



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK
university: the perspectives of an L2 student,
proofreader, and lecturers

By

Fiona Mary Richards

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The University of Sheffield
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
School of English

Submission Date: 15th May 2022

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Nigel Harwood whose supervisory support throughout my doctoral journey has been exemplary. His excellent advice has allowed me to considerably develop as a researcher and furnished me with valuable skills necessary for my career in a university environment. I appreciate Doctor Beatriz González-Fernández's support in guiding me through my doctoral development programme and for providing me with useful academic opportunities. Additionally, I would like to thank my Doctor of Education student and her proofreader; their kind participation proved invaluable. Further, I am most grateful to the lecturers and other students involved throughout my project. Finally, I am eternally indebted to my dearest parents for their continuous emotional and financial support.

Abstract

At present, much research has focused on editorial revisions made to English as an Additional Language (EAL) scholars' manuscripts for publication with less attention given to the proofreading changes made to English as a second language student texts. Furthermore, even less research exists regarding the *actual* rather than *reported* interventions that proofreaders make. Additionally, many universities do not have proofreading guidelines and those that do provide little information concerning ethically acceptable forms of assistance. The thesis presents the interventions that a proofreader made to a second language (L2) student's text, and the ethical perspectives of the student, proofreader, and lecturers regarding proofreading practices at a UK university. The study aims to establish ethically appropriate forms of proofreading intervention and develop recommendations for proofreading guidelines that adhere to acceptable forms of assistance. Hence, a textual analysis was used to measure the interventions made to a student's texts, and semi-structured interviews were conducted to determine stakeholder perspectives of the proofreader's changes and awareness of proofreading policies. The findings of the textual analysis revealed that proofreading interventions were made in-text or via comments with the majority falling in the former category. Regarding the types of intervention, the highest number were made in the mechanical alteration category, especially in regard to punctuation and in-text references. Categories that saw noticeably less intervention were those of structural editing, rewriting, and meaning and content. The interviews revealed a general consensus amongst the student, proofreader, and lecturer participants concerning ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of intervention with the lecturers adopting a more conservative stance when opinions did diverge. The thesis concludes with a draft proposal of proofreading guidelines which clearly stipulate ethically appropriate, questionable, and inappropriate forms of intervention that should be made available to all stakeholders in order to uphold high standards of academic integrity.

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	2
<i>Abstract</i>	3
<i>Chapter 1 Introduction</i>	8
1.1 Background to the Study	8
1.2 The Importance of Researching Proofreading Practices in an L2 Student Context	9
1.2.1 Arguments Against the Proofreading of L2 Student Texts.....	9
1.2.2 Arguments For the Proofreading of L2 Student Texts.....	11
1.2.3 The Necessity of More Research Concerning L2 Student Proofreading	12
1.3 Purpose and Aims of the Research	14
1.4 Motivation to Investigate Proofreading Practices	14
1.5 Definition of Key Terminology	15
1.6 Thesis Outline	16
<i>Chapter 2 Literature Review</i>	18
2.1 The Interventions that Third Parties Make to L2 Texts and the Reasons	18
2.1.1 Willey and Tanimoto’s (2012) Study of Editors’ Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts	19
2.1.2 Luo and Hyland’s (2016 and 2017) Studies of Editors’ Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts	23
2.1.3 Flowerdew and Wang’s (2016) Study of Editors’ Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts	28
2.1.4 Rebeck’s (2014) Study of L2 Student Writing Feedback.....	31
2.1.5 Harwood’s (2018 and 2019) Studies of the Proofreading Interventions Made to an L2 Student’s Text	33
2.1.6 Kruger and Bevan-Dye’s (2010 and 2013) Studies of Appropriate Editing Interventions for Student Dissertations and Theses.....	40
2.1.7 Additional Insights into Why Proofreaders Make Interventions	44
2.2 Lecturer and English Language Tutors Beliefs Concerning Proofreading	49
2.3 Student Beliefs Concerning Proofreading	56
2.4 Upholding Ethical Standards through Proofreading Guidelines and Improved Stakeholder Communication	63
2.5 Research Questions	64
<i>Chapter 3 Methodology</i>	67
3.1 A Mixed Methods Study Using Triangulation and a Case Study Approach	67
3.2 Participant Recruitment	70
3.3 Research Instruments and Procedures	72
3.3.1 Textual Analysis Taxonomy Selection and Procedure	73
3.3.2 Student Pre-Interview Task and Procedure.....	79
3.3.3 Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures	84
3.3.3.1 Student Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures	87
3.3.3.2 Proofreader Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures	90
3.3.3.3 Lecturer Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures	94
3.4 Coding and Analysis	98
3.4.1 Coding for the Textual Analysis Taxonomy.....	98
3.4.2 Coding for the Semi-Structured Interviews	100
3.4.2.1 Lecturer Coding System	101

3.4.2.2 Student Coding System	102
3.4.2.3 Proofreader Coding System.....	103
3.4.2.4 Additional Changes	103
3.5 Ethics	104
3.5.1 Ethical Approval	104
3.5.2 Appendices Location of Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms	106
Chapter 4 Results	107
4.1 The Proofreading Interventions Made to the EdD Student’s Text.....	107
4.2 The Ethical Appropriacy of Proofreader Interventions	114
4.2.1 Ethically Acceptable Interventions Made by the Proofreader	115
4.2.1.1 Minor Addition and Advice to Add More Information	115
4.2.1.2 Substitution	116
4.2.1.3 Meaning and Content – Judgemental Text	118
4.2.2 Ethically Questionable Interventions Made by the Proofreader	118
4.2.2.1 Deletion – Removing Non-Content Words in Transcripts and Repetitive Paragraphs	119
4.2.2.2 Reordering	121
4.2.2.3 Structural Editing.....	123
4.2.2.4 Mechanical Alterations – APA Referencing Style	125
4.2.3 Ethically Unacceptable Interventions Made by the Proofreader	126
4.2.3.1 Restructuring – Changing the Order of the Writer’s Research Questions.....	126
4.2.4 Ethically Acceptable Interventions Not Made To The Student’s Text.....	128
4.2.4.1 Recombining.....	128
4.2.5 Ethically Questionable Interventions Not Made To The Student’s Text.....	129
4.2.5.1 Meso and Major Addition.....	129
4.2.5.2 Meaning and Content – Correcting Words Used Incorrectly in Terms of Meaning ..	129
4.2.6 Ethically Unacceptable Interventions Not Made To The Student’s Text	130
4.2.6.1 Rewriting	131
4.2.6.2 Meaning and Content – Writing Additional Material, Rewriting Sections, Deleting Irrelevant Content, and Checking for Plagiarism	132
4.2.7 The Number and Frequency of Interventions	136
4.2.8 Perspectives on Non-Interventions	138
4.3 Proofreading Practices.....	139
4.3.1 Students Consulting a Professional or Non-Professional Proofreader.....	139
4.3.2 In-House and External Proofreading Services	142
4.3.3 The Frequency of Consulting a Proofreader.....	147
4.3.4 Face-to-Face Consultations with a Proofreader	148
4.4 Communication Amongst Stakeholders.....	150
4.5 University Proofreading Guidelines and Stakeholder Advice for the University	153
4.5.1 University Proofreading Guidelines.....	153
4.5.2 Stakeholder Advice for the University.....	156
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	159
5.1 The Proofreading Interventions Made to the EdD Student Text	159
5.2 Ethically Acceptable, Questionable and Unacceptable Forms of Intervention	165
5.2.1 In-Text Changes Versus Comments	172
5.2.2 Perspectives on Non-Intervention.....	174
5.3 Proofreading Practices.....	174
5.3.1 Students Consulting a Professional or Non-Professional Proofreader.....	175

5.3.2 In-House and External Proofreading Services	176
5.3.3 The Frequency of Consulting a Proofreader	177
5.4 Communication Amongst Stakeholders.....	179
5.5 University Proofreading Guidelines and Stakeholder Advice for the University	180
5.5.1 University Proofreading Guidelines.....	180
5.5.2 Stakeholder Advice for the University.....	181
Chapter 6 Conclusion	182
6.1 Draft Proofreading Policy and Guidelines	182
6.2 Using Bretag <i>et al.</i>'s (2011, pp. 5-6) Academic Integrity Principles to Inform Proofreading Guidelines.....	200
6.3 General Enhancement of Proofreading Policies.....	207
6.4 Limitations of the Study.....	208
6.5 Recommendations for Further Research	212
References	215
List of Tables	
Table 1 Total Number of Proofreader Interventions.....	109
Table 2 Specific Types of Proofreader/Editor Intervention.....	161
List of Figures	
Figure 1 Willey and Tanimoto's (2012, p. 259) Editing Strategy Definitions and Examples	20
Figure 2 Luo and Hyland's (2016, p. 55) Minor, Meso, and Major Forms of Intervention.....	24
Figure 3 Harwood's (2018, pp. 517-519) Textual Analysis: Taxonomy of Proofreaders' Interventions	35
Figure 4 Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 167-168) Taxonomy of Editing Tasks.....	41
Figure 5 Textual Analysis Taxonomy	75
Figure 6 Student Pre-Interview Task.....	81
Figure 7 Minor Addition	115
Figure 8 Substitution	117
Figure 9 Deletion – Removing Non-Content Words in Transcripts and Repetitive Paragraphs	119
Figure 10 Reordering.....	121
Figure 11 Structural Editing	123
Figure 12 Mechanical Alterations – APA Referencing Style	125
Figure 13 Restructuring – Changing the Order of the Writer's Research Questions.....	126
Figure 14 Proofreading University Policy and Guidelines Concerning Student Texts For Assessment	183
Appendices	222
Appendix A Quantitative Inter-Rater Reliability Tests and Codebook.....	223
Table 1 Results of the Second Round of Quantitative Coding (10 th September 2021)	223
Table 2 Results of the Third Round of Quantitative Coding (14 th and 16 th September 2021)...	236
Table 3 Quantitative Codebook to Measure Proofreader Interventions (21 st September 2021)	245
Appendix B – Qualitative Coding Results and Participant Codebooks	251
Figure 1 Noteworthy Lecturer Transcript Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Tester and Researcher	251
Figure 2 Noteworthy Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Researcher's First and Second Tests (Student).....	255

Figure 3 Noteworthy Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Researcher’s First and Second Tests and (Proofreader)	258
Table 1 Second Round of Qualitative Coding Results (7 th September 2021).....	261
Table 2 Student, Proofreader, and Lecturer Qualitative Codebooks (7 th October 2021).....	264
Appendix C – Research Ethics Documentation.....	278
Figure 1 Research Ethics Board Approval Letter	278
Figure 2 Student Participant Information Sheet.....	279
Figure 3 Proofreader Participant Information Sheet.....	284
Figure 4 Lecturer Participant Information Sheet	289
Figure 5 Student Consent Form	293
Figure 6 Proofreader Consent Form.....	296
Figure 7 Lecturer Consent Form.....	299
Appendix D – The Total Number of Proofreading Interventions For Each Analysed Text ..	301
Table 1 Literature Review.....	301
Table 2 Findings.....	303
Table 3 Chapter 4.....	305
Table 4 Chapter 5.....	307
Table 5 Chapter 6.....	309
Table 6 Chapter 7.....	311
Table 7 References.....	313
Table 8 Entire Thesis	314
Appendix E – Interview Transcripts	316
Figure 1 Student Interview Transcript	316
Figure 2 Proofreader Interview Transcript.....	341
Figure 3 Lecturer Interview Transcript.....	357

Chapter 1 Introduction

My project assesses the proofreading interventions made to a second language (L2) doctoral student's thesis and the ethical perspectives of said student, her proofreader, and two lecturers regarding proofreading practices at a UK university. The introduction begins by discussing the background of my study in regard to focusing on an L2 student context. I then discuss the importance of investigating L2 student proofreading practices by considering arguments against and for third-party intervention which highlight the necessity of more research concerning L2 student proofreading. Next, I present the purpose and aims of the research as well as my motivation to investigate proofreading practices. I then discuss key terminology and conclude with a brief outline of the thesis.

