PROOFREADING AND EDITING IN STUDENT AND RESEARCH PUBLICATION CONTEXTS

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Edited by Nigel Harwood

Proofreading and Editing in Student and Research Publication Contexts

This book explores proofreading and editing from a variety of research and practitioner-led perspectives to describe, debate, and interrogate roles and policies within the student and research publication context.

Chapters feature a wide range of empirical research findings gathered from an internationally diverse set of experts in the field from Australia, Canada, Finland, Hong Kong, the UK, and the USA. The book progresses debates surrounding the legitimacy and necessity of copyeditors and proofreaders, drawing upon a range of theory and practice. Contributing to further research and dialogue in the area, the book addresses the ethicality and educative benefits of proofreading from various perspectives.

Ultimately, the book offers vital discussions about the ethics and boundaries of proofreading and editing with experts sharing their experiences and recommendations for next steps. This book will be of relevance to postgraduate students, researchers, and academics in the fields of literary studies, higher education, language arts, and applied linguistics. Teaching and learning professionals, policymakers, proofreaders, and editors can also benefit from the volume.

Nigel Harwood is Professor in Applied Linguistics, School of English, University of Sheffield, UK.

Routledge Research in Higher Education

Creating Supportive Spaces for Pregnant and Parenting College Students
Contemporary Understandings of Title IX
Edited by Catherine L. Riley and Katie B. Garner

Gamification and Design Thinking in Higher Education
Case Studies for Instructional Innovation in the Economics Classroom
Carmen Bueno Muñoz, Núria Hernández Nanclares, Luis R. Murillo Zamorano, and José Ángel López Sánchez

The Development of Professional Identity in Higher Education
Continuing and Advancing Professionalism
Edited by Myint Swe Khine and Abdulghani Muthanna

Internships, High-Impact Practices, and Provocative Praxis in Higher Education
A Social Justice Framework Based on Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Access
Beth Manke, Bonnie Gasior, and Michelle Chang

Philosophical, Educational and Moral Openings in Doctoral Pursuits and Supervision
Promoting the Values of Wonder, Wander, and Whisper in African Higher Education
Yusef Waghid

Proofreading and Editing in Student and Research Publication Contexts
International Perspectives
Edited by Nigel Harwood

Proofreading and Editing in Student and Research Publication Contexts

International Perspectives

Edited by Nigel Harwood

Contents

Contributors

Luke Beckstrand, Writing Tutor, Department of English, Brigham Young University, USA

Nina Conrad, self-employed editor, USA

Charlotte Cottier, self-employed editor, Australia

Rhonda Daniels, self-employed editor, Australia

Mary Davis, Principal Lecturer and Institutional Academic Integrity Lead, Business School, Oxford Brookes University, UK

Grant Eckstein, Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics, Brigham Young University, USA

Tyler Gardner, Assistant Teaching Professor, Department of English, Brigham Young University, USA

Pejman Habibie, Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, Canada

Louise Harnby, Chair, Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading, UK

Nigel Harwood, Professor, School of English, University of Sheffield, UK

Guangwei Hu, Professor, Department of English and Communication, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

Alice Lehtinen, self-employed editor, Finland

Songsha Ren, Lecturer, School of Foreign Languages, China West Normal University, China; PhD student, Department of English and Communication, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

Fiona Richards, Teaching Fellow, Center for Preparatory Studies, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan

Kate Sotejeff-Wilson, self-employed editor, Finland

Joan Turner, Professor Emerita, Department of English and Creative Writing, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

Saskia Van Viegen, Associate Professor, Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics, York University, Canada

Katie Watkins, Writing Center Associate Manager, Department of English, Brigham Young University, USA

Foreword

Like many professional editors, I started my career by proofreading for students and academic researchers. Back in 2006, after 14 years in the scholarly publishing industry—first with the company that became Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, then with SAGE Publishing—and with a hankering for the independence that a freelance life offered, it seemed an obvious path. After all, the demand for such services was global, and the search engines gave people like me a way to be visible to those who needed my help.

I quickly realised that the sector I'd considered targeting was perhaps the most challenging, and within months I'd shifted my focus towards working directly for scholarly presses such as Blackwell, Cambridge University Press, Edward Elgar, Harvard University Press, Polity, Routledge, and SAGE Publishing. Between me and the author was an in-house editor. I was provided with detailed style guides. And the briefs I was given demonstrated a shared understanding of the differences between proofreading, copyediting, and more stylistic and structural interventions. The result? I found myself relieved of multiple burdens—managing ethical boundaries, verifying a student's institutional policy on editorial support, and navigating the blurred space between language support and academic collusion. All of that became someone else's problem.

In the years that followed, I changed course once more, until by 2014 I was a fully fledged stylistic line editor committed to helping independent authors of crime fiction, thrillers, and mystery write stories that grip readers and drip with suspense. And while these days my professional practice is more likely to involve helping an author craft a cliff-hanger, I've continued to engage with an international community of editors and proofreaders, many of whom still tackle the challenges of proofreading and editing for students and researchers. I follow their discussions and read their research, and it's clear that the problems I encountered early on in my career haven't gone away; if anything, they're more complex.

