduced the subject of the establishment and current operational status of American writing centers, and emphasized the need for writing centers in Korea. According to (Kim 1999), 316 writing centers could be found on American websites, and the National Writing Centres Association (NWCA) was established. There were various entities in charge, including the English department, the college of humanities, and the writing center's head office; these were operated by English professors or exceptional writing center researchers. Graduate students whom the writing center had selected or trained, or in some

cases, senior undergraduate students, delivered the writing counseling. After introducing the writing center's practical theory and teaching method, counselors offered their services. Counseling content covered many writing assignments, reports for significant courses, thesis preparation, resume writing, resume envelope writing, and research plans for graduate school applications. This way, (Kim 1999, p.107-109) conveyed, in detail, the American writing centers' operational status and presented legal hurdles of establishing such centers at Korean universities, as well as the potential usage method and operating budget.

As such, discussions about the necessity of introducing the writing center system in Korea began around 1999. The 2000s saw an increase in the number of universities operating the writing counseling program (Lim 2017). Subsequently, in the 2010s, writing centers in Korea attempted to communicatively expand from the primary, limited function of correcting writing and have actively established new extracurricular programs such as face-to-face writing counseling. However, many universities have only a small-scale writing center that is usually operated to support university financing projects. Due to the difficulty of arranging to finance, there are many cases where the writing center's operations discontinue after the funding project ends. For this reason, it is difficult to maintain a dedicated full-time staff.

Many writing centers at universities of Korea aim for learner-centered operations. This is based on the constructivist view of education, a practical curriculum, and the active exploration of knowledge. An instructor is not a person who conveys knowledge but a facilitator and guides the learners. Constructivism intends, through autonomous task exploration and problem-solving, to cultivate soft skills rather than mechanical knowledge memorization skills. Writing centers in Korea focus more on helping students set their learning objectives learn how to write, and improve their thinking and problem-solving skills, rather than merely correcting sentences or disseminating knowledge. Suppose subjects that appear on a traditional writing education report card, such as reading, writing, and typing, cultivate hard skills. In that case, it is also necessary to develop soft skills. Soft skills are critical to developing human capital and achieving professional success, and there is growing evidence that soft skills are academic and technical performance indicators (Lippman et al., 2015).

Learner-centred Writing Education and Educational Assessment

In writing education, both writing and the writing education program are assessed. This evaluation is an integrated process to determine how effectively learners have progressed. "Writing assessment" means evaluating a student's writing performance or potential. A writing education program assessment compares and analyses the difference between the educational goal and the student's actual results. An academic evaluation examines various education-related issues and deepens the understanding of learners toward improving education. (Neaves 2011) stated that the writing center's goal is to help students achieve a higher level of cognitive development through coursework such as "critiquing drafts, understanding grammatical concepts, generating ideas, explaining ideas, and organizing ideas," learn the skills that are necessary to complete the writing process, and become confident writers. To achieve this, Neaves analyzed data from

the University of North Carolina (UWC) writing center students. The latter filled out an education scorecard (a 6-week spring 2011 assessment that captured data from 182 writing center sessions). The data confirmed that students perform much better when improving their cognitive skills. For writing centers, this means that education that can achieve cognitive development rather than simply mechanically correcting students' writing should be implemented.

(Laughlin 2008) argued that the ratio of the effects of the learning stage, learning experience, and follow-up stage on outcomes is 26:24:50. Thus, it is essential to take follow-up measures for education to lead to outcomes. However, for follow-up measures to occur, education deficiencies must first be understood, and an educational assessment is needed to identify them. "Educational assessment" is used in a rather broad sense to mean an act of giving value to the results obtained in the educational field, thus determining the value of a specific curriculum.

In assessment, the degree of achievement based on educational objectives is usually measured for value judgment. Rather than mechanically judging the facts as revealed by numbers, a comprehensive determination should consider educational value. (Tyler 1951) conceptual definition is that educational assessment determines the extent to which educational objectives have been achieved through teaching. However, if the educational assessment delves too profoundly into educational outcome value judgment, it can lead to performance-centredness, prioritizing outcomes over processes. The fact that students learn through the potential curriculum and the intended one and that the data for evaluation cannot be limited to learning evidence related to the student's goals should be considered (Park et al., 2005). Thus, educational assessment should be used as a reference, not as an absolute criterion for value judgment.