1.1 Background to the Study

Regarding the background of my study, whilst acknowledging that both native English (L1) and L2 speakers use proofreading services as identified by Conrad (2020, p. 11) in her research concerning assumptions about postsecondary student users of proofreading, I have chosen to focus on an L2 context as such students who attend British universities often approach proofreaders before the submission of written work for assessment (Harwood, 2019, p. 17). With regard to L2 students contacting proofreaders, whilst some use paid-for services, research by Turner (2011) and Conrad (2020) has shown that much proofreading appears to be undertaken within students' social networks and free of charge; for instance, Turner (2011, p. 430) highlighted in her study concerning perspectives on proofreading that it is commonly undertaken in an informal context whereby favours are exchanged for the help provided such as taking a proofreader for a meal or to a concert. Conrad (2020, p. 8) confirms Turner's findings by reporting that only 15% of her total sample of native/near-native and non-native English speaking student participants paid for commercial proofreading services. Indeed, whilst the proofreader in my research was a professional who worked for a company and on a freelance basis, she was also a close friend of my L2 student participant and proofread her thesis without payment. Having provided the background, I will now explain the importance of my research in an L2 student writer context.

1.2 The Importance of Researching Proofreading Practices in an L2 Student Context

Regarding the importance of my study, this will be highlighted by firstly setting the scene regarding arguments against and in favour of proofreading. By highlighting the tension existing around debates concerning the legitimacy of proofreading, I underline the necessity of more research concerning proofreading in an L2 student context and consider the lack of proofreading guidelines as well as ambiguity surrounding the term proofreading.

1.2.1 Arguments Against the Proofreading of L2 Student Texts

From an ethical perspective, much debate exists surrounding the proofreading of L2 student texts and arguments against the practice equate it to cheating. Indeed, Baty (2006) reports that Alan Smithers, the director of the Centre for Education and Employment Research at Buckingham University, criticised Bradford University's proofreading practice of providing students with the contact details of proofreaders. Smithers believes that this is tantamount to "spoon-feeding gone mad" and that having work proofread is dependent on students' ability to afford such services rather than a reflection of academic prowess. Furthermore, Smithers highlights that an award from an English university shows an employer that the holder is a fluent English user when this may not in fact be so if writers are allowed to have their texts revised by proofreaders. In addition, third-party interventions have far-reaching consequences as highlighted by De Oliveira (2020, p. 246) who argues that ethical questions concerning writing support need to be addressed by "professors, research advisors, and writing centre tutors" as a large proportion of students, especially those studying towards a doctorate, later progress to academic roles and are charged with guiding future pupils in their academic writing. Indeed, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010, p. 56) emphasise the danger of breeding writer dependency in that L2 student writers might not be able to reproduce under exam conditions the same level of work submitted with the aid of a proofreader which would also apply to coursework when students may no longer have the financial means available to afford a proofreader for subsequent work. Regardless of the aforementioned, receiving help from a third party also throws into question the apparent unfairness of students who can afford proofreading services and accordingly obtain higher marks as highlighted by Turner (2018, p. 95), McKie (2019) and De Oliveria (2020, pp. 249-250). Such views are supported by

Scurr's (2006) argument that editing student writing hinders the development of writing competency and commercial proofreading services mask rather than confront literacy issues. However, this stance was challenged by Budenz (2007) who complained about Scurr's (2006) apparent lack of consistency as will now be explained. Hence, Scurr (2006) advised that an agency called Proof-Reading-Service.com provides proofreading support with prices ranging from "0.65 pence per word" to "£520 for a PhD" which she believes is concerning for potential employers who expect employees to have "basic literacy and presentation skills." Scurr also notes that prior to the availability of proofreading services catering for student writing needs, students would consult their peers for support and remarked that she had "once proofread a German friend's PhD." Scurr underlined that said friend expressed gratitude with dinner and flowers rather than £520. As such, Budenz (2007) found it questionable that Scurr was seemingly prepared "to tidy up a fellow student's PhD thesis for a token reward" and yet disagreed with students consulting proofreading services by emphasising that not all will have access to an L1 friend who can provide support. Another important ethical concern is highlighted by Harwood (2019, p. 19) in that students can simply accept all interventions made to their text via Microsoft Track changes without paying attention to persistent errors which would be an unethical form of proofreading because the objective is no longer formative but a form of 'quick fix' solution. Such an assertion echoes the views of Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 154) who state that writers can accept tracked changes en masse and without reflection. In addition to uncertainty regarding ethically appropriate levels of interventions and who is best suited to proofread a text, Lines (2016) asserts that due to a lack of regulation of editing practices in Australia, many editors are insufficiently trained and as a result are unable to differentiate between "editing and substantive editing" (p. 375). Lines (2016) further argues that even editors who are qualified and can distinguish between different forms of editing may still be unaware that such forms of intervention are contrary to university procedures (pp. 375-376). In addition, Lines (2016) explains that even if editors are aware that "heavy editing or rewriting" is contrary to university regulations, it is often not sufficient reason to prevent them from undertaking such a task when considering the apparent multitude of economic pressures that they face (p. 376) by which Lines is presumably referring to some editors having to undertake freelance work rather than being employed by a company with a steady income.

1.2.2 Arguments For the Proofreading of L2 Student Texts

Without negating important ethical concerns surrounding proofreading, arguments in favour highlight the benefits of third-party intervention. To begin with, McNally and Kooyman (2017, p. A148) argue that as a university education is now far more accessible than in previous years, imposing an outright ban on proofreading seems to be reflective of an archaic school of thought where a certain level of academic writing literacy was to be expected. Furthermore, the authors note that if universities are to progress to accommodate L2 students from diverse cultural backgrounds with varying writing needs, a more flexible approach should be adopted rather than expecting learners to succeed solely by their own efforts. In this vein, Haggis (2006) advises that higher educational establishments should view the situation from an alternative perspective by questioning areas of the curriculum which prevent students' progress rather than assuming learners from diverse backgrounds are already equipped with the skills required to complete traditional forms of assessment. Indeed, Shaw (2014) reports that Louise Harnby, a professional proofreader since 2005, states that many L2 students are not provided with adequate services at their universities to support language needs; importantly, Harnby also stresses that international students do not set out to cheat but instead make the most of the language skills at their disposal. Regarding the apparent lack of support from universities concerning L2 students' language needs, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2012, p. 575) advise that proofreaders can help for instance by adopting a "leveller" role in which they compensate for deficiencies within higher education; such a concept is seemingly supported by Colin Neville, an Effective Learning Officer at Bradford's School of Management, who posits that providing L2 students with a list of proofreaders levels the playing field between home and international students in an environment which Neville believes favours the former (Baty, 2006). Furthermore, some would argue that proofreading is to be expected as can be seen from the following reader comment posted underneath Shaw's (2014) online Guardian article concerning international students turning to proofreading agencies; the Guardian reader asked, "who in their right mind would submit an essay/assignment etc, without having it proofread in some capacity?" The reader then asserted that:

International students, who arguably need proofreading the most, are least likely to have access to a native speaker within their own “community of practice” and are therefore at a significant disadvantage. That is why they turn to professional proofreaders as any sensible person would.

Having explained salient issues surrounding third-party intervention, the following subsection underscores the necessity of more research concerning L2 student proofreading practices, thus further highlighting the importance of my study.

1.2.3 The Necessity of More Research Concerning L2 Student Proofreading

Additional to the aforementioned arguments, my research is especially important when considering that the editing of English as an Additional Language (EAL) scholars’ writing for international publication has received much attention (see Burrough-Boenisch, 2003; Willey and Tanimoto, 2015; Flowerdew and Wang, 2016; Luo and Hyland, 2017; Kim, 2019) whereas Harwood (2018, p. 477) reports that studies concerning the proofreading of L2 student texts for assessment are far fewer and accordingly warrants further investigation to ascertain student, proofreader, and lecturer perspectives regarding ethically appropriate forms of third-party intervention. By determining each stakeholder’s interpretation of ethical issues surrounding proofreading, such findings can be used to inform and improve current proofreading policies and guidelines within universities to uphold academic standards. Indeed, at present, many British universities do not have proofreading guidelines and those that do provide little information regarding what is and is not ethically appropriate in terms of proofreading intervention (Harwood, 2018, p. 477). Furthermore, such guidelines are not widely disseminated and many stakeholders are unclear as to ethically sound proofreading practices (Harwood, 2019, p. 39). This is especially pertinent when considering that the media regularly reports issues associated with plagiarism, cheating, on-demand essay services, and internet-based proofreading assistance (McNally and Kooyman 2017, p. A149). The very fact that proofreading is grouped with such unethically sound practices and receives widespread attention is clear evidence that further research is needed to ensure that such an important issue within academia is not simply ignored or left to the students to manage.

Furthermore, additional research is particularly important when considering that the term ‘proofreading’ is rather ambiguous and does not have the same meaning amongst students, proofreaders/editors and lecturers. For instance, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, p. 168) mention that:

Proofreading in the traditional sense of the word (“a final run-through” before submission, “changing a misspelling here or putting in a punctuation mark there”) is not a true representation of the type of interventions being made.