When Nigel and I first discussed a foreword for this edited volume, I had just become the chair of the Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading (CIEP), an international membership organisation that offers training and community for editorial professionals, and helps members develop business

confidence. The CIEP sets standards, models excellence, advocates for clear and thoughtful language use, and promotes respect for all voices.

That's a broad and ongoing mission, one that requires the governing body and members to interrogate some of the questions being addressed in this volume: What are the different types of editing? Is editorial intervention in some kinds of texts ethical? Who decides where the boundaries lie and how the standards are defined? What do we need to consider when working on texts whose style of English looks different from the one we were taught? And how do we create cohesion in a globally unregulated industry?

One recurring theme in the editorial community concerns how far an editor or proofreader should go, and at what point we leave well enough alone. It's a tricky skill that requires time to develop even when we're working for presses and independent authors. It becomes a minefield if the text has been written by a student because the rules governing what's allowed vary so widely.

There are many in the freelance editing community—and the various national editorial societies they belong to—who are working hard to educate writers about the differences between proofreading, copyediting, line editing, and developmental editing. That's no easy task when even editors and publishers can't agree on the lingo themselves. In the early years of my career, "proofreading" was something you did on "page proofs"— printed or digital facsimiles of what a reader might pull off a bookshelf— and involved no direct intervention in the raw text. Instead, we used proofreading markup language (e.g., the symbols recommended by British Standard Institution's BS 5261-2:2005 Copy preparation and proof correction), annotating the designed pages so that a typesetter could implement the changes into the text files.

Some practitioners still insist on this distinction even if most have expanded their definition of proofreading to allow for the direct amendment of an online document too, using tracked changes and comments. The result is that these days, the distinction between the different levels of editing is less to do with *how* you work and more to do with the *extent* of intervention.

Regardless of the medium in which today's editors are working, many editorial societies and publishers do distinguish between proofreading and editing. The CIEP considers copyediting as the stage in the publication workflow that comes after structural/developmental editing but before design and layout. It examines the content of text—checking grammar, spelling, and punctuation; applying consistency to the language and formatting; and making sure that the text is clear and reads well for its intended purpose and audience.

While the CIEP acknowledges that the word "proofreading" is used more loosely these days, it still positions this as a quality-control service that takes place after copyediting and near the end of the publishing workflow. Proofreaders are tasked with finding any *remaining* errors rather than starting from scratch. Unless briefed to do so, and paid for the additional work, the proofreader will not be recasting sentences or carrying out structural interventions or fact-checking, though they may query anything that seems problematic.

   That's in contrast to how some authors use the term "proofreading" to mean something far broader: *fix the problems, whatever and wherever they are*. The result is that even if a university does allow students to seek the services of external professional proofreaders, and even if researchers decide to seek the support of the same to increase their chances of publication in high-impact journals, it's not a given that both parties will have a mutual understanding of what that service includes and the degree to which it's permitted or ethically appropriate. It's no wonder that authors—and some language professionals—are confused. And so, while attempting to globally unify the tangled terminology may be an ask too far, the kind of communication efficiencies recommended by Cottier and Daniels in Chapter 4 of this volume make more than good sense.

   If the terminology is confusing, so are the ethical boundaries. What's acceptable or not can differ not just between universities but also between lecturers within a single institution, as Richards' study in Chapter 5 illustrates, and between proofreaders working to the same institutional guidelines as discussed by Davis in Chapter 7. Although some editorial societies offer valuable training and guidance on editorial intervention in student work (the CIEP's course Proofreading Theses and Dissertations, for example), we're a long way from a space in which an editorial policy of ethics is standardised at national level. And even if there were to be standardisation, that in itself leads to questions around who's deciding what the standard should be.

   This ethical issue extends well beyond students and into academic publishing too. Researchers seeking to construct what Ren and Hu in Chapter 9 call "scholarly identity" are driven towards publication in high-impact English-medium scholarly journals that support that goal. As Habibie and Van Viegen note in Chapter 11, that contribution to the knowledge economy of the 21st century is not only desired but expected. And yet, while the language support that researchers seek might be called "proofreading," there are occasions where it's more akin to substantive language editing and might even border on what some would call authorship. And again, given that there's no consensus in academia or publishing about what constitutes an acceptable level of intervention, it's incumbent on editorial professionals working with researchers to establish on a job-by-job basis what's expected and what's permitted within publisher/client guidelines.

   However, it's surely also important that researchers and publishers use terminology that reflects what's being done rather than language that masks the level of collaboration, however much that editorial collaboration helps the writer develop. In other words, if it's editing that's taking place, isn't it time to start calling it that?

   Part of the solution to the ethical conundrum lies in teaching language professionals how to query well. In order to address the historical dearth of appropriate training for editors and proofreaders, the CIEP created its Art of Querying course, which focusses not just on what to query but also how to do so in a way that's efficient and sensitive. Editors and proofreaders who hone querying skills are in a stronger position to help students and researchers

recognise and understand a textual problem, and make their own revisions. The result is a process that's less tampering and more teaching, and that preserves the principle of authorship at the heart of academic integrity.