To conquer the challenges of the 21st century, high levels of thinking skills, flexibility, innovation, and communication skills are required to adapt to change and apply knowledge in different contexts. These soft skills can be expressed differently in each individual. Since other methods are needed to suit individual circumstances, education should be tailored to learners. Therefore, writing counseling services that reflect personal characteristics can be effective. In the new era, educational objectives should aim to develop soft skills. However, appropriate educational evaluations are needed to review which educational purposes have been realized. This is because educational assessment induces learning motivation, spurring learners to examine and develop their learning competency through evaluation. Motivation is an essential part of learner-centered education because it strongly influences learner autonomy. The learning process is critical, and personal growth evaluation is more important than evaluating outcomes. Furthermore, realizing the educational objectives that learners set for themselves is essential in learner-centered education, so assessing whether learning objectives have been achieved should reflect learners' needs. "Competency-based education," which has recently emerged in the education world, aims to produce good results; it is, therefore, necessary to establish assessments that can determine whether the goals have been met. Here, "performance" does not mean obtaining good grades; instead, it is a measure of progress toward building the capabilities needed to realize the goals.

Educational Assessment for Developing Soft Skills

Although learner-centered education is purported to have several learning gains, instructors' attitudes play a crucial role in realizing its prolific outcomes (Badjadi 2020). Educational goals are an essential factor in determining instructors' perspectives. Competency-based education cultivates core competencies, and in writing, "competence" must include soft skills in addition to hard skills. In 2005, in "The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies," the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defined core competencies as "essential competencies that students must have to enjoy the social life in the future successfully." The article highlighted that "Individuals should utilize their key competencies to adapt to a world characterized by changes, complexity, and interdependence" and that "Technology is changing rapidly and continuously, and learning to deal with it requires not just one-off mastery of processes but also adaptability." Also, "Societies are becoming more diverse and compartmentalized, with interpersonal relationships, therefore, requiring more contact with those who are different from oneself," and "Globalisation is creating new forms of interdependence, and actions are subject both to influences (such as economic competition) and consequences such as pollution that stretch well beyond an individual's local or national community." Accordingly, it emphasized that individuals should be equipped for the changes and participates in technological innovation. Since then, core competencies have been situated at the center of education in many countries, as evidenced, for instance, by the fact that the Definition and Selection of Competencies (DeSeCo) project has become a global trend (Sinnema et al., 2013). In Korea, core competencies became an essential vision for education after the Ministry of Education (2015) presented the core competencies for cultivating "creative convergent talents" in the 2015 revised curriculum. High grades and good evaluation results are not the goals in competency education, and the acquisition of knowledge and skills does not mean that competency has improved.

Educational assessment is only a process for obtaining basic information about educational outcomes, and even the most well-calibrated educational measurement tools have limitations. Accordingly, it should only be used as a reference. It is impossible to assess students' progress using a single assessment tool. Objective testing is an effective tool to measure knowledge, comprehension, and memory, which are required to cultivate hard skills. However, the competencies that constitute soft skills, such as thinking, creativity, and performance, are challenging to measure using objective tests. Essays, project outcomes, and observation are effective. Practically, conducting a multi-faceted assessment in a writing center using all these methods is difficult; therefore, it is necessary to consider that the results are somewhat limited. A growth or competency reference assessment for writing centers is a more appropriate method. A growth reference assessment measures students' growth based on their history accumulated over multiple visits to the writing center. The final evaluation compares the initial achievement before completing the curriculum and after writing counseling, not the last achievement level (Choi et al., 2017). It provides an opportunity for academic promotion by looking at how much learners have developed according to the curriculum objectives (Koo et al., 2015).

In writing, determining the final level of achievement based on the final assessment fails to reflect individual differences. However, a competency reference evaluation considers these individual differences by examining students' efforts compared to their abilities. If students have done their best, they could receive a high rating, even if their writing skills are poor and their achievement levels are low. However, the limitation is that it is difficult to properly evaluate a student's ability if their history is inaccurate or missing.

It is not easy to evaluate soft skills, as it is challenging to establish objective evaluation criteria. Nonetheless, Thyer of Deakin University presented a method for evaluating critical thinking, one of the essential competencies in writing. (Thyer 2015, p.6) stated that "When assessing critical thinking, academics need to return to the concept that critical thinking relates to criteria. They should assess each of the criteria they have taught students as part of the critical thinking process (Table 1) to ensure robustness."