Indeed, the interventions that proofreaders make can range from very light mechanical alterations through to meso and even major substantial changes at the level of argumentation and content which may or may not be classified as proofreading and will be included in my investigation. The various types of interventions that I investigate will be presented in-depth in my literature review and methodology chapters. However, the following gives a brief overview of said forms of intervention which I importantly wish to acknowledge have been based on taxonomies devised by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), Cottier (2017), and Harwood (2018). Hence, interventions of a minor nature include mechanical changes to areas such as punctuation, spelling, numbering, and capitalisation, and when the proofreader adds or deletes five words or fewer of a writer’s text. Similarly, minor changes are applied to the substitution of a word of a writer’s text with another. Meso level changes are more substantial than minor interventions and include a proofreader adding, deleting, or rewriting six to nine words of a text. Further, meso changes also encompass the proofreader rewriting sentences which are six to nine words in length. Finally, interventions of a major nature include rewriting ten or more words of a student’s text and making changes that affect the meaning and content of a writer’s argument. Having presented the reasons why the proofreading of L2 student texts for assessment warrants further research, the following will discuss the purpose and aims of my project.

1.3 Purpose and Aims of the Research

Given the need to further investigate ethical perspectives regarding the proofreading of L2 student texts, my research involves a textual analysis of the type and number of interventions that a proofreader made to a Doctor of Education (EdD) student's texts; doctoral level has been chosen due to the lengthy nature of theses for which proofreading help is often sought and sometimes promoted by higher educational establishments (Kruger and Bevan-Dye, 2010, p. 153; Kim and LaBianca, 2018, p. 40). Following the textual analysis, an EdD student Sarah (all informants' names are pseudonyms), her proofreader (Jane), and two senior lecturers (Michael and Emily) were asked to discuss at interview the ethical appropriacy of the different types of intervention extracted from the textual analysis. The results of the textual analysis and interviews will be used for the purpose of raising university awareness concerning acceptable forms of proofreading practice to support international student writers whilst upholding high standards of academic integrity. In order to raise awareness, support students, and uphold academic integrity, I provide a draft proofreading policy that incorporates my findings and academic integrity principles devised by Bretag *et al.* (2011) in section 6.1 of the conclusion. My policy could also be useful to areas beyond academia that include editing agencies because some students turn to such services to have work proofread as highlighted by Turner (2011).

1.4 Motivation to Investigate Proofreading Practices

My interest and motivation in researching proofreading practices stems from my teaching experience to date. Having taught English for Academic Purposes (EAP) to international students for several years, I am acutely aware of the struggles that learners face when writing in another language. Indeed, from first-hand experience of advising students to proofread certain parts of their writing, I have seen just how difficult a task this is. Students advised me in all sincerity that even though they had tried to self-correct and asked classmates to help, it was still very challenging to locate errors. By my indicating the types of common errors to search for such as articles and 3rd person singular or plural forms, the students were at least able to focus on particular areas of language rather than the whole text resulting in a more effective location of mistakes. However, this was only the tip of the iceberg as many students needed guidance with areas of sentence and paragraph structure which clearly required much more intervention.

Furthermore, many of the students had been used to more traditional approaches whereby the teacher simply corrected all mistakes and students spent little time reflecting upon error correction. As such, not enough attention was given to feedback and the same errors would inevitably reoccur in following writing tasks. In addition to difficulties L2 students encounter when proofreading, I have seen from my own experience of proofreading the challenges that second language speakers face. For instance, during my doctoral study, I had the opportunity to supervise an L1 foundation level student who was required to complete a project as part of his course. When proofreading the L1 student's work, the difference between his written work and that of the EAP students became quickly apparent. Indeed, I was immediately able to focus on the content and structure of the L1 student's arguments rather than grammatical and mechanical issues which frequently occurred in my EAP students' work; this experience further strengthened my desire to help international students improve their academic writing skills to ensure that the wealth of knowledge that such learners bring to academia is clearly and succinctly communicated. Therefore, given my teaching background and experience, I am extremely interested and motivated in determining how investigations into proofreading practices can support international students with their academic writing whilst adhering to ethically appropriate forms of third-party help.

1.5 Definition of Key Terminology

The terms proofreader/proofreading and editor/editing will be used interchangeably throughout the thesis. The use of the aforementioned terms will depend upon that which an author or organisation employ. However, my definition of any interventions made to a student text follow that of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, p. 167) who define proofreading as:

Types of help (whether voluntary or paid) that entail some level of written alteration to a “work in progress” (i.e. work that will contribute towards an undergraduate or postgraduate degree, or which may be published).

The all-encompassing nature of this definition has been selected as editing agencies tend to use narrower definitions. For instance, the Institute of Professional Editors Limited (IPEd) (IPEd, 2013, ix) states:

The goal of editors, regardless of their role or type of publication, is to ensure that the material is consistent and correct, and that its content, language, style and layout suit its purpose and meet the needs of its audience.

As can be seen from such a definition, IPEd emphasise the goal of editors *regardless of their precise role*. However, with specific regard to the role of proofreading, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, p. 167) argue that, “*proofreading* may be used differently by individuals to describe a range of interventions which are not necessarily limited to interventions at the level of grammar, syntax, and morphology.”

1.6 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

The literature review begins by discussing the revisions that editors/proofreaders make to L2 texts and the reasons. Next, I present lecturer/English language tutor and student beliefs concerning proofreading practices. Having highlighted stakeholder views concerning proofreading, the subsequent section emphasises the need for widely disseminated university proofreading guidelines. The chapter concludes by detailing the research questions that have evolved from my review.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

The chapter commences by presenting my research methodology that was based on a mixed methods approach which incorporated triangulation and followed a single-case study design. Following this, I discuss my participants and then explain the choice of research instruments. Next, I present the coding and analysis processes used to analyse my data and conclude the chapter by discussing how ethical approval for the project was secured.

Chapter 4 – Results

This chapter presents the results of my textual analysis that measured the (non-) interventions which the proofreader made to the EdD student’s writing drafts, and the semi-structured interviews conducted

with my student, her proofreader, and two senior lecturers to determine their perspectives regarding ethically appropriate forms of proofreading.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

My results are analysed in the discussion chapter and focus on key findings concerning: 1) the proofreading interventions made to the student text; 2) ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention; 3) proofreading practices; 4) communication amongst stakeholders; and 5) university proofreading guidelines and stakeholder advice to my home institution.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion

The final part of my thesis proposes a draft proofreading policy based on stakeholder views of ethically appropriate forms of proofreading intervention and academic integrity principles devised by Bretag *et al.* (2011). I then consider the general improvement of proofreading policies to encourage ethically appropriate proofreading practices in order to uphold academic integrity. To conclude the thesis, I detail the limitations of my research and outline areas for further research.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

I begin the literature review by presenting revisions that third parties make to L2 texts and detail the reasons for their interventions. Following this, I discuss proofreading practices from a lecturer and student perspective. From presenting differing proofreader, lecturer, and student views, I emphasise the need for universities to ensure that all stakeholders have access to proofreading guidelines. The chapter concludes with the research questions that have evolved from my review.

2.1 The Interventions that Third Parties Make to L2 Texts and the Reasons

Before commencing this section, I wish to advise the reader of its organisation. Hence, subsections 2.1.1 to 2.1.3 present research by Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), and Flowerdew and Wang (2016) respectively. Although said authors focused on editors' revisions made to EAL scholarly texts for publication, the studies provide the reader with an understanding of the type of revisions third parties make to L2 texts and the reasons. Furthermore, taxonomies employed by Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) influenced the design of my own framework that measured the proofreading interventions made to an L2 student's doctoral thesis which will be discussed in section 3.3.1 of the methodology. Flowerdew and Wang's (2016) study has also been chosen as it had similar editorial revision categories to those used by Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) which provides further understanding of the interventions that third parties make to L2 texts and the reasons. Subsection 2.1.4 presents research conducted by Rebuck (2014) which Harwood (2018, p. 479) importantly highlights was the first to analyse what *proofreaders* do to L2 *student* texts for assessment and provides useful insights into third party decisions when revising a text. Next, in subsection 2.1.5, I discuss research undertaken by Harwood (2018 and 2019) which built upon Rebuck's (2014) study by reporting the proofreading interventions made to an L2 student's text for assessment as well as the reasons. Importantly, Harwood (2018) used a systematic revision framework developed from taxonomies employed by Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) which was further adapted for the purposes of my research. Leading on from Harwood's (2018) research, subsection 2.1.6 presents studies undertaken by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010 and 2013) who investigated editor and supervisor perspectives concerning the role of an

editor when editing student dissertations or theses which is in keeping with the context of my research as I analysed the interventions made to an EdD student's thesis. Furthermore, elements of the taxonomy employed by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) were incorporated into my own framework and will be discussed in the methodology. For the reader's information, Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010 and 2013) studies are presented last due to the fact that their taxonomy differs considerably to those used by Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), Flowerdew and Wang (2016), and Harwood (2018 and 2019). By presenting the aforementioned authors' research, I will also be able to provide comparisons with my own findings in the discussion chapter. Finally, subsection 2.1.7 presents additional insights into the reasons why proofreaders make certain interventions by drawing on the research of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, 2010, and 2012) and Alhojailan (2019). The aforementioned studies are reported at the end of this section as unlike many of the authors above, they focused on *reported* rather than *actual* proofreader interventions and did not use a systematic framework. However, the studies offer very useful additional insights into why proofreaders make certain interventions and provide detailed descriptions of third-party beliefs and practices.

2.1.1 Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) Study of Editors' Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts

Regarding Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) study, the authors investigated strategies editors utilised when editing a Japanese EAL medical researcher's abstract for publication. The participants were native English speakers and formed four distinct groups of ten members each. The groups were split as follows: 1) a *novice* set of English teachers employed at universities in Japan who did not have any experience of editing texts of a healthcare nature; 2) a *control* group neither employed as English language teachers nor involved in healthcare; 3) a *health* group comprised of predominantly doctors and nurses who had no association with English language teaching; and 4) an *experienced* set of English teachers based in Japanese universities with experience editing texts concerning healthcare (p. 251). To analyse the editorial revisions, Willey and Tanimoto began by looking at the revisions which an English teacher had made to five drafts of the EAL medical researcher's text. Having identified the revisions, they devised a framework that incorporated a cognitive process used by Flower *et al.* (1986); Flower *et al.*'s (1986, p. 24) model of cognitive processes gives four options which a writer can undertake when

reviewing a text that include revising, rewriting, delaying action concerning a problematic part of the text, or ignoring a problem. Following this, Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 251) conducted an inter-rater reliability test and the resulting framework is displayed below (Figure 1) in which it can be seen that interventions were divided into seven forms of editorial revision, namely addition (insertion of words, phrases, or sentences), deletion (subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences), substitution (replacement of words or phrases), reordering (repositioning of words, phrases, or sentences), rewriting (transformation of sentences at lexical and grammatical level), recombining (combining of one or more sentences, or division of one sentence into two or more sentences), and mechanical alteration (formatting or cosmetic changes not affecting meaning; e.g., spelling, font, indenting). In addition, Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 250) also reported consultation points which were instances whereby an editor would “take the strategic route of consultation with the author to make a revision.”