Language has always been fluid, but more recently an acceptance of this fluidity has been called for more loudly, such that some of the words and phrases considered acceptable only a few years ago are now being challenged. And rightly so given the underlying roots and assumptions, however nuanced. For example, the CIEP style guide now asks for the terms "native English" and "non-native English" to be avoided on the grounds that they risk the othering of English speakers who are non-white and non-Western, and could be used in ways that conflate fluency with birthplace. It's a single but potent example of the meaning that can lie underneath and around text—one that can impact readers negatively even when no harm is intended—and a reminder that words have power. Which of course they do; if they didn't, we wouldn't use them. For the creators of texts, and the editors who work with them, that power comes with responsibility: the willingness, however uncomfortable that makes us feel, to consider our individual unconscious biases. Does that mean abandoning our linguistic, grammatical, and stylistic traditions? No, but it does demand that we explore whether those traditions are framed by a narrative of exclusion, prescription, and pedantry or by one of sense and sensibility.

So who is to judge what passes muster in a world where universities increasingly welcome students whose first language isn't English, along with those who speak and write English fluently regardless of whether it's a first, second, or third language, but do so in a way that's inflected with regional and/or cultural distinctions? The editor, the tutor, or a university language centre? And what of researchers seeking publication? Is it the publishers of the journals and books they're contributing to, or the editorial boards and peer reviewers the publishers commission?

Those gatekeepers are no more bound by a universally acknowledged set of conventions and preferences than the students or researchers. That's one reason why the CIEP aims over the next decade to introduce a range of editorial tests that embrace myriad Englishes. It will be a clarion call to embed respect for diversity of voice into the very fabric of professional proofreading and editing practice.

Will there be pushback from those who insist on preserving a narrative of right/wrong, correct/incorrect, standard/non-standard in discussions around the English language? Inevitably, yes; but if our centres of learning and the publishing industry genuinely seek to create spaces that celebrate clear communication in ways that avoid othering and erasure, this is work that must be done, and it must be led by the very gatekeepers who hold language privilege in the first place.

Embracing the concept of authentic voice means addressing the digital elephant in the room. Just a few weeks before I began writing this foreword, a CIEP member asked about training to help editors and proofreaders manage

perhaps one of the newest and biggest ethical challenges facing the profession—AI-generated texts. This isn't a problem for even the *near* future; it's here right now and evidences the dawn of a type of "literacy brokering" that shifts the landscape identified by Conrad in Chapter 2 even further, particularly for students with poor access to formal or social written-language support, for researchers seeking publication in peer-reviewed journals written in languages they're not fluent in, and especially for those who'd rather have ChatGPT write their essays and academic articles. How academic institutions, publishers, and the professional editorial community meet this challenge is not yet clear, but it cannot be ignored.

In all of this lie the *needs* of the students and researchers—all of whom have different lived experiences that mean they come to the academic table with various levels of language proficiency, funding, and access to resources. Even if there were a level playing field, the path to language support is unclear. Policy around whether and to what degree editorial support from a third party is allowed is inconsistent and of varying quality, as several of the chapters in this volume note. That issue might be overcome by academia, publishers, and editorial societies collaborating with the aim of developing consistent policies and guidelines, at least nationally, on best practice for language support, and deciding how those who evaluate students' and researchers' written-communication competencies are trained themselves. For that reason, it's a conversation that the CIEP has identified as a necessity in its strategic plan.

There is yet another elephant in the room, this one concerning regulation. The CIEP, Editors Canada, and IPEd are three examples of institutions that put professional standards at the heart of their membership, yet any individual on the planet can set themselves up as a practising editor or proofreader regardless of whether they're a member of one of these bodies and despite having no core-skills editorial training. The result is that students and researchers who unwittingly source the services of those who don't have the foundational skills or have elected to ignore the ethical dimensions of editorial work find themselves at risk—academically and financially. Again, embedding robust support pathways within the university setting sooner, rather than leaving it to students and researchers to make the decisions later, would seem to be the logical approach, though coordinating such policymaking at national level will be a challenge.

In the meantime, if editorial societies wish academic institutions and publishers to collaborate with them in the setting of inclusive standards around the adjudication of academic texts, their practitioner members must be able to demonstrate skills that engender trust. The creation of codes of practice (CoPs) and graded membership structures that reward members for carrying out appropriate professional development are core to this endeavour.

This is the route the CIEP has gone down. All members are bound by a professional CoP, and qualifying for Professional and Advanced Professional membership requires a rigorous balance of training (including being able to

evidence core skills in editing and proofreading taught by industry-recognised bodies), practical experience (requiring between 500 and 1,500 hours of relevant editorial work), and references provided by industry professionals with editorial expertise (publishers, for example).

That's a lot of work, but there's a reward—the right to advertise in the Directory of Editorial Services, which is optimised for search engine visibility and a source of regular work for many members. It should therefore come as no surprise that the graded membership structure—and its benefits—are two of the most oft-cited reasons why people join the CIEP. And it's something that benefits the students and researchers who use those editors where that's permitted.

There is much work to be done. More research and multiple collaborations will be needed if academic and editorial practitioners are to serve the students, researchers, and readers of the future, and in ways that support the development of consistent, professional, and accessible standards that are robust enough to demand clarity of communication but flexible enough to allow for diversity of voice. In this volume, you'll find a springboard for some of those vital conversations—academics and editors sharing their experiences, studies, and recommendations for the next best steps. I warmly invite you to explore them.