Table 1
Criteria to assess in the critical thinking process

Critical thinking stage	Assessment criteria Did the student...
Observe	...gather an appropriate number of resources? ...provide resources from diverse sources? If not, did they discuss why?
Analyze	...identify all major themes?
Evaluate	...identify arguments that are opinion only compared to those that are evidence-based? ...classify the most important arguments?
Question	...pose questions that are unanswered by the literature?
Contextualize	...consider the analysis and evaluation in light of the specific context?
Reflect	...test the question that they posed (this step may not always be included, especially at lower levels)

Source: Thyer, E. (2015). *Development of the Critical Thinking Teaching Resource*: (<http://teachassist.deakin.edu.au>)

As shown in Table 1, even questions that the literature leaves unanswered become an assessment element. Thinking about the content that exists between the lines and questioning the content that has been excluded from the text exceed the role of the "writing clinic;" these have traditionally been thought to constitute a writing competency evaluation item in writing education. Additionally, reading the context is an applied ability that stems from understanding the context and the relationship, and it is related to potential competency.

Active learning is required to develop these potential competencies. Active learning takes place during a hands-on process and requires students to process concepts cognitively (in a "minds-on" process) (Perry et al., 1996). A contextualization process that allows students to familiarise themselves with concepts and apply them to various contexts is essential; checking whether students are analyzing and evaluating in consideration of a specific context ensures that they have

demonstrated critical thinking. Also, students need to think about, instead of accepting or memorizing, what they have learned. Further, they should critically weigh information. Critical thinking involves assessing the validity of conflicting arguments and considering a topic from various viewpoints (Chaffee 1994; Ruggiero 1996).

The Table 2 below is the grading rubrics used for a class of West Texas A&M university, which was adapted from the Washington State University's critical thinking education model. (Macy et al., 2008, p.46).

Table 2
Grading rubric for the course

Learning objectives	Level 1 Insufficient	Level 2 Sufficient	Level 3 Competent	Level 4 Accomplished
Identifies the issue or question	Demonstrates severe misconceptions about the important themes or issues.	Displays an incomplete understanding of the essential issues in a question or problem.	Displays a rather complete understanding of the important issues or themes in a question or problem.	Displays a thorough and accurate understanding of the important issues or themes in a question or problem.
Identifies and considers the influence of context and assumptions	Does not relate to other contexts.	Analysis includes some outside verification but primarily relies on established authorities.	Analysis acknowledges complexity although may hold to bias in context.	Analyses the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including assessment of the audience.
Develops, presents, and communicates personal viewpoint	Fails to present or justify own opinion or forward hypothesis.	Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration.	Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.	Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge, integrating objective analysis and intuition while integrating contrary views.
Presents, assesses and	Excludes data and information.	Overlooks some information	Demonstrates skill in searching,	Synthesizes and assimilates

analyses supporting evidence		and does not distinguish between fact, opinion, and value judgments.	selecting, and evaluating information but confuses causal it and correlation.	data, questions data's accuracy, relevance, and completeness, and recognizes bias.
Integrates other disciplinary perspectives and viewpoints	Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss other perspectives.	Begins to relate the alternative view to quantify analysis.	Engages challenging ideas tentatively or may dismiss alternative views hastily.	Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification in a respectful manner.
Identifies and assesses conclusions and implications	Fails to present any solution or recommendations.	Acknowledges some aspects of context to the problem and solution but presents conclusions as to relative and not considering consequences.	Considers the influence of context on the choice of solutions. Presents implications that may impact other issues.	Demonstrates a clear sense of context in proposed solutions. Implications are developed, and ambiguities are considered.
Communicates effectively	In many places, language obscures meaning—no citing of sources.	Language does not interfere with communication. Sources are cited.	Errors are not frequent or distracting, although there may be some problems with style and voice. Sources are cited and used correctly.	Organization and style are clear, and transitions between ideas enhance the presentation. Employment of sources understands the issues involved with using information.

The grading rubric standards include identifying issues, clarifying the relationship to reality, "analyzing issues according to a clear view and context, and communicating effectively." The grading rubric evaluates text interpretation and evaluates students' ability to apply content to other situations. Measuring students' achievement according to these standards makes it possible to evaluate the writing process rather than the outcome because the standards examine

whether students have developed the ability to produce good writing rather than the writer's technical maturity.

Assessments in writing education in Korea are shifting toward competency evaluation and away from technical evaluation. This is evidenced in the following assessment table, the rubric table the writing clinic at Sookmyung Women's University uses to assess criticism. This rubric table uses a five-point scale, but it allows instructors to write comments on each score. That is, it does not simply express a score; it also describes the assessment. This provides the assessor's perspective and delineates strengths and weaknesses an individual may have, thereby enabling a multi-faceted evaluation.