Figure 1 Willey and Tanimoto’s (2012, p. 259) Editing Strategy Definitions and Examples

Editing strategy	Definition and example from participants' revisions (participants' ID numbers indicated in italics)
1. Addition	Insertion of words, phrases, or sentences Ex: Hemodynamic changes in the breast → Hemodynamic changes <i>in cutaneous blood flow</i> in the breast (H5)
2. Deletion	Subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences Ex: aged between 8 and 23 weeks old → aged between 8 and 23 weeks (N4)
3. Substitution	Replacement of words or phrases (not whole sentences) Ex: increased compared with → increased compared <i>to</i> (N1)
4. Reordering	Repositioning of words, phrases, or sentences Oxy-hemoglobin in both breasts decreased significantly → Oxy-hemoglobin <i>decreased significantly</i> in both breasts (H1)
5. Rewriting	Transformation of sentences at lexical and grammatical level; specific revision strategies cannot be identified, except those judged to be distinct from the rewriting (e.g., spelling correction, deleted article) Ex. The hemodynamic responses to lactation of the breast and the prefrontal cortex in breastfeeding mothers didn't synchronize.→ No correlation was found between the hemodynamic responses to lactation in the breast and prefrontal cortex in breastfeeding mothers. (N1)
6. Recombining	Combining of one or more sentences, or division of one sentence into two or more sentences Ex. The changes in... were measured in 3 study patterns: in the both breasts, the ipsilateral breast and forehead, the contralateral breast and forehead. → The changes in... were measured. Three study patterns were used: in the both breasts, the ipsilateral breast and forehead, the contralateral breast and forehead. (H3)
7. Mechanical alteration	Formatting or cosmetic changes (not affecting meaning; e.g., spelling, font, indenting) Ex. Oxy-hemoglobin → Oxyhemoglobin (E9)

Willey and Tanimoto’s (2012, p. 252) results revealed that the experienced group undertook the greatest number of overall revisions (313) followed by the novices (277). Next was that of the health group (269) and the control made the least number of revisions (238). In addition, the findings revealed that all four groups relied most heavily on editing strategies of substitution at 350 in total (83 novice, 84

control, 94 health, and 89 experienced), addition at 345 (102 novice, 89 control, 58 health, and 96 experienced), and deletion at 252 (64 novice, 48 control, 62 health, and 78 experienced). Interestingly, consultation points were mainly made by the novice group (36); in contrast, the control group made less than half the number of consultation point editing strategies as the novice set (16) and the experienced and health groups only made 10 and 6 respectively. As such, the authors emphasised that the novice group were aware of the need to consult the writer regarding healthcare topics and texts which they had no prior experience of editing. Other categories saw significantly less intervention with reordering at 52 in total (7 novice, 4 control, 21 health, and 20 experienced) and mechanical alteration at 42 (6 novice, 6 control, 13 health, and 17 experienced). Categories of rewriting and recombining saw the least amount of editing strategies with each displaying totals of 28; rewriting saw 9 for the novice group, 3 for the control, 9 for the health, and 7 for the experienced, and recombining had figures of 6 for the novice group, 4 for the control, 12 for the health, and 6 for the experienced (p. 252).

From their findings, Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 257) deduced that editing strategies were similar amongst the four types of participant group as rather than using more substantial forms of revision such as rewriting or recombining, editors preferred to use interventions of substitution, addition, and deletion. Willey and Tanimoto highlighted that the only area in which a noteworthy difference occurred amongst the groups concerned that of reordering as the health and experienced participants made far more interventions in this area than the control group; the authors explain this was most likely due to the former two groups being more accustomed to reviewing texts of a medical nature. Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 257) also remarked that novices added “the” much more to the writer’s text than health participants; however, the authors then referred to a health participant who clearly stated that definite articles are not widely used in medical texts which would imply that the writer had not necessarily used them incorrectly.

Regarding the reasons why editors make interventions, Willey and Tanimoto (2012, pp. 255-257) conducted a post-task written reflection to determine editors’ perspectives regarding their editing experiences. Although the findings were based on experiences rather than specific interventions made

to the medical abstract, their results revealed interesting trends from the reflections of the novice, health, and experienced groups. Hence, in theory the novice group generally had a positive experience of editing but at times it could be challenging when detracting from their main teaching/researching responsibilities. Furthermore, throughout the editing process, certain members of the novice group appreciated author involvement when editing as it seemingly alleviates the pressure of editing requests which presumably means that it helps the editors with their decision making when deciding what parts to edit. The health group generally found the editing process of the EAL scholar's abstract to be more enjoyable than the novices which Willey and Tanimoto attributed to the former group having less experience editing L2 texts. Furthermore, unlike the novice group, the health group commented that they did not feel the need to have the author's involvement during the editing process. In addition, when more information was required, the health group stated that they could refer to the main body of the scholar's manuscript. Interestingly, the health care group often commented on the quality of language and highlighted issues of a grammatical nature which differed to the other three groups who tended to focus on particular words. Reasons for intervening in areas of language concerned: 1) the need to make writing clear by appropriate use of prepositions; 2) having the verb and subject in close proximity so that it is easier for a reader to determine the purpose of a sentence as well as the function of a modifying phrase; 3) the order of a subject plus predicate was often reversed; and 4) there was an excessive use of 'the' by the authors which as noted above is not always necessary in medical texts. In addition to language issues, the health group also commented on having to intervene when ideas are not clearly expressed. Concerning the experienced group, they differed from the novice and health participants by focusing more on the organisation of the abstract and its rhetorical features. In particular, one of the group members observed that although the text was generally well written, further information was necessary in regard to sections concerning the objective and conclusion whilst acknowledging that the author would have been confined by word count restrictions. Another participant in the experienced group remarked that the author had not given sufficient information concerning the literature and the methodology required further detail. Finally, regarding the experienced group's experience of editing, their accounts were similar to those of the novice group as they had varying responses with some finding it enjoyable and others highlighting the demanding nature of reviewing an L2 text. Additionally, the

experienced group appreciated author involvement in the editing process which led Willey and Tanimoto to highlight the fact that this group was not engaged in the medical profession even if they did have experience of editing health-care texts. From presenting the findings of Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) research, it can be observed that the editors' profiles in terms of their disciplinary background (some were English teachers whereas others had no English language teaching experience) and familiarity of editing texts of a medical nature seems to impact upon the nature of their editing and underlying reasoning. In addition, the types of intervention that tended to be made by the four groups were deemed by Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 257) to be more straightforward forms of revision namely addition, deletion, and substitution. In contrast, Willey and Tanimoto (2012, p. 257) observed that more substantial types of change i.e., recombining and rewriting were made to a lesser extent by each group. The only category which saw a difference was that of reordering as the health and experienced groups made more changes in this area than control participants which the researchers deduced was due to the former two cohorts familiarity with manuscripts of a medical nature (p. 257). Leading on from these interesting findings, the next authors' studies which I present are those of Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) who used a taxonomy developed from that of Willey and Tanimoto (2012).

2.1.2 Luo and Hyland's (2016 and 2017) Studies of Editors' Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts

Luo and Hyland (2016) investigated forms of collaboration and the challenges encountered between teachers of English and scientist authors within Chinese universities in which a total of eight local teachers and four authors participated in the study. Luo and Hyland held semi-structured interviews with the eight English teachers where questions sought to determine the nature of manuscripts that the group edited as well as their editing practices (see page 54 Appendix A of Luo and Hyland's 2016 study). The author group also had interviews using a similar set of questions to those of the teacher participants. In addition, Luo and Hyland collected text data which included drafts, published articles, and author-editor correspondence, and in order to measure textual interventions, they referred to and adapted Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) taxonomy. Luo and Hyland's (2016) resulting taxonomy is displayed in Figure 2 below and shows that the researchers devised categories of minor, meso, and major changes with familiar definitions of addition, deletion, substitution, reordering, and rewriting.

Luo and Hyland's (2016) definitions differed to Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) in the following areas:

1) sentence combination and sentence splitting were treated as two separate entities rather than having a recombining category; 2) there was no mechanical alteration category; 3) an additional category of reorganization of subsections and sections was included; and 4) "a scale of revisions" at minor (below clause level), meso (between clause and sentence) and major (above the sentence) editing levels was included (p. 47).

Figure 2 Luo and Hyland's (2016, p. 55) Minor, Meso, and Major Forms of Intervention

Change scales	Definitions and examples from participants' revisions
Minor changes	<p>Addition, deletion, substitution and reordering of grammatical markers, words, and phrases</p> <p>Example: When the coiling temperature <u>rose</u> (<i>minor addition</i>) to 700 °C, the microstructure are still <u>remains</u> to be (<i>minor substitution</i>) ferrite-pearlite, as shown in Figure 4 <u>as shown in Fig. 4.</u> (<i>minor reordering</i>) [T5]</p>
Meso changes	<p>Addition, deletion, rewriting and reordering of clauses and sentences combination and splitting of sentences.</p> <p>Example: Atherosclerosis plaque...is closely related to the activation of PPARγ, which it is known that PPARγ and RXR form a heterodimer that promotes facilitates (<i>meso rewriting</i>) the expression of <u>multiple transporters, including ABCA1, ABCG1, SR-B1, CD36, apoE, and LXR.</u> Furthermore, the activation of PPARγ is essential for the regulation of macrophage function in atherosclerosis plaque formation. (<i>meso deletion</i>) [T3]</p>
Major changes	<p>Addition, deletion, rewriting and reordering of more than two continuous sentences, reorganization of subsections and sections.</p> <p>Example: Because the area of the grounding grid is usually large, the power of the current sources injected into the grounding grid would be much larger. Since it is difficult to manufacture such a large current source of varying frequencies, two current sources are injected into the grounding grid. If the frequency is too low... (<i>major deletion</i>) [T1]</p>

To determine the interventions which the teacher participants made and the reasons, I will focus on Luo and Hyland's third research question concerning the effectiveness of third-party interventions. To begin with, Luo and Hyland (2016, pp. 48-50) discuss how T3 (a teacher participant) was initially disheartened when faced with negative reviewer comments on the language of A1's (an author participant) graduate students' texts which she had edited. However, A1 provided encouragement and assurance that they were nearer to their goal of publication as T3's editorial interventions had enabled them to surpass the screening and review stages. Such positive reinforcement led T3 to work more carefully with texts either on her own or with the author's support and all of A1's graduate students had their work published in high quality journals after additional revisions and editing. T3's experience working with A1 developed the former's confidence to the extent where she was comfortable making substantial forms of mediation which included structural revisions to content presentation. This confidence extended to making extensive revisions to another author participant's (A2) manuscript for publication in which the main paragraphs were rewritten and many interventions were at meso and major levels. Indeed, Luo and Hyland (2016, p. 49) provide an example of such changes which show that: 1) the first sentence had been reshuffled from the third paragraph; 2) the second sentence was added; 3) the third sentence was reshuffled and revised; 4) the fourth sentence had text deleted and added; and 5) the fifth sentence was reshuffled forward. Luo and Hyland explained that T3 made changes to the first sentence based on her awareness of move structures within A2's discussion section as well as additional text knowledge. However, T3 faced much disagreement from A2 in making the change. The second sentence was inserted based on T3's advice and A2 agreed after a lengthy discussion that the intervention positively transformed their argument; this resulted in A2 accepting all of T3's revisions, ensuring that ideas were clearly expressed which ultimately led to the paper being published.