Louise Harnby
Chair, Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading (CIEP)

1 Introduction

Proofreading and Editing in Student and Research Publication Contexts

Nigel Harwood

This book explores proofreading/editing from the perspective of a number of different parties. One party is the academic writer who seeks help from a proofreader, and writers can be divided into two types for our purposes: i) student writers who have their work proofread before it is assessed (e.g., coursework essays, dissertations, theses); and ii) academics who have their manuscripts proofread before submission for review and publication (e.g., to a journal/publisher). We also hear the perspectives of disciplinary faculty, since they are supervising student writers who seek proofreading, and are marking students' coursework, dissertations, or theses. These texts, of course, may have been proofread with or without their knowledge and consent. Another party in focus in the volume is the writing centre tutor. There has been much debate in writing centres as to whether part of the tutor's role should include proofreading (see, for instance, Blau et al., 2002; Clark & Healy, 2008; Moussu & David, 2015; Nicklay, 2012); and there is evidence that student writers visiting the writing centre often expect proofreading to be included in the tutor's remit (Corcoran et al., 2018; Kim, 2014; Liu & Harwood, 2022a, 2022b). Finally, it is important to consider the perspective of the proofreaders themselves, and their voices are present in this volume also.

For the sake of concision, in this chapter I refer to proofreading/editing simply as "proofreading," and to those who perform this role as "proofreaders," but some contributors to this book prefer to speak of editors, literacy brokers, language professionals, or text-mediators rather than proofreaders. The terminology to describe proofreading is contested, and its boundaries are fuzzy and understood differently by various stakeholders; as I have argued elsewhere (Harwood, 2023), "proofreading" is to be viewed as a mere term of convenience, given the very different ways in which it is understood. There are traditional definitions and conceptualisations of proofreading and editing, such as the definition of proofreading by the Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading (CIEP, 2020) as "a process of identifying typographical, linguistic, coding or positional errors and omissions on a printed or electronic proof, and marking corrections." However, we know from studies of proofreading in both student and research publication contexts that proofreaders'

understandings of the role they should play are far less stable than such definitions suggest; for instance, some proofreaders go far beyond the grammar and syntax interventions the CIEP definition speaks of, while others interpret proofreading in a narrower sense (Harwood, 2018, 2019; see also Conrad, 2020; Kruger & Bevan-Dye, 2010, 2013; Li, 2012; Luo & Hyland, 2016). This is why in my own research, I have adopted a much broader definition of proofreading as "third-party interventions (entailing written alteration) on assessed work in progress" (Harwood et al., 2009, p. 166); such a broad definition means that everything from light- to heavy-touch interventions can be seen as different forms of proofreading, and the ethics of these various forms and types of intervention can be interrogated. So this contested terminology is indicative of the contested nature of proofreading in general; and this volume seeks to make explicit the various debates associated with the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders directly or indirectly involved in the act of proofreading, including those who have responsibility for formulating and enacting proofreading policy.

In each of the two contexts in focus in this volume, the student context and the research publication context, those who are suspicious of proofreading ask questions about the legitimacy of proofreader help, particularly when the proofreader's contribution is not acknowledged by the writer upon submission of their text. In contrast, those more sympathetically inclined to proofreading may claim the process is formative and educative for writers, with the proofreader raising writers' awareness of grammatical or rhetorical deficiencies in the text as well as enhancing their literacy skills. Those sympathetic to proofreading may also argue that proofreading enables L2 students to have their work assessed fairly, without the markers being distracted by faulty grammar and syntax, and enables L2 researchers to have their journal submissions given a fair hearing by editors and reviewers for the same reason.

This volume seeks to move the above debates forward, and to advance proofreading research in both student and research publication contexts. The contributors to this volume describe, debate, and interrogate expectations, roles, responsibilities, and policies associated with proofreading in each context. This book therefore addresses questions such as the following:

Questions about writers' behaviour seeking proofreading

– Who do writers approach to have their work proofread?
– What information do writers provide when approaching proofreaders for help? What additional information do proofreaders require which writers fail to provide?

Questions about stakeholders' expectations, beliefs, and practices

– What expectations do writers have regarding the types of interventions the proofreader will make? To what extent do writers' expectations and assumptions coincide with those of their proofreaders? To what extent do the views

of students and disciplinary faculty align with regard to the ethicality of various types of proofreader intervention?

– Under what circumstances do authors believe that their proofreaders should be credited with co-authorship of a manuscript?

– What kind of interventions do proofreaders make? To what extent do proofreaders vary in their practices? Why? Do proofreaders believe that their goal is to produce flawless and "native speaker" English?

– To what extent do student writers, English language tutors, and disciplinary faculty display ethical uncertainty about different types of proofreader interventions? What causes this uncertainty?

Questions about writers' experience of proofreading

– To what extent do writers experience proofreading as educative?

Questions about proofreading policies

– How do proofreading policies compare across different universities? To what extent do these policies debar or legitimise proofreading? How much information do policy documents provide about the types of proofreader interventions which are permissible? How can policies be made clearer and more transparent to stakeholders?