Table 3 shows the educational assessment for the criticism model of Sookmyung Women's University's writing center of the General Education Research Institutes.

Table 3:
Assessment for criticism

Assessment standard	Self-assessment	Instructor assessment
• Did the individual assess by well identifying the author's point of view?	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
• Has the individual criticized the text by understanding the core concepts and content of the text?	-. 5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
• Is the individual criticizing in the light of society of the time?	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
• Is the individual criticizing by relating the content of the text to reality or applying to social reality?	-. 5 4 3 2 1	- 5 4 3 2 1
• Has the individual criticized the text while grasping the entire topic and problem?	-. 5 4 3 2 1	-. 5 4 3 2 1
• Other (Sentence and expression)	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

Fundamentally, this rubric evaluates whether the author's viewpoint is well understood and whether the sentences and expressions are appropriate. Further, it considers whether the content overlaps with social issues and whether the author's logic can be applied to social reality. Moreover, it includes the item "Has

the individual criticized in light of the contemporary society?" prompting readers to consider the social aspects of both the current and a different time. Notably, the assessment also contains a self-assessment. Ultimately, the rubric encourages students to understand by relating content to reality and to adopt a critical gaze when viewing problems. This is consistent with the modern demand for "ready-to-use knowledge."

Instructor assessment is detailed, and it has a specific narrative form. If assessments are based on scores, scores themselves become the goal. Since scores are results-oriented, no further learning takes place if scores become the goal. Therefore, providing feedback besides scores can help students learn. Also, descriptive assessment effectively evaluates soft skills.

Surveying students' satisfaction with the writing center curriculum is also a form of educational assessment. The Sookmyung Women's University writing center has a system that evaluates a program immediately after students complete writing counseling. In the next chapter, we examine the necessity of individual counseling about writing and the vision of the online writing feedback system by analyzing the contents of the survey in detail.

Materials and Methods

Participants

This study used the data from the survey received from Sookmyung Women's University students who participated in online writing counseling programs on second semester 2020. Writing feedback satisfaction survey results for students who completed the writing feedback can prove the educational effectiveness of this program's merits. Since it is a women's university, all genders are women. The survey was conducted using the Google Drive survey program from January 10 to 27, 2021. The students who used this service were all freshmen taking up general education courses about writing for the first grade, and the respondent's majors were distributed in various ways.

Instruments

There were 11 questions in total, and 42 students responded to the survey. Satisfaction with Online Writing Feedback and advantages and improvements of writing feedback due to online characteristics were asked. The learner satisfaction means and standard deviation were calculated based on survey data from students who used the online writing counseling program during the second semester 2020 academic year.

Statistical Analysis

The researcher conducted an independent sample t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the SPSS software 22.0 program to investigate the

differences in learner satisfaction with correction guidance. Google questionnaires were provided to students for the survey and allowed students to participate voluntarily and anonymously. A notice was attached that fully explained the purpose and method of the study, and only students who read and agreed to it were asked to participate in the survey. It was informed that the survey data would be used only for research, kept confidential, and discarded as soon as the study was completed. It was a web-based survey that is accessed through a common URL for the survey and it did not collect any identifying information from respondents.

Variance homogeneity was verified first using Levene's equal variance test, and then a post-hoc test was conducted to determine whether there were any between-group differences. The differences were analyzed using the Duncan test since the number of respondents by the group was small. For the items measured as multiple responses, multiple selections were treated as individual responses and analyzed. Although the sample size is not large due to the small number of respondents, when more than 30 samples were extracted and averaged, a normal distribution was closely approached. A sample of more than 30 people is considered statistically significant, and thus, there is no difference in confidence in the results.

Results

Sookmyung Women's University recently established an online feedback system in response to the pandemic and started operating a pilot. When non-face-to-face counseling first began, there were concerns that the student-instructor trust relationship would not be well-formed in non-face-to-face settings and that online counseling might be less effective than face-to-face counseling. To probe these concerns, an educational assessment was carried out using the online feedback system. The learner satisfaction mean and standard deviation were calculated based on survey data from students who used this system. This survey data will be used to contemplate ways to improve the writing center's online feedback system in the future. This survey does not only verify whether the curriculum effectively improved the students' writing skills, but also serves as an important indicator for improving the program.

The details of the data analysis are as follows. The result of the survey indicated a high level of satisfaction among the respondents who said that "The level of writing and score can be identified through the general review and evaluation form" ($M = 4.36bc$, $SD=0.49$); this item appeared among the survey questions on the educational program's merits (alphabet subscript is the mean difference, as indicated by Duncan's post-test).