Another teacher participant (T1) also made extensive forms of revision to an article that was approved for publication which involved areas of content. Luo and Hyland (2016) discussed the changes made to the abstract of said article which were as follows: 1) the first two sentences were completely rewritten; 2) the second sentence had words deleted and added or relocated; 3) the third sentence had very minor

changes as one word was pluralised; 4) the fourth and fifth sentences were combined; and 6) the sixth sentence was rewritten (p. 49). Luo and Hyland explained that T1 made minor and meso level interventions whereby the former were made when working alone and the latter were undertaken when conferring with the author which included text deletion and reconstruction. Luo and Hyland's findings led them to observe that successful negotiations between an author and editor ensure that important information is communicated effectively and that third-party intervention extends much further than issues of language and moves into areas of content.

Following on from the above research, Luo and Hyland (2017) conducted another study into editorial revisions and although specific reasons why editors made certain interventions were not provided, it importantly discussed the changes that were made to an L2 text and accordingly offers further valuable insights as will now be presented. Luo and Hyland's (2017) study concerned three editors' revisions of a manuscript for publication by Amy, a Chinese EAL doctoral student. Amy was in the final stages of her doctoral degree at a hospital connected to a Chinese university where students are required to publish in SCI-indexed journals in order to graduate. Amy's paper had been rejected by two journals with a third advising her to revise and resubmit. As such, Amy employed the services of a "professional text mediator" as she struggled to address the third journal reviewer's comments and did not have sufficient support from her supervisor who had little experience with international publications. After receiving help from three text mediators, Amy's paper was finally published (pp. 419-421). I now discuss the three text mediators and Amy's reasons for procuring such an individual's editing services. The first (M1) was named the "discipline specialist" by Luo and Hyland and was an experienced L1 English speaking "specialist mediator" employed full time at a language editing company located in Europe who worked on texts of a scientific nature and had published numerous journal articles. Amy chose M1 as the latter worked for an editing company which a friend had recommended (p. 423). Next, the second editor (M2) named the "field specialist" by Luo and Hyland was also an experienced "specialist mediator" who was of Chinese heritage and had a scientific and medical background. M2 operated as a freelance editor who similarly to M1 had also published numerous journal articles, and peer reviewed for international journals. Amy chose M2 due to their similar background which she

thought would help with content issues (p. 425). Finally, the third editor (M3) who Luo and Hyland called the “language specialist” had a background in English and Law with experience in teaching English and accordingly differed considerably to participants M1 and M2. In addition, M3 had experience as a “text mediator” and had edited approximately 30 texts primarily of a medical nature for workmates. Further, M3’s experience of acting as a text mediator paved the way for her to become a PhD student in which her thesis focused on textual mediations made to Chinese EAL scholars’ writing for publication in international spheres. Amy selected M3 from having had prior communications and face-to-face meetings with her (p. 428).

Luo and Hyland’s (2017) textual analysis focused on Amy’s discussion section which was 1,520 words in length with nine paragraphs of 59 sentences (p. 423). In order to conduct the analysis, Luo and Hyland (2017) used Willey and Tanimoto’s (2012) taxonomy with the added categories of minor, meso, and major level changes that were detailed in Luo and Hyland’s (2016) research above. Furthermore, Luo and Hyland (2017) made additional revisions to their taxonomy as they stated that “a major revision is one of ten words or more, a meso is one between six and nine words, and a minor one fewer than five words” (p. 422). Finally, the authors relabelled mechanical alteration as mechanical fixing. From Luo and Hyland’s (2017) findings, the authors deduced that the first editor made the majority of interventions in areas of language accuracy and appropriacy which is evident in that M1 made the highest number of changes in the mechanical fixing and deletion categories. Furthermore, the category which saw the third highest number of interventions was substitution with a total of 25 amendments in which 23 were minor and two meso. In contrast, the other two editors focused more on the organisation and progression of ideas which ultimately enabled Amy to publish her paper. Another observation concerns the rapport between an author and editor. To this end, M1 had to leave many comments on Amy’s text due to the fact that her company prevented direct contact with a client (p. 424), and M2 was not interested in having a close author-editor rapport with Amy as he did not feel the need to consult her on particular issues (p. 426). Contrastingly to M1, M3 was able to communicate with Amy via social media and face-to-face. Furthermore, based on M3’s previous experience, her editing approach differed to that of M2 as she believed in working alongside an author to combine their skills of knowledge in

the subject area and language expertise (p. 428). These findings led Luo and Hyland (2017, pp. 433-434) to stress the importance of author-editor interactions by pointing out that Amy was not always certain of M1's interventions due to the fact that direct contact was prohibited and M2's lack of interaction caused him to misunderstand Amy's intentions on certain occasions. Differently to M1 and M2, M3 had close contact with Amy; by having such close communication, M3 was able to expand upon Amy's subject knowledge as opposed to only focusing on the manuscripts' content which is the type of author-editor rapport that Luo and Hyland endorse. From Luo and Hyland's (2017) findings, parallels can be drawn with their earlier 2016 research mentioned above in that a positive author-editor rapport can allow for the successful negotiation of communicating ideas, and interventions were made not only to language but also text organisation as well as the expression of ideas. In addition, Luo and Hyland's (2016 and 2017) studies can be compared to that of Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) as an editor's knowledge and disciplinary background seemingly affect the types of editing interventions which are made. Furthermore, the opportunity to consult with the author appears to be of importance not only for novices such as those in Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) study but also seasoned editors such as M1 and M2 in Luo and Hyland's (2017) research. Finally, both Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) observed that some changes were more substantial in nature such as recombining, rewriting, text organisation, and the expression of ideas. Having presented the research of Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), the next study concerns that of Flowerdew and Wang (2016) whose investigations into editorial revisions made to EAL scholarly texts produced comparable editing categories such as addition, deletion, and substitution.

2.1.3 Flowerdew and Wang's (2016) Study of Editors' Revisions to EAL Scholarly Texts

Flowerdew and Wang's (2016) investigation into the revisions made to EAL scholarly manuscripts for publication was conducted with the co-author of their paper (Wang), identified as an "author's editor" (p. 41). Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 41) report that said author's editor had experience of working as an English language tutor at an important Chinese research university which expects its science and engineering students and academic staff to publish research papers in international journals. In addition to teaching, the author's editor had extensive experience of editing doctoral manuscripts for university

students and had received acknowledgment in more than 60 research papers published in high quality journals. However, the author's editor did not have extensive formal training in the field of applied linguistics and undertook his editorial revisions by drawing upon experience and knowledge of the English language as well as relying on the student writers' awareness of their discipline.

In order to undertake their analysis of the interventions that the author's editor made, Flowerdew and Wang (2016) devised a taxonomy adapted from Faigley and Witte (1981, p. 403) who examined the revisions which writers made to their texts at different stages of the drafting and writing process. In addition, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 43) formed a small corpus of 15 specialised research article texts that the author's editor previously edited and contained papers which were initially rejected as well as those that were later published. The authors of said 15 research articles had been asked by publishers to revise issues concerning content and language. As such, the authors would revise issues concerning content and then send it to the author editor for further revision; however, Flowerdew and Wang report that additional changes still needed to be made at content level. Flowerdew and Wang then engaged the services of an undergraduate research assistant who had the task of extracting each sentence from the earlier drafts as well as from the published texts. In doing so, the resulting corpus contained combined revisions of the authors and author's editor which allowed Flowerdew and Wang to track each type of intervention made when ensuring a text was suitable for publication. Importantly, whilst interventions were determined at sentence level, Flowerdew and Wang advised that some changes extended to discourse issues. Furthermore, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 44) acknowledged that although their taxonomy may interest other researchers, the authors' framework evolved from the effort of a sole researcher and could be particular to their study in which data was primarily coded depending on how and where interventions were undertaken.

The results of Flowerdew and Wang's (2016) data analysis identified five specific types of intervention involved in the editing process which are substitution, correction, addition, deletion, and rearrangement. In addition, each of the five categories was further divided into scales of rank at morpheme, word, group, and clause/clause complex levels (see Table 2 on page 44 of Flowerdew and Wang's 2016

research for an overview). Importantly, the authors highlight that of each form of revision, only correction does not affect meaning as it is applicable to surface-level errors. However, the four remaining categories reflect substantial changes to a text and require negotiation between the EAL scholar and editor (p. 39). Regarding the results of each type of revision, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, pp. 44-45) observed that the greatest number of interventions were undertaken in the substitution category (39.4%) and another high area was that of correction (29.3%). Categories which saw far fewer revisions were those of addition (15.5%) and deletion (12.1%), and the final category of rearrangement saw very little intervention (3.7%).

Concerning the reasons why editors made interventions, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 45) reported that the substitution category differed to that of correction (primarily concerned with grammatical accuracy) as the former is frequently undertaken to change meaning. For instance, substitutions were made when issues of discourse arose at clause level such as the replacement of “we may refer that” with “it is concluded that” which resulted in the author expressing themselves with greater assertion (p. 46). In regard to correction, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 46) made reference to Harwood, Austin and Macaulay’s (2009) research in which they distinguished proofreading and editing revisions whereby the former concerns more superficial “surface level” changes whereas the latter refers to issues of ideas and clearly expressing oneself. In this vein, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 46) noted that 30% of their correction interventions were those of a proofreading nature whereas the others required greater editorial involvement concerning issues of meaning. Regarding addition, Flowerdew and Wang (2016, p. 46) observed that changes were made in one particular example for the author to refer to the direction of future studies, and in other instances to address issues of cohesion and coherence that arose both within and across sentences. Concerning deletion, changes were made to remove superfluous information or to reduce wordy texts. In addition, deletion was also used to remove unnecessary words when the reader would be able to understand the meaning of an utterance from its context (pp. 47-48). Flowerdew and Wang (2016) also observed that changes concerning addition and deletion were far more involved than those of a surface level nature (p. 48). For the final category of rearrangement, Flowerdew and Wang (2016) importantly observed that even though changes did not affect meaning,

they were fairly important in regard to improving the overall quality of texts and ensuring that conventions of the English language were adhered to (p. 48). Flowerdew and Wang's (2016, p. 49) study led them to highlight the importance of author-editor negotiations when revising a text which is in accordance with the views of Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017). In addition, similarly to Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2017), Flowerdew and Wang (2016) also observed that some changes were of a more substantial nature and affected meaning.