– Where do university writing centres stand regarding proofreading policy? Should a writing centre tutor perform a different role to that of a proofreader? How has writing centre policy on proofreading shifted over time?

– Why is there the need for professional bodies to issue proofreading guidelines to their members? How have such bodies' proofreading guidelines evolved over time? How closely do these guidelines align with university guidelines? How comfortably do the guidelines sit alongside governmental anti-cheating legislation?

– In what ways do proofreading policies need to be updated in the light of changes to English-medium universities, English-medium publishing, and to the increasing availability and sophistication of compositional tools, such as AI and programs like Grammarly?

These and other questions are addressed in this book by a diverse group of contributors who study proofreading across student and research publication contexts, opening up a space for debate and discussion between and among the different sets of stakeholders concerned: students, writers seeking publication, disciplinary faculty, writing centre tutors, teaching and learning professionals, proofreaders, and policymakers.

Overview of the Volume

Part I of the volume focuses on **studies of proofreading in student contexts**. Previous studies have found that students seek out proofreading "as a routine

part of their academic lives" (Turner, 2011, p. 430), and we tend to assume that for the most part, the proofreaders students approach are those operating on a professional, commercial basis. However in Chapter 2, Nina Conrad focuses on the "informal" proofreaders student writers recruit from their social networks, rather than on professionals, based on a diverse sample of 241 undergraduate and postgraduate domestic and international students studying at an American university. Conrad finds that friends and family members are the most common types of informal proofreaders and that receiving help from commercial proofreading agencies is relatively uncommon in comparison to these informal arrangements. In addition, Conrad investigates students' motivations for soliciting proofreading. Two of the most common motivations were a desire to improve writing skills and to receive higher grades; but also noteworthy is that nearly half the writers had been advised to have their work proofread by an instructor. Conrad shows how her findings varied between undergraduate and postgraduates and between domestic/international and L1/L2 groups: for instance, whereas the undergraduate writers primarily sought out proofreading to obtain higher grades, the postgraduate writers' most common motivation was to enhance their writing skills. There is also coverage of the types/genres of texts proofread, and the types of interventions proofreaders make on the writers' texts.

A perennial source of debate in writing centres concerns the tutor's remit: Is part of the writing centre tutor's job to proofread? Or is the remit of the proofreader (whether commercial or informal) totally separate from that of the writing centre tutor? In Chapter 3, Grant Eckstein, Luke Beckstrand, Katie Watkins, and Tyler Gardner focus on the proofreading of student writing from the perspective of the writing centre. Eckstein and his co-authors describe how most writing tutors in the United States are prohibited from proofreading. Taking a historical perspective, however, they show that this was not always so; and that the prohibition on proofreading is increasingly being questioned in today's multilingual university by both writing centre tutors and by students (see also for instance Corcoran et al., 2018). Eckstein and colleagues then investigate the attitudes of student writers and writing centre tutors at their American university towards proofreading. Although students were interested in receiving help with their grammar, they were also keen to develop their linguistic ability rather than merely having their writing "fixed" as they sat passively by. And although some tutors felt anxious or unprepared to tutor L2 writers, the university's mandatory training in this regard eased their anxieties. Eckstein et al.'s chapter therefore adds to recent studies charting the evolution of the writing centre and its aims, as well as presenting us with the perspectives on proofreading of those who work in and receive help from writing centres.

The perspective of the volume changes in Chapter 4, as we hear from the proofreaders themselves. And whereas in Chapter 2, the focus was on "informal" proofreaders, in this chapter the focus is on professionals. Charlotte Cottier and Rhonda Daniels are freelance, Professional-grade members of the

Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd). IPEd is a respected professional body providing support and professional development for Australian and New Zealand proofreaders via an accreditation scheme, awards for exemplary practice, and by organising a biennial conference (see https://www.iped-editors.org/about-iped/), similar to other professional organisations around the world, such as The Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading (CIEP), The Society of English-language Professionals (SENSE), Nordic Editors and Translators (NEaT), and Editors Canada. In their chapter, Cottier and Daniels study initial student enquiries for postgraduate dissertation or thesis proofreading, as well as the type of proofreading being requested. There have been previous accounts of students requesting unethical forms of proofreading (see, for instance, the accounts by proofreaders in Harwood et al., 2010); but in this study, such forms of intervention were not requested. The proofreaders nevertheless found students' enquiries problematic, inasmuch as insufficient information was provided by the writers about submission deadlines and about the text itself, with the result that the proofreaders were unable to detail costs, turnaround times, or whether they would be able to take the work on. Other important information omitted by some writers included their discipline, their budget, and the text's word count/institution's word limit. In line with earlier research (Harwood et al., 2009), student writers used a variety of terms to describe the service they required, including proofreading, editing, and copyediting. As Cottier and Daniels argue, the findings suggest that policymakers as well as professional bodies need to develop procedures to ensure more efficient communication between proofreaders and their clients.