The average learner satisfaction level was high, as it was greater than three, which was the median on the five-point scale ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.62$ M : mean, SD : standard deviation). In response to the question, "What did you feel when you heard that you could receive expert correction guidance through Online Writing Feedback system?" all of the respondents answered that they felt this system was good benefits for learners.

Table 4
The positive aspects of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance

the positive aspects of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance	N	%
not being restricted to a fixed place and time	25	29.8%
being able to easily identify correction annotations and memo contents	7	8.3%
being able to view saved corrections at any time	14	16.7%
being able to access references through the use of links and computer programs	5	6.0%
being able to avoid showing emotional withdrawal When a problem is pointed out	8	9.5%
having access to their writing level and score on the general review and evaluation sheet	25	29.8%
total	84	100.0%

Table 5
The difference in satisfaction with the positive aspects of the feedback system's correction guidance

the positive aspects of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance	N	M	SD	F/Duncan test	p
not being restricted to a fixed place and time _{b c}	25	4.32	0.48		
being able to easily identify correction annotations and memo contents _c	7	4.57	0.53		
being able to view saved corrections at any time _{a b c}	14	4.21	0.58		
being able to access references through the use of links and computer programs _a	5	3.80	0.45	2.362 c>b>a	.047
being able to avoid showing emotional withdrawal When a problem is pointed out _{a b}	8	3.88	0.64		
having access to their writing level and score on the general review and evaluation sheet _{b c}	25	4.32	0.48		

The results of investigating whether there was a difference in learner satisfaction with the positive aspects of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance showed a difference in satisfaction level ($F=2.362$, $p<.05$). Students were the most satisfied with not being restricted to a fixed place and time ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.48$), being able to easily identify correction annotations and memo contents ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.53$), being able to view saved corrections at any time ($M = 4.21$, SD

= 0.58), and having access to their writing level and score on the general review and evaluation sheet ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.48$).

Table 6
The inconvenience of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance

inconvenience of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance	N	%
The application period was short and the number of requests was limited	19	27.5%
responses were not received due to the long waiting time	17	24.6%
Not being able to ask questions and hear answers right away when the students couldn't understand the corrections	18	26.1%
Not being able to choose the instructor who gives feedback	2	2.9%
Not being able to get confirmation from the instructor after correction.	13	18.8%
total	69	100.0%

Table 7
The difference in satisfaction with the inconvenience of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance

	N	M	SD	F/Duncan test	p
The application period was short and the number of requests was limited	19	4.37	0.50		
responses were not received due to the long waiting time	17	4.12	0.60		
Not being able to ask questions and hear answers right away when the students couldn't understand the corrections	18	4.44	0.51	1.195	.322
Not being able to choose the instructor who gives feedback	2	4.00	0.00		
Not being able to get confirmation from the instructor after correction	13	4.23	0.44		

***alphabet subscript is the mean difference, as indicated by Duncan's post-test*

Results of investigating whether there was a difference in learner satisfaction regarding the inconvenience of the online writing feedback system's correction guidance showed no difference ($F=1.195$, $p=.322$). Thus, there was no difference in satisfaction level; even though the application period was short, the number of requests was limited, or responses were not received due to the long waiting time. Students were still satisfied with the advantages of online writing, despite some inconveniences.

Overall, students greatly appreciated that the online writing feedback system is "not being restricted by place and time." Also, they were hugely satisfied with the accessibility of their writing level and score on the overall review and assessment sheet. Moreover, students found it helpful that the online system enabled them to

easily identify correction annotations and memo contents compared to when these were written by hand, and since all feedback received was stored in the system, they could view it repeatedly at any time. Instructors can enter evaluation content in the system and check it easily. Coupled with the inclusion of objective indicators, this online feature not only helps students ascertain their achievement in writing education, but it is also more convenient. It is much easier for instructors to assess and store data online than manually filling each assessment table. If students receive writing counseling on several occasions, they can monitor their growth using their personal assessment history. Since the entire feedback process can be converted into data using the "feedback history principle," it can assist instructors and learners in achieving effective teaching and learning.

The advantage of the Sookmyung Women's University online feedback system is that students can set their learning objectives, as the system is equipped with a pre-selection item allowing students to upload manuscripts, write questions in advance, and input the goals they want to attain through writing counseling. When feedback is provided face-to-face, not many students ask questions, resulting in one-way, instructor-centered feedback. In contrast, pre-questioning through online feedback can be carried out relatively freely, less affected by the instructor's reaction. Thus, more active questioning is made possible.