Having drawn upon the research of Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), and Flowerdew and Wang (2016), the following two subsections expand upon their studies by focusing squarely on the proofreading of student texts for assessment. The first study I present was undertaken by Rebuck (2014) and whilst he did not use a framework as sophisticated as that of the previously mentioned researchers, Harwood (2018, p. 479) advises that the study importantly investigated the interventions proofreaders make and provides a suitable basis which further studies can build upon. Indeed, following Rebuck's research, I then discuss Harwood's (2018) study concerning the interventions proofreaders made to a master's student text that draws upon the previously mentioned taxonomies devised by Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017).

2.1.4 Rebuck's (2014) Study of L2 Student Writing Feedback

Rebuck's (2014) study sought to determine what form of feedback L2 students deem to be the most valuable which was undertaken in his capacity as an English teacher tasked with checking students' English language for academic papers at Nagoya University's Graduate School of International Development. As part of Rebuck's research involved an analysis of the interventions that proofreaders make to a student text, I will focus on that specific element for the purposes of my own research. To begin with, the participants involved were fifteen L2 graduate students in International Development Studies, and eleven L1 and L2 proofreaders who were employed based on an informal interview as well as a trial proofread. Proofreaders brought a range of English academic writing experience which included producing bachelor's and master's texts, journal articles, and book chapters. Two of the proofreaders had no prior proofreading experience whereas other participants had some knowledge in

this area ranging from proofreading for friends and coursemates to editing university newspapers. Further, the proofreaders were not given any specific proofreading training but were provided with a document that gave a general description of what the job entailed. The participants proofread a short section of approximately 300 words from the introduction of the students' texts and were advised to proofread the same way they normally proofread a master's dissertation. Finally, the participants were not provided with any details regarding the study to avoid overzealous proofreading or any form of correction that deviated from their standard practice.

The findings of Rebeck's (2014) study revealed that proofreaders made the following type of interventions: i) articles were corrected "very carefully" by one of the participants (GB) (p. 7) although another (ZC) did not provide feedback on such issues (p. 12), ii) proofreaders made comments such as "*Do you mean...?*" (this was viewed favourably by the students who appreciated the proofreader taking the time to determine what the writer wanted to express and provided options) (p. 7); iii) sentences were adjusted to reflect what the writer wished to express as one student commented that the proofreader "changed sentences to what I want to say exactly" (this feedback was also viewed positively as such proofreader interventions corresponded to the meaning which the student wished to convey) (p. 7); iv) individual words were changed and clarity was improved through the addition of punctuation marks (p. 9); v) register was adapted to make the writing more academic (p. 9); vi) question marks and underlining were used to highlight problematic parts of the text (p. 10); vii) mistakes were made when the proofreader was not familiar with the disciplinary context as "wage costs" was changed to "wages" and thus the writer's meaning was erroneously modified (p.10); viii) some errors were left unaltered as one of the proofreaders stated that in a text riddled with mistakes, certain ones were overlooked when the overall meaning could still be understood (p. 11); ix) alarmingly, errors were introduced by the proofreaders such as changing the possessive "its" to the contracted form "it's" (p. 11); and x) students were asked to rewrite sentences but the proofreaders did not specify what exactly needed to be changed (p. 11). Overall, the number of interventions ranged from only four corrections by one proofreader, which were all incorrect, to sixty comments or corrections by another.

Although Rebeck (2014) did not provide specific reasons why changes were made as the study focused on students' reactions to written feedback, two useful insights were offered into proofreaders' thought process when making interventions as follows: 1) one of the proofreaders (GB) adopted a seemingly negative attitude when proofreading an extensive text that was consistently unclear or riddled with errors, leading to over-zealous corrections in unnecessary areas such as a footnote which contained a quote from a reputable source (pp. 8-9); and 2) two of the proofreaders (KA and SA) alerted students to problems when the text was unclear but were not specific enough. Rebeck deduced that KA and SA's lack of proofreading expertise led them to believe that an L2 student could simply correct the problem themselves (p. 12). Even though Rebeck's (2014) study was very different to that of Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), and Flowerdew and Wang (2016) in that a systematic framework was not used, a parallel can still be drawn as changes were made in areas that went beyond language and concerned meaning to ensure the clear expression of ideas. Having discussed Rebeck's research, I now turn to that of Harwood (2018 and 2019) which sought to further probe what interventions proofreaders make and the reasons.

2.1.5 Harwood's (2018 and 2019) Studies of the Proofreading Interventions Made to an L2 Student's Text

Harwood's (2018) research analysed the interventions that proofreaders made to a master's level student text. The research involved 14 university proofreaders who were given the same text written by an L2 applied linguistics graduate student with a bare pass grade of 50. As Harwood used a single authentic text, it allowed for an accurate and complete picture of the types of interventions that proofreaders make and allowed him to compare the interventions of different proofreaders. Furthermore, as Harwood was very familiar with the source text to which the L2 graduate student referred, he was able to determine whether the changes made by the proofreader aligned with the writer's intended message. In order to analyse the proofreading interventions made to the student's text, Harwood devised a taxonomy (see Figure 3 below) based on that of Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Luo and Hyland (2016). For Harwood's (2018, pp. 517-519) taxonomy, the types of interventions that were made to the student's text were separated into familiar categories of addition (insertion of words, phrases, or sentences),

deletion (subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences), substitution (which for greater accuracy was defined as the replacement of 1 to 5 consecutive words *or* the replacement of the writer's text by 1 to 5 new consecutive words by the proofreader), reordering (repositioning of words, phrases, or sentences), rewriting (which for greater accuracy was defined as the replacement of 6 or more consecutive words in the writer's text *or* the replacement of the writer's text by 6 or more new consecutive words by the proofreader), recombining (combining of one or more sentences, or division of one sentence into two or more sentences), mechanical alteration (changes to punctuation, spelling, and formatting), and consultation/teaching points (places where a proofreader: 1) addresses questions, comments, or suggestions to the writer of the text, all of which may be rhetorical and have formative or pedagogic intentions; 2) expresses genuine puzzlement or uncertainty and asks for clarification; and 3) uses less overt forms of intervention such as underlining, highlighting, using question marks and/or symbols to emphasise problematic areas of the text). Regarding consultation/teaching points, Harwood (2018, p. 485) explained that this was a renamed version of Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) consultation point category which refers to instances where an editor needs to check the writer's message. Harwood (2018) chose to relabel the category as whilst the proofreaders in his study did seek clarity, he also found that they made comments of a pedagogic and formative nature insofar as specifying how a text could be improved with suggestions such as adding a page number to quotes or giving advice regarding the development of an argument (p. 485). In addition, Harwood (2018, p. 484) also states that "Luo and Hyland's grouping of proofreading alterations into minor changes (proofreaders changing 5 words or fewer), meso changes (6-10 words), and major changes (more than 10 words) was adopted for a finer level of precision." Finally, Harwood (2018) advised that minor changes were applicable to the categories of addition, deletion, and substitution, and meso and major changes concerned addition, deletion, and rewriting; the reader will note that Harwood's (2018, pp. 517-519) taxonomy displayed in Figure 3 below displays his revised numbering for each minor, meso, and major descriptor.

Figure 3 Harwood's (2018, pp. 517-519) Textual Analysis: Taxonomy of Proofreaders' Interventions

ADDITION

Insertion of words, phrases, or sentences.

Examples

Original:	<i>in second language</i>
Proofread text:	<i>in a second language</i>
Original:	<i>opinions of the effort</i>
Proofread text:	<i>opinions of the amount of effort</i>

DELETION

Subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences

Examples

Original:	<i>received the equal results</i>
Proofread text:	<i>received equal results</i>
Original:	<i>53 new students were acted as participants</i>
Proofread text:	<i>53 new students acted as participants</i>

SUBSTITUTION

Replacement of 1-5 consecutive words OR the replacement of the writer's text by 1-5 new consecutive words by the proofreader. Includes changes to verb tense (*design* → *designed*), number errors, such as replacement of nouns erroneously thought by the writer to be countable with the correct uncountable equivalent (*feedbacks* → *feedback*), and agreement (*both group received* → *both groups received*).

REORDERING

Repositioning of words, phrases, or sentences.

Examples

Original:	<i>then teacher would give</i>
Proofread text:	<i>teacher would then give</i>
Original:	<i>no tutorial combined</i>
Proofread text:	<i>no combined tutorial</i>

REWRITING

Replacement of 6 or more consecutive words in the writer's text OR the replacement of the writer's text by 6 or more new consecutive words by the proofreader.

Examples

Original:	<i>It is easily to see that</i>
Proofread text:	<i>As we might expect</i>
	[= replacement of 6 consecutive words of writer's original text]
Original:	<i>a positive effect on students' rewrite</i>
Proofread text:	<i>a positive effect on the quality of the revised piece</i>

[= replacement of writer's original text by 6 consecutive words by proofreader]

RECOMBINING

Combining of one or more sentences, or division of one sentence into two or more sentences.

Examples

Original: *equal results, that is to say*
Proofread text: *equal results. Thus,*

MECHANICAL ALTERATION

Changes to punctuation, spelling, and formatting (e.g., paragraphing, font, indenting, ampersand in a citation changed to “and,” comma after a journal title in the reference list changed to colon).

CONSULTATION/TEACHING POINT

Places where proofreaders address questions, comments, or suggestions to the writer of the text. These questions, comments, or suggestions may be rhetorical and have formative/pedagogic intentions:

Examples

*Should this reference be Truscott & Hsu [rather than Truscott]?
These quotation marks are in different fonts. Support your view with more arguments.
Perhaps could go as an opening sentence.
Don't say "opinion" as this sounds informal and unscientific.*

Alternatively, the comments may express genuine puzzlement or uncertainty, as the proofreader seeks further information to enable them to properly proofread the text and/or the proofreader believes the writer needs to transmit their intended message more effectively:

Examples

*What are you trying to say?
What are the "linguistic forms"??
Could you explain this further?
This is a bit confusing.*

Alternatively, the interventions may be less explicit, consisting merely of underlining, highlighting, question marks, symbols (“^” indicating missing words), etc., which point to problematic parts of the text.