In Chapter 5, Fiona Richards analyses the types of interventions a proofreader made on an L2 MA TESOL student's essay and solicits the views of the student, Suzy, as well as two TESOL lecturers, Jack and Lizzy, on the ethicality of the proofreader's interventions. The proofreader, a PhD student who was paid about £65 to proofread the essay, made 219 interventions on the 2,657-word text (8.24 interventions/100 words), most of which were classified as minor additions, deletions, or substitutions, and so the more substantial, unethical forms of proofreading detected in the practice of some proofreaders (see Harwood, 2018, 2019) were notable by their absence here. When it came to the participants' views on the proofreader's changes, Suzy took a more permissive view of proofreading compared to the two lecturers. For instance, Suzy felt that the purpose of proofreading was to boost her marks and that even more substantial forms of intervention, like rewriting, were ethically acceptable, in contrast to Jack and Lizzy. At times, though, the two lecturers disagreed with each other on the ethicality of the proofreader's changes: Whereas Jack was comfortable with the number of changes the proofreader had made, Lizzy felt it was excessive; and Lizzy wished for a form of proofreading which flagged problems up rather than corrected them, so that the proofreading experience was educative for the writer. Richards' study therefore provides further evidence of the lack of consensus between and among stakeholders as to how far proofreaders of student writing should be

permitted to intervene (cf. Harwood, 2023), making it difficult for university policymakers to formulate proofreading guidelines acceptable to all.

Richards' two lecturers sometimes exhibited uncertainty as to the ethicality of the proofreader's interventions. For instance, Jack was unsure whether a proofreader's role should include giving advice to the writer on their essay content and on rhetorical conventions associated with academic writing, or whether their role is simply to pick up typos and act as a "spellcheck with a brain." In Chapter 6, Nigel Harwood examines this theme of ethical uncertainty in detail, soliciting the views of disciplinary faculty, English language tutors, and students. This uncertainty arose in relation to eight different themes. For instance, there was uncertainty about the line between ethical and unethical proofreading practices. Some of this confusion related to assessment criteria, with proofreading being viewed as more ethically acceptable where these criteria said nothing about the evaluation of linguistic correctness and less acceptable where language was explicitly mentioned, since in the latter case the proofreader's interventions would likely boost a writer's mark. Certain types of intervention also caused feelings of ethical uncertainty, such as interventions where the proofreader reorganised the structure of the text by moving paragraphs around. There were also uncertainties about whether proofreading may breed writer dependency on the proofreader. Only 22% of lecturers, 47% of language tutors, and 10% of students reported being wholly or somewhat familiar with university proofreading policy, inevitably contributing to their feelings of uncertainty about the acceptability of proofreading in general, and about specific types of proofreading in particular, and policy is in focus in the next part of the book.

Part II of the volume focuses on **proofreading policies and policymaking**, beginning with Mary Davis' study in Chapter 7. Focusing on the policy statements of 15 UK universities, Davis finds that only 8 of the 15 university policy statements actually spell out what they mean by proofreading, potentially leading to confusion as to what is and is not permitted by the various parties involved (such as writers, supervisors, academic integrity advisors, teaching and learning staff, and the proofreaders themselves). The amount of detail provided in the policy statements varied markedly, ranging from 12 pages to a cursory half a page in length. Only 8 of the 15 policy statements required student writers to declare they had used a proofreading service when submitting their work, lessening the visibility of proofreading and transparency around the help received. Looking next at these universities' advice on study skills, Davis finds that some of this advice contradicts that institution's proofreading policy: for instance, whereas the proofreading policy explicitly warned students against contracting third-party proofreaders, the study skills advice encouraged the use of these proofreaders. There was little evidence of universities offering study skills classes which taught students to proofread themselves; and, given that the literature suggests that enabling students to be better proofreaders of their own writing is pedagogically valuable (Carduner, 2007), Davis suggests a suite of teaching activities to help students learn to do

just that. Davis concludes her chapter with a series of recommendations to enhance university policies, study skills advice, and teaching activities to help ensure proofreading policies and practices align.

The second contribution to this policymaking section is Chapter 8 by Rhonda Daniels and Charlotte Cottier, whose focus is on policies devised by a professional body of proofreaders, the Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd), rather than policies devised by universities, as in the previous chapter. Daniels and Cottier trace the origins and evolution of IPEd guidelines for editing postgraduate dissertations and theses from the first version (2001) to the most recent version (2019). The guidelines address the extent to which proofreaders are entitled to intervene: rather than being permitted to rewrite a text's "content, substance or structure," IPEd proofreaders are only permitted to "draw attention to problems" and "offer examples or comments to guide the student." The guidelines stress the necessity of students obtaining evidence that their supervisor has given permission for the work to be proofread, and of providing this evidence to the proofreader. Also important is for writers to provide proofreaders with the IPEd guidelines before proofreading begins, and for all parties to be clear as to which interventions are permitted and which are off-limits. Other supporting material available on the IPEd website includes advice on writer–proofreader communication and on fair pay rates. Daniels and Cottier situate the guidelines in the context of other educational policymaking, such as the proofreading guidelines of Australian and New Zealand universities, and Australian anti-cheating legislation. The chapter concludes by considering the challenges ahead for IPEd policymakers in updating their guidelines in the context of the changing landscape of HE, such as the increasing language diversity of university students and faculty, the rise of the thesis by publication, changing support and supervisory arrangements at doctoral level, and the rise of AI writing tools, such as ChatGPT.