Discussion

Soft skills are cultivated through education designed for learners rather than instructors. Such education is the process- not results-oriented. Soft skills include various competencies that affect results rather than see the achievement of "results." Considering that the recent change in education is learner-centered, the educational method should also be changed. Teaching is a social activity that collaborates between lecturers and students (Lim et al., 2013).

Soft skills are difficult to measure and should be evaluated multifacetedly. Multisource feedback can also be suggested as an alternative. Unlike other measures of performance, multisource feedback is designed to develop and support feedback recipients (Goldring et al, 2015). The online feedback system basically provides this multi-source feedback. Since students' writing and records of growth is stored in the online feedback system, it has the advantage of receiving multi-source feedback from various people.

The existing education system selects competent students via evaluations based on the final result. However, writing center evaluations, namely growth or ability reference evaluations, place more weight on overall value production or an individual's growth. Participating, growing, interacting, and creating value is the key to future education. If students change from a fixed to a growth mindset, their learning pathways change and their achievement increases (Blackwell et al., 2007; Good et al., 2003). Based on recent evidence from neuroscience such as Kalinec-Craig's work (2017), the importance of mistakes to the learning process is highlighted recently. Boaler & Anderson emphasized that the important knowledge that neuroscience has developed is on the benefits of mistakes and challenge to the brain (Boaler et al., 2018). Since the assessment of the writing

center evaluates the growth process, not the final result, and values the development of competencies necessary for writing, it embraces mistakes and allows them to learn from mistakes.

Assessment should be multi-faceted and based on individual differences, with a focus on growth. Assessment via traditional scoring is unsuitable for self-learning. Soft skills cannot be measured using a single assessment criterion. Furthermore, ranking students by grades encourage competition and are not conducive to active learning. Students should be able to assess themselves against their situations. Section 2.3 provided examples of assessments that cultivate soft skills. These include an assessment table that gives specific, practical feedback rather than mere scores. Since scoring is results-oriented, descriptive evaluation and detailed feedback in scores can help students learn and grow. Additionally, students should be able to self-evaluate. It is essential to get students involved in goal setting, which entails providing them with a personal learning history to monitor their growth continuously.

Today's learners are digital natives, and they must receive a value-producing education with an emphasis on knowledge application so that they can adapt to the digital age. As shown in the survey data analysis of this study, it is necessary to think about who the learners of this era are and what they need and provide an online environment tailored to their digital needs. Knowledge sharing and cooperation are the factors that should be considered, and this can be achieved more efficiently through online learning.

To realize a sustainable general education innovation system, writing centers need to have various systems for class innovation. Education should be considered from an integrated perspective, and the fact that students have capabilities that go beyond report cards or scores should be considered.

As shown in the case of the writing center of Sookmyung Women's university and the survey data, the writing center's digital-based correction system is a way to make the process more efficient and provides quicker feedback and more data and improves accessibility by removing time and place restrictions. Additionally, it increases interaction.

To develop soft skills, writing centers should focus on providing learner-centered and personalized counseling on writing and interpretation rather than mechanical correction. Writing counseling can deliver mentoring, which is lacking in current university education.

Conclusion

Society is changing and education should change accordingly. This paper discussed the need to cultivate soft skills to avoid being marginalized in a rapidly changing data explosion era. Furthermore, it is necessary to implement new teaching and learning methods that meet digital natives' needs. A channel should be provided for students to share ideas and communicate with instructors. This is difficult in instructor-centered classes. Education should, therefore, be designed around learners and inspire students to participate actively.

This paper highlighted that in a world full of information, learning more profound concepts beyond facts is more important than mere knowledge. Thus, it is essential to acquire soft skills, such as critical thinking and application skills.

Critical thinking is indispensable to learning in the new era since it relates to finding, planning, and innovating an effective solution to a problem rather than repeating existing answers. One must first learn how to think to write well. Writing education aimed at improving soft skills and discusses the education that writing centers offer. Soft skills can help persons distinguish accurate information and identify crucial new information in a world with too much information.

As the digital revolution accelerated information distribution and the Internet took over knowledge production, the ability to compile and utilize knowledge, decipher the truth in information, and apply knowledge to new contexts have become more important than creating knowledge. Moreover, because society is constantly changing, there is no longer permanent validity to any knowledge. Accordingly, it is necessary to create an educational model that cultivates the ability to learn continuously throughout a lifetime using soft skills.