Also classified as Consultation/Teaching Points are places where proofreaders give writers alternatives from which to choose (e.g., *conducted/designed*) as the writer has to decide which, if any, of the possibilities put forward is appropriate, and therefore a degree of proofreader-writer consultation is present.

Minor = Revisions of 5 words or fewer (applicable to the categories of Addition, Deletion, Substitution)

Meso = Revisions of 5-9 words (applicable to the categories of Addition, Deletion, Rewriting)

Major = Revisions of 10+ words applicable to the categories of Addition, Deletion, Rewriting)

Harwood's (2018) findings revealed that the majority of changes were of a minor level for all 14 proofreaders. However, there was noticeable variation as Moira only made 19 interventions whereas Jackie undertook 341. Nevertheless, said figures were exceptional as the second lowest number was 97 and the majority were between the 164 to 194 mark. Regarding the vast difference between Moira and Jackie's minor forms of intervention, the former predominantly intervened by making teaching/consultation points, 84 in total. This figure of 84 was particularly noteworthy as the next

highest was 45 (Fiona) and no comments were left by Jackie. Regarding meso and major level interventions, there was a certain amount of variation amongst the proofreaders but far less than that of the minor changes. Indeed, the maximum number of meso interventions was 15 with all others being 7 or below, and major level changes were very low with just four proofreaders making one change only and the other ten not making any such adjustments.

Regarding the total number of complete text changes (in-text and consultation/teaching points), Jackie made 472 whereas Moira only made 113. Harwood (2018, p. 497) explains this difference in proofreading approaches as Jackie stated that she aims to ensure work is “something that reads more clearly and is hopefully as error free as possible.” However, Moira adopts another approach by following an “indirect technique of correction symbols” (p. 505) which she learnt on her Master’s in a Teaching English as a Foreign Language course. Harwood (2018) further explains that Fiona, Sheila, and Eleanor also made a high number of interventions at 428, 407, and 363 respectively. In contrast, Bernard, like Moira, made far fewer changes (161). Similarly to Moira, Bernard highlighted the formative nature of proofreading as he wanted interventions to have an educative effect which spoke to his background in teaching. The remaining proofreaders in the study (Sally, Norman, Linda, Andy, Ana, Adrian, Helena, and Martha) made a similar number of complete text changes ranging from 242 (Martha) to 283 (Sally and Norman).

When considering specific forms of proofreading intervention, Harwood’s (2018) results show that the largest number were made in the categories of substitution (1415), mechanical alteration (844), and addition (783). Noticeably fewer changes were made in areas of deletion (379) and reordering at (152), and categories of recombining and rewriting saw even less intervention with figures as low as 76 and 36 respectively. Regarding the specific interventions that each proofreader undertook, Harwood (2018, p. 492) explained that those who made the greatest number of changes in total also undertook the highest number of interventions in a particular category.

Concerning the reasons why proofreaders made certain interventions, Harwood (2018) reports Ana's comment in that if a student was unclear as to an article or essay question, clarity could be provided when the proofreader shares the same discipline. Furthermore, the proofreader could offer support by organising the writer's ideas in an appropriate order. Ana's proofreading ethos contrasted significantly with Helena who emphasised that she does not view herself as a "professional proofreader" because she believes it is unethical to simply do the work for the writer and produce a perfect text; instead, Helena prefers to advise a writer that the text is unclear and asks leading questions such as, "Did you mean this?" (p. 498). In addition, as discussed above, Jackie made changes to ensure that a text was clear and free of errors whereas Moira used an indirect approach learnt on her master's course which was similar to Bernard's formative method of proofreading. Further insights into why proofreaders make certain interventions will be discussed below as revealed in Harwood's (2019) subsequent paper that focused on the ethics of proofreading specifically which helped explain the wide discrepancies in the degree of interventions his proofreaders made.

Harwood (2019, pp. 27-29) confirmed Helena's seemingly formative nature of asking questions as mentioned above in that she aims to help students develop as writers. Indeed, Helena asserted that it would be irresponsible to return a perfect text in which a high mark was later awarded as students would be unable to learn their limitations and work on such issues. Instead, Helena stressed that students should dedicate time to independent learning rather than having a proofreader provide the answers. In this vein, Helena explained that if she did not understand a particular phrase, she would read the source text to clarify meaning. However, rather than advising the student, Helena would determine from the student's subsequent draft whether the message had been accurately conveyed through her process of questioning. In doing so, Helena felt she avoided ethically questionable proofreading practices by amending a student's text based on her interpretation of the source and that writers are accordingly responsible for their own work. In addition, Helena refuses to intervene in areas of referencing and emphasised the importance of consistency by explaining that it is obvious when a writer has simply copied references if all their references do not adhere to the same style guide. Harwood (2019) highlighted that whilst Helena may send the student links regarding a particular referencing system, she

would stop short of actually proofreading the references and accordingly help develop the writer's academic literacy skills. In a similar vein, Sally also emphasised the importance of students taking responsibility and rather than correcting in-text citations, she would advise a writer to consult their department's referencing style guide. Additional reasons for proofreading interventions were provided by Bernard in that he corrects depending on a student's level and year of study. For instance, Bernard would intervene more with a master's level text than that of a first-year student's work. As such, Bernard would highlight but not correct a first-year's student's text to ensure that an accurate depiction is given of a writer's ability to both the student and marker (pp. 29-30). Sheila also stated that she would highlight a problematic part of the text that concerned the writer's argument to avoid interfering with issues of author's voice. However, Sheila did actually provide a rewrite of the problematic part of text in which she noted two question marks at the start of her reworked version. Sheila explained that by having question marks and highlighting, she alerted the student to problematic parts of the text in which the student is responsible for making changes which echoes the views of Helena and Sally. Indeed, Sheila also addressed the ethical aspect of intervening extensively in a student's text by emphasising that the writer needs to decide whether a text should appear as a proofreader suggests and ultimately it should be work the student has produced (pp. 30-31). Similarly to Sheila, Eleanor highlighted the danger of a proofreader appropriating a student's text and stressed that rather than rewriting, it would be better to leave a text in the writer's own words as long as the meaning is clear. In addition, Eleanor observed that she would not intervene in structural editing areas or improve a student's argument or content. Indeed, Eleanor would avoid suggesting ideas to students studying within a discipline she was familiar with as it could interfere with content (p. 31).

As can be seen from the above discussion, Harwood (2019) clearly underscored that ethical concerns were at the forefront of proofreaders' minds and some also acknowledged the ethical dilemmas they face when being asked to proofread very poor quality texts. In such instances, Fiona recognised areas in which she had intervened substantially in the text and explained that by proofreading such work, she was condoning the university's decision to admit students whose work was not of a suitable level (pp. 33-34). With further regard to proofreaders' decisions to make ethically appropriate forms of

proofreading intervention, Sally stressed her uncertainty regarding the distinction between appropriate and inappropriate forms of help. As such, Sally questioned whether it is part of her remit to simply attend to language issues or whether she can become involved with areas of structure and argument (pp. 33-34). Regarding issues of argument, Ana intervened extensively in this area and explained that she would do so when the text was unclear. Furthermore, Ana stated that it would be acceptable to offer advice concerning content if the proofreader belonged to the same discipline as the student (p. 36). Even Sheila, who advocates a less interventionist approach as noted above, still made comments concerning content by highlighting the text in question and advising the student to review it (pp. 36-37). Finally, Moira also made interventions in areas of content by explaining that she asks writers to provide the source text and their summary to check that the student had understood the context and avoided plagiarism (p. 38).

The findings of Harwood's (2018 and 2019) research led him to deduce that proofreading practices vary considerably and rather extensively as was evidenced in the research undertaken by Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017), Flowerdew and Wang (2016), and Rebeck (2014). To resolve this issue of variable proofreading practices, Harwood (2019) suggested having widely disseminated proofreading guidelines as well as in-house proofreader training (p. 39) which are areas that I explore in my results and discussion chapters. The final studies which I examine for this section are those of Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010 and 2013) who analysed appropriate editorial interventions when editing student dissertations and theses.

2.1.6 Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010 and 2013) Studies of Appropriate Editing Interventions for Student Dissertations and Theses

To conduct their research concerning editors' perceptions of the role of an editor when editing a dissertation or thesis, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) contacted a number of experienced editors to formulate an inventory of editing tasks to determine those which were part of an editor's remit. The inventory of editing tasks was based on Mossop's (2007) taxonomy of editing tasks (Mossop, 2007, cited in Kruger and Bevan-Dye, 2010). Seven editors replied to the request and respondents were asked

to add or remove tasks from the inventory that were considered/not considered to be part of an editor's remit. The replies received were incorporated into an updated second inventory that was again emailed to participants. Upon receiving the results of the second inventory, the researchers accordingly made adjustments and subsequently sent out a third inventory which was finally agreed upon by all participants. This taxonomy was comprised of several tasks, 30 of which were copyediting, 12 stylistic editing, 7 structural editing, and 14 content editing (see Figure 4 below).

Figure 4 Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 167-168) Taxonomy of Editing Tasks