Part III of the volume focuses on **studies of proofreading in research publication contexts**. In Chapter 9, Songsha Ren and Guangwei Hu's case study centres around the various "extensive" language and content interventions four proofreaders made to two manuscripts for publication authored by Huang, a Chinese biologist. Ren and Hu focus on two ethical dimensions: i) whether it is ethical for authors to credit proofreaders as co-authors for improving manuscripts—particularly when these same unedited manuscripts were previously rejected for publication; and ii) whether proofreading hinders or fosters writer development (i.e., whether proofreading is educative). The type and frequency of interventions made by the four proofreaders (Ivy, Ted, Wang, and Zhang) varied markedly. In the first manuscript, Zhang and Ted made around five times more interventions than Wang. In the second manuscript, Ivy made more than three times as many major interventions as those made by the other three proofreaders put together. The proofreaders also gave advice on rhetorical conventions, helping raise Huang's awareness of the importance of underscoring the contribution of his work in his introduction sections and enhancing his knowledge of the purpose and structure of an abstract. Ren and

Hu therefore conclude that Huang's proofreading experience was educative, particularly since the proofreaders provided explanations of the linguistic and rhetorical shortcomings of Huang's text rather than simply making the corrections. Huang decided to include his proofreaders as co-authors because of their language- and content-level contributions to the manuscripts despite the fact that their lack of involvement in conducting the research debarred them from co-authorship according to CRediT (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) guidelines. Ren and Hu argue that these more rigid authorship guidelines need to be reconsidered in the light of the findings of cases like Huang's, and in the light of the formidable obstacles faced by L2 writers seeking publication.

In Chapter 10, Kate Sotejeff-Wilson and Alice Lehtinen report proofreaders' perspectives as to how far they should intervene when proofreading multilingual authors' work for publication, particularly around questions of style which proofreaders recognise as "non-native." Hence Sotejeff-Wilson and Lehtinen bring an English as a lingua franca (ELF) perspective to the proofreading debate. Proofreaders were asked questions such as "Would you shorten longer phrasing?," "Would you join shorter sentences into longer ones?" and "Would you change word order in a sentence, e.g., from front to end focus?," as well as questions about changing paragraph order, and changing passive to active voice. Sotejeff-Wilson and Lehtinen explain that the passive voice is "a much more natural part of the Finnish language" compared to English, and is less formal in Finnish; hence when they write in their L2, Finns may overuse the passive compared to L1 speakers of English. Hence these questions sought to identify the extent to which proofreaders amend different L2 speaker varieties of English, as opposed to amending grammatically incorrect English. The focus on proofreaders' attitudes to local varieties of English can also be seen in the survey question "Would you change source-language phrases/idioms to English ones?" For instance, would proofreaders consider it necessary to change the Finnish idiom "Don't wake a sleeping bear" to "Let sleeping dogs lie"? In general, although there was considerable variation in reported practices, the proofreaders' responses spoke of the "balancing act" between, on the one hand, making changes to writers' work to try to ensure it would be read without prejudice and was intelligible and readable, and, on the other, allowing writers to maintain their own local/idiosyncratic styles and varieties of English. In the same vein, Sotejeff-Wilson and Lehtinen conclude that proofreaders of writing for publication should primarily strive to help their writers produce clear, rather than nativelike, text.

The final part of this volume, Part IV, consists of two **reflective accounts** on proofreading. In Chapter 11, Pejman Habibie and Saskia Van Viegen argue for what they call a "humanist approach" to proofreading, addressing the themes of "trust, voice, respect, and power." Habibie and Van Viegen draw upon their experiences of supporting student writers in a writing centre to surface some key difficulties, dilemmas, and constraints facing proofreaders which have been addressed in earlier chapters. They conclude that proofreaders have not only a valuable role to play in helping writers develop their

rhetorical knowledge; their role is also one of doing "humanist and relational," interpersonal work to support writers. Proofreaders may lack disciplinary knowledge of the writer's field, and may be unsure how far they are ethically permitted to intervene and help the writer; there is said to be "a fine line between mentorship and spoon-feeding." Then there is often the issue of limited consultation time, with writing centre tutors being restricted to perhaps a single meeting of 30–60 minutes with the writer. The authors argue that despite these restrictions, proofreaders can do their best to provide "affective and emotional support," as well as linguistic and rhetorical guidance for students. Where more substantial feedback is given, Habibie and Van Viegen describe a dialogic style of intervention rather than one where the tutor simply corrects and shuts down any writer–proofreader interaction, the tutor instead encouraging the writer to retain their voice within the text.