The online writing center has the advantage of being able to save and record the growth process of writing. It is easy to compile a learning history that reflects students' growth process with online learning. Standardized, quantified evaluation tools allow students to check achievements recorded as data, but this is not the same as competitive scoring because students can only check their growth without being burdened with rankings. Another advantage of the online feedback system is that reference materials can be easily accessed online. Given that the ability to learn independently lies at the core of digital innovation and those soft skills require active learning, Online writing center innovation provides essential implications. Although the number of respondents was not large due to the short period of operation for the online writing center of Sookmyung Women's University, research was conducted on all participants who used the online writing center. For this reason, the sample size of the survey is small, but when more than 30 samples were extracted and averaged, a normal distribution was closely approached (Pett 1997; Salkind 2004; quoted in Corder & Foreman, 2009). Samples larger than 30 ensure the researcher the benefits of central limit theorem (Roscoe 1975; Abranovic 1997; quoted in Hill, 1998).

An example of more than 30 people is considered statistically significant, and thus, there is no difference in confidence in the results. In addition, there are few official online writing center cases for college students, so this case study has the value of research as a rare case at this point. This paper suggested a sample of the writing grading rubric, and even though it doesn't have validity because it is from one operating online writing center, but it can be a meaningful reference of educational evaluation that fosters soft skills, which needs to be further developed to other researchers who are interested in the online feedback system.

The primary purpose of this study is not to focus on analyzing the survey results or the introduction of evaluation methods but to examine the vision of an online writing feedback system and the essence of improving soft skills.

Mentoring enhances learners' self-directedness and activity and provides a customized education that accommodates individuality. However, this has not been successfully achieved because many people still believe that writing education should focus on hard skills, and many writing centers have been unable to provide sufficient mentoring due to financial problems. Also, even if writing centers wanted to provide various services, they face poor accessibility on large campuses because they cannot secure a physical space to run the center. If the writing center is operated online, this problem can be solved. Online writing centers can lower operational expenses and overcome the disconnection between space and time. The satisfaction survey of students presented in this paper would be one basis for supporting the need for an online feedback system by examining the effectiveness of writing counseling at the writing centers.

When writing counseling is designed effectively considering the new-era changes in education, it can be an easy means of delivering a customized education. Non-face-to-face learning from online writing centers for soft skills development is suggested.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2019S1A5C2A04083150).

References

- Badjadi, N. E. (2020). Learner-centered English language teaching: Premises, practices, and prospects. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Blackwell, L., Trzesniewski, K., Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. *Child Development*, 78(1), 246-263.
- Boaler, J., & Anderson, R. (2018). Considering the rights of learners in classrooms: The importance of mistakes and growth assessment practices. *Democracy and Education*, 26(2), 1-5.
- Broad, B. (2003). *What we really value: Beyond rubrics in teaching and assessing writing*. University Press of Colorado.
- Cairns, L., & Malloch, M. (2011). Theories of work, place and learning: new directions. In: Cairn L, O'Connor B-N, Evans K, Malloch M (eds) *The SAGE handbook of workplace learning*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Castelluccio. (2018). "Toward web 3.0. *Strategic Finance; Montval*. 100(6), 53-55.
- Chaffee, J. (1994). *Thinking critically*, 4th ed., Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin.
- Choi, C. -Y., & Kim, H. -N. (2017). *Educational evaluation*, Yangseowon.
- Corder, G. W., & Foreman, D. I. (2009). *Nonparametric statistics for non-statisticians: a step-by-step approach*. New Jersey: Wiley & Sons.
- Drucker, P. (1969). *The Age of Discontinuity*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An electronic journal for the 21st century*. 6(3-4), 1-12.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College composition and communication*. 32(4), 365-387.
- Goldring, E. B., Mavrogordato, M., & Hayanes, K. T. (2015). *Multisource principal*