Copyediting tasks		Stylistic editing tasks	
T1	Correcting incorrect spelling	T32	Removing/correcting ambiguities
T2	Correcting incorrect punctuation usage	T33	Improving vague formulations
T3	Correcting incorrect sentence structure	T34	Removing redundancies
T4	Correcting incorrect word structure	T35	Tailoring vocabulary so that it is suitable for the readership
T5	Correcting words that have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning	T36	Tailoring sentence structure so that it is suitable for the readership
T6	Correcting abbreviations and acronyms that have been used incorrectly	T37	Tailoring register so that it is suited to the text type
T7	Correcting to ensure that text conforms to generally accepted usage in the particular field	T38	Tailoring register so that it is suited to the readership
T8	Correcting to ensure that subject-specific terminology has been used in a consistent way	T39	Correcting to ensure that style and register are consistent throughout the text
T9	Correcting to ensure consistency in terms of spelling, punctuation, typography, etc.	T40	Making sentences more concise
T10	Correcting to ensure that text conforms to the higher-education institution's house style or style rules	T41	Making text smooth and readable (cohesive and coherent) by, for example, changing or adding logical connectors to link sentences, paragraphs and sections
T11	Correlating parts: correcting incorrect cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, and the table of contents	T42	Rewriting sections of text to improve style
T12	Correcting headings to ensure consistency in numbering and style	T43	Inserting comments (electronically or handwritten) to alert the author to significant and prevalent stylistic problems without correcting the problems
T13	Correcting referencing style for in-text references		Structural editing tasks
T14	Correcting to ensure that all references in the text appear in the bibliography, and that all sources in the bibliography are referenced in the text	T45	Reordering sentences to ensure that the argument is logically structured
T15	Correcting bibliography in accordance with the prescribed style	T46	Reordering paragraphs to ensure that the argument is logically structured
T16	Correcting, where necessary, bibliographical information for accuracy	T47	Reordering sections or larger units to ensure that the argument is logically structured
T17	Correcting to ensure consistency in terms of layout	T48	Inserting or changing paragraph breaks in order to create a more logical structure
T18	Correcting, where necessary, text of front matter and end matter	T49	Inserting/creating textual 'guideposts' to help the reader orientate him-/herself in the text
T19	Correcting, where necessary, layout of front matter and end matter, if working with a print-ready document	T50	Changing the presentation of text to formats that help the reader orientate him-/herself in the text
T20	Correcting to ensure that page numbers are correct and consecutive, if working with a print-ready document	T51	Inserting comments (electronically or handwritten) to alert the author to significant and prevalent structural problems without correcting the problems
T21	Correcting to ensure that heading numbering is correct and consecutive		Content editing tasks
T22	Making suggestions/changes pertaining to font type and font size, if working with a print-ready document	T53	Checking accuracy of facts and making corrections if necessary
T23	Making suggestions/changes pertaining to line spacing/leading, if working with a print-ready document	T54	Checking accuracy, content and relevance of illustrations, diagrams, charts and tables, and making corrections if necessary
T24	Correcting running heads, where applicable	T55	Checking accuracy of mathematical/statistical operations and making corrections if necessary
T25	Correcting to ensure that there are no widows/orphans if working with a print-ready document	T56	Checking accuracy of dates and making corrections if necessary
T26	Doing hard-copy mark-up of a document to indicate formatting and layout for the typesetter or author	T57	Checking accuracy and spelling of names and places, including the names of institutions, organisations, associations and companies, and making corrections if necessary
T27	Doing electronic mark-up of a document to indicate formatting and layout for the typesetter or author	T58	Checking, and where necessary correcting, accuracy of quotations
T28	Doing document layout and design	T59	Correcting to ensure consistency of content
T29	Checking, and where necessary correcting, final documents (in whatever form) in terms of layout to ensure that they are ready for print	T60	Writing additional or supplementary material if necessary
T30	Inserting comments (electronically or handwritten) to alert the author of the dissertation/thesis to significant and prevalent copyediting problems without correcting the problems	T61	Rewriting sections to improve content
		T62	Deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content
		T63	Checking for plagiarism and alerting the author
		T64	Checking for possible libel (defamatory statements) and alerting the author
		T65	Checking for bias and parochialism
		T66	Inserting electronic comments (or another form of note) to alert the author to significant and prevalent content without correcting the problems

From the authors' inventory above, the reader will note that copyediting is concerned with correcting surface errors and ensures presentation consistency whereas stylistic, structural, and content editing are more comprehensive in nature as areas of readability, organisation and checking content are covered.

Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) took the above inventory and incorporated it into a questionnaire which was emailed to the 37 participants. The findings showed a consensus amongst the 37 editors regarding copyediting and stylistic tasks in that such interventions were believed to be appropriate when editing dissertations and theses, whereas changes made in terms of structural and content editing were not viewed as favourably. However, there were disagreements amongst the editors as to the appropriacy of some interventions. For instance, editors agreed that it was their responsibility to verify that a correct style had been adhered to regarding in-text citations and the bibliography but there was disagreement concerning changes to the bibliography in terms of accuracy as well as verifying that in-text citations also appeared in the bibliography and vice versa. Furthermore, higher standard deviations, indicating differences of opinion amongst the proofreaders were found concerning stylistic changes with reference to rewriting parts of the text to improve the style, reordering sentences and paragraphs to present a more logically structured argument, and inserting or changing paragraph breaks to ensure a more logical structure. Finally, noticeable differences occurred regarding content editing tasks; as such, a greater standard deviation was displayed when respondents evaluated the appropriacy of editors checking for plagiarism, checking for possible libel, and deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content.

Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) subsequent research used the same instrument as their 2010 study because it also investigated the role of an editor when editing dissertations and theses but from the perspective of a supervisor. Although subsections 2.1.1 to 2.1.5 have focused on the interventions that *editors/proofreaders* made and the reasons, I have chosen to include Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) supervisor findings concerning their perception of an editor's role in this part of the literature review due to the fact that the researchers employed the same research instrument and there is accordingly much crossover between the 2010 and 2013 studies in which useful comparisons can be made. Regarding Kruger and Bevan-Dye's 2013 study, a number of supervisors at South African universities were contacted and 121 completed questionnaires were returned. The findings of the research showed that both supervisors and editors held similar views as to the inappropriateness of content and structural interventions. However, supervisors and editors differed in their opinions regarding the *amount* of intervention that could be made to content and layout in which supervisors were of the opinion that an

editor should be more involved in such areas than the editors. Further differences occurred in terms of copyediting and stylistic changes with the supervisors being more cautious than editors in these areas. As with Kruger and Bevan-Dye's 2010 study, differences still occurred amongst each group in their 2013 research and such discrepancies appeared in similar areas. Indeed, in regard to copyediting tasks, the authors found a higher standard deviation amongst both editors and supervisors regarding the appropriateness of the editor ensuring that the bibliography adhered to the correct style and that in-text citations and the bibliography were accurately cross-referenced. Regarding stylistic changes, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2013) noted that the highest level of standard deviation occurred with reference to different areas amongst both groups. Indeed, the editors showed greater difference of opinion regarding rewriting parts of the text whereas for the supervisors, differences of opinion occurred in ensuring that sentences were more concise. However, both groups displayed similar high standard deviations for structural areas of reordering sentences and paragraphs to ensure a more logically structured argument.

Although the editors and supervisors were not interviewed to discuss the reasons why certain editing tasks were or were not appropriate, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010 and 2013) were able to arrive at some interesting conclusions from the findings. Focusing firstly on the editors, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 162) observed that they appeared to primarily cover areas of language correction, textual errors, and issues of consistency. In contrast, certain tasks were deemed to be skills which students need to master or part of a supervisor's remit; such tasks concern areas of layout, formatting, correlating parts of the text, verifying that a university's house style is adhered to, and checking the referencing and bibliography. Similarly, Kruger and Bevan-Dye noted that the editors were cautious with regard to changes of a stylistic and structural nature as it would be more appropriate to question rather than correct such issues. Turning to their subsequent study, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2013) noted that both the supervisors and editors displayed high standard deviations in regard to copyediting tasks concerning the bibliography. Kruger and Bevan-Dye explained that the reason for such differences of opinion amongst both supervisors and editors could be that certain participants are of the view that referencing is an important part of academic discourse which postgraduate students should be able to do. In addition, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2013, p. 892) observed that significant differences occurred between the

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of an L2 student, proofreader, and lecturers supervisors and editors in areas of “correcting incorrect spelling”, “rewriting sections of text to improve style”, “checking accuracy of mathematical/statistical operation and making corrections if necessary”, and “checking accuracy of dates and making corrections if necessary”. This led Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2013, p. 892) to deduce that supervisors believe students should be able to demonstrate skills in fundamental areas of writing and text presentation which contrasts with editors who regard linguistic, grammatical, and in certain instances, stylistic changes to be an essential part of editing. From their research, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2013, pp. 896-897) importantly concluded that even though the supervisors’ views were in accordance with much higher education institutional policy, it could be time to challenge seemingly conventional opinions that editors should have a highly restricted role, especially when considering the amount of support students need. This is based on the fact that the number of editing tasks which were deemed appropriate by both editors and supervisors were limited to the simplest forms of copyediting. Nevertheless, whilst editing tasks are restricted, from the above account, it can be seen that differences occur between editing practices amongst editors as highlighted by Harwood (2018 and 2019) in subsection 2.1.5. Furthermore, supervisors also have varying interpretations of the role of a third party and this will be explored more in section 2.2 concerning lecturer/English language teacher perspectives.

Having discussed a number of studies regarding the interventions that proofreaders/editors make to manuscripts and texts for assessment as well as the reasons, the following subsection probes deeper into why third parties make certain changes by discussing research undertaken by Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, 2010, and 2012) and Alhojailan (2019).

2.1.7 Additional Insights into Why Proofreaders Make Interventions

Regarding Harwood, Austin and Macaulay’s 2009, 2010, and 2012 studies, their interview-based research involved 16 proofreaders who were asked questions concerning their proofreading beliefs, practices, and experiences. To provide a background to the three studies, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, pp. 172-175) reported that their proofreaders were all educated to degree level with the majority possessing a postgraduate qualification. Proofreaders held various roles in academia

(lecturers, EAP language teachers, graduate teaching assistants, postdoctoral researchers, and student support services) and only Anne and Eve had received professional proofreading/editing training. The majority of participants were native English speakers except for Chloe and Bill. Regarding their proofreading status, the 16 participants fell into the following three categories: 1) professionals who undertook proofreading as their principal job (or one of their main vocations) but did not necessarily have a qualification; 2) part-time or temporary freelance proofreaders who proofread periodically for reasons such as having an additional income to fund studies; and 3) volunteers who were affiliated with Rowena Macaulay's university's resource centre in which such proofreaders wished to extend the support they had received as early career academics to other students. Regarding the texts that the proofreaders had previously proofread, the majority were those of L2 speakers and belonged to categories of undergraduate and postgraduate work as well as CVs, covering letters, and research grants. With further regard to the texts, some proofreaders were content to read those of an unfamiliar discipline whereas others did not feel comfortable proofreading work in areas where they had no prior knowledge.

Regarding the first study, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, pp. 179-180) discuss that whilst their proofreaders believed grammatical and spelling corrections were acceptable but accuracy and content level changes were not, a noticeable lack of agreement occurred regarding the delineation between language and content forms of intervention. As such, some of the proofreaders stated that interventions in the form of argument and structure were inappropriate whereas another proofreader, Eve, did not take any issue with commenting on such matters. Indeed, Eve believed that her lack of expertise in a specific subject area allowed her to make comments on arguments presented within the text and stated that close acquaintances of a student (e.g., family, friends) who may act as proofreaders might also make similar adjustments. Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009) report that ethical concerns as to when to intervene were also raised. For instance, Gill expressed uncertainty when realising that a student has not addressed an essay question and acknowledged that she may need to intervene whilst being conscious of the fact that such action could be beyond the role of proofreader. In such cases, Gill would appreciate institutional proofreading guidelines and the possibility of speaking to a student's lecturer to check concerns. Similarly, Anne also expressed her dismay at the lack of guidance and she

also refers a student to their supervisor when in doubt as to whether intervention is ethically appropriate. This view was supported by Tom who stated that