In the final contribution to this volume, in Chapter 12, Joan Turner reviews all the chapters and draws out many of the principal themes which I itemised at the start of this Introduction, speaking to "textual, educational, ethical, and affective aspects" of the debate. Turner revisits the debates around the preferred terminology to describe proofreading, highlighting the problematic nature of the term because of the lack of clarity as to the nature of the interventions it includes and excludes. Turner also discusses the (in)appropriate roles of the proofreader, reminding us that different parties may have very different expectations of the proofreader and very different beliefs about the ethicality of different types of interventions. Some students will view the *raison d'être* of proofreading as the means to obtain higher marks, whereas others will prioritise its educative potential; and others still will have both these objectives in mind (see the various student perspectives reported in Conrad, 2019, 2020; Corcoran et al., 2018; Harwood et al., 2012; Kim, 2014). There is a similar lack of consensus about the ethicality and educative benefits of proofreading from the perspectives of writing centre tutors and disciplinary faculty. Another theme surfaced by Turner is that of authorship. In the student writing context, there is often the assumption that the student writer should be the sole author of work for assessment; in which case, where does the role of the proofreader fit in? Sometimes university guidelines assume that lighter-touch syntax and grammar proofreading does not impinge on authorship; but such a view is far from universally accepted, as evidenced by some of Harwood's interviewees, from accounts in the literature (e.g., Corcoran et al., 2018), and as evidenced by some universities' no-proofreading policies. In contrast, in Ren and Hu's chapter, Huang is happy to confer co-authorship status upon his proofreaders, being of the view that without their help his work would have remained unpublished. Finally, Turner problematises the language–content divide. As she points out, metaphors which describe the role of proofreading as "tidying up" a text downplay the "intellectual hard labour" of learning to master the linguistic and rhetorical dimensions, not just the disciplinary content, of academic writing. Such a trivialised notion of proofreading also of course downplays the skill and craft of the proofreader.

And so at the end of this introductory chapter, I leave the reader with a whole host of intellectual and ethical dilemmas foregrounded by the contributors to this volume to contemplate and engage with. Trivialised by some, demonised by others, proofreading will be the source of debate for some time to come.

References

Blau, S., Hall, J., & Sparks, S. (2002). Guilt-free tutoring: Rethinking how we tutor non-native-English-speaking students. *Writing Center Journal*, *23*, 23–44.

Carduner, J. (2007). Teaching proofreading skills as a means of reducing composition errors. *Language Learning Journal*, *35*, 283–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701317655

CIEP [Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading]. (2020). Ensuring editorial excellence: The CIEP code of practice. Available: https://www.ciep.uk/standards/code-of-practice/. (Accessed 8 September 2023).

Clark, I. L., & Healy, D. (2008). Are writing centers ethical? In R. W. Barnett & J. S. Blumner (Eds.), *The Longman guide to writing center theory and practice* (pp. 242–59). Pearson.

Conrad, N. (2019). Revisiting proofreading in higher education: Toward an institutional response to Editors Canada's Guidelines for Ethical Editing of Student Texts. *TESL Canada Journal*, *36*, 172–83. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1309

Conrad, N. L. (2020). Proofreading revisited: Interrogating assumptions about post-secondary student users of proofreading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *46*, 100871. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100871

Corcoran, J., Gagné, A., & McIntosh, M. (2018). A conversation about "editing" plurilingual scholars' thesis writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, *28*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.589

Harwood, N. (2018). What do proofreaders of student writing do to a master's essay? Differing interventions, worrying findings. *Written Communication*, *35*, 474–530. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318786236

Harwood, N. (2019). *'I have to hold myself back from getting into all that'*: investigating ethical issues in the proofreading of student writing. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *17*, 17–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9322-5

Harwood, N. (2023). Lecturer, language tutor, and student perspectives on the ethics of the proofreading of student writing. *Written Communication*, *40*, 651–719. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221146776

Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2009). Proofreading in a UK university: Proofreaders' beliefs, practices, and experiences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*, 166–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.05.002

Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2010). Ethics and integrity in proofreading: Findings from an interview-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, *29*, 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.08.004

Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2012). Cleaner, helper, teacher? The role of proofreaders of student writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, *37*, 569–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.531462

Kim, J. (2014). Better writers or better writing? A qualitative study of Second language writers' experiences in a university writing center. Ohio State University [Unpublished doctoral thesis].

Kruger, H., & Bevan-Dye, A. (2010). Guidelines for the editing of dissertations and theses: A survey of editors' perceptions. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *28*, 153–69. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2010.519110

Kruger, H., & Bevan-Dye, A. (2013). The language editor's role in postgraduate research: A survey of supervisors' perceptions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *27*, 875–99. https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC150422

Li, Y. (2012). "I have no time to find out where the sentences come from; I just rebuild them": A biochemistry professor eliminating novices' textual borrowing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.01.001

Liu, C., & Harwood, N. (2022a). Proofreading in a UK university writing centre: Perspectives and practices. In I. Bruce & B. Bond (Eds.), *English for Academic Purposes in Higher Education: Politics, Policies, and Practices* (pp. 87–108). Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350230484.ch-005

Liu, C., & Harwood, N. (2022b). Understandings of the role of the one-to-one writing tutor in a UK university writing centre: Multiple perspectives. *Written Communication*, *39*, 228–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883211069057

Luo, N., & Hyland, K. (2016). Chinese academics writing for publication: English teachers as text mediators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *33*, 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.005

Moussu, L., & David, N. (2015). Writing centers: Finding a center for ESL writers. In N. W. Evans, N. J. Anderson, & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *ESL readers and writers in higher education: Understanding challenges, providing support* (pp. 49–63). Routledge.

Nicklay, J. (2012). Got guilt? Consultant guilt in the writing center community. *Writing Center Journal*, *32*, 14–27. https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1851

Turner, J. (2011). Rewriting writing in higher education: The contested spaces of proofreading. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*, 42740. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003671786