- evaluation data: Principals' orientations and reactions to teacher feedback regarding their leadership effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(4), 572-599.
- Jagannathan, S., (2016). Advancing knowledge economies through education and skills. Retrieved from <https://development.asia/explainer/advancing-knowledge-economies-through-education-and-skills>.
- Ji, H. B. (2017). Design concept of on-offline convergence writing feedback system, culture and convergence. *The Korean Society for Culture and Convergence*, 39(6), 203-234.
- Hibner, E. (2021). Learning literacy and the currency of a knowledge-based economy. Retrieved from: <https://www.chieflearningofficer.com/2021/03/30/learning-literacy-and-the-currency-of-a-knowledge-based-economy>.
- Kim, M. -R., (2019). University writing center operation performance and tasks : focusing on the case of Chosun University. *Ratio et Oratio* 12(3). The Korean Society for Thinking and Communication, 135-160.
- Nethanomsak, K. N. T., & Ariratana, W. (2014). Development of soft skills: Transition from university to the workplace in ASEAN Com-munity Era. *KKU Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (Graduates Studies)*, 2(2), 1-23.
- Koo, B. -D., & Choi, J. -J. (2015). Educational evaluation, Yangseowon.
- Kwon, J. -H. (2018). Current status and suggestions for extracurricular program. Proceeding of Conference, The society of Korean language and literature.
- Laughlin, C., & Bahl, L. (2008). Training is not the training: Getting business result from training. TU117. ASTD 2008 International Conference and Exposition. CA: ASTD.
- Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D., & Troy, J., (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centred learning. *Studies in higher education*, 28(3), 321-334.
- Lim, S. -A. (2017). A current status and problems of university writing center operation. *The Korean Journal of Literacy Research*. Korean Association for Literacy, 21, 133-156.
- Lim, C. S., Tang, K. N., & Tan, S. F. (2013). Building rapport with pupils to enhance teaching: Implications from observing three primary excellent teachers. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 21(3), 1-6.
- Lippman, L. H., Ryberg, R., Carney, R., & Moore, K. A. (2015). Workforce connections: Key "soft skills" that foster youth workforce success: Toward a consensus across fields. Washington, DC: Child Trends,
- Macy, A., & Terry, N. (2008). Using movies as a vehicle for critical thinking in economics and business. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research*, 9(1), 31-51.
- Moore, K., Lippman, L., & Ryberg, R. (2015). Improving outcome measures other than achievement. *AERA Open*. 1(2), 10.1177/2332858415579676
- Moore, K. A., & Pearson, B. J. (2021). Soft skills in an online class. *HortTechnology hortte*. 27(5), 583-585. Retrieved from: <https://journals.ashs.org/horttech/view/journals/horttech/27/5/article-p583.xml>.
- Neaves, J. (2011). Meaningful assessment for improving writing center consultations. Western Carolina University.
- North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English*. 46(5). National

- Council of Teachers of English, 433-446.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). The definition and selection of key competencies: executive summary. Paris: OECD.
- Pachauri, D., & Aruna, Y. (2014). Importance of soft skills in teacher education programme. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 5.1, 22-25.
- Paiz, J. M. (2018). Expanding the writing center: A theoretical and practical toolkit for starting an online writing lab. *TESL-EJ*. 21(4), 1-19.
- Park, D. -S., & Hong, H. -J. (2005). Curriculum and Educational Evaluation, Mooneum.
- Patrick, C. J., Venables, N. C., Yancey, J. R., Hicks, B. M., Nelson, L. D., & Kramer, M. D. (2013). A construct-network approach to bridging diagnostic and physiological domains: application to assessment of externalizing psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 122(3), 902-16.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 2: Do they really think differently?, *On the horizon*. 9(6), 1-5. Retrieved from: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/10748120110424843/full/pdf?title=digital-natives-digital-immigrants-part-2-do-they-really-think-differently>.
- Ramlan, R., & Ngah, S. (2015). Student perception on the importance of soft skills for education and employment. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*. 1(1), 696-708.
- Ruggiero, V. R. (1996). *Becoming a critical thinker*. Rapid City, SD: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sinnema, C., & Aitken, G. (2013). Emerging international trends in curriculum. *Reinventing the curriculum: New trends in curriculum policy and practice*.
- Taylor, G. (2021). Writing centers in North America, a presentation for the international academic conference of Sookmyung women's university: The status quo and vision of university general education courses around the world.
- Thyer, E. (2015). Development of the critical thinking teaching resource. <http://teachassist.deakin.edu.au>.
- Tyler, R. W. (1951). The functions of measurement in improving instruction. *Educational measurement*. Washington D.C. American Council on Education.
- Washington State University. (2008). Guide to Rating Integrative & Critical Thinking. Retrieved May 14, 2007, from <http://wsuctproject.wsu.edu>.
- Wikle, T, Fagin, T. (2014). Hard and Soft Skills in Preparing GIS Professionals: Comparing Perceptions of Employers and Educators, *Transactions in GIS*, 19(5), 1-12.
- Zelazo, P. D., Carlson, S. M., & Kesek, A. (2008). The development of executive function in childhood, In C. A. Nelson & M. Luciana (Eds.), MIT Press, (2008). 553-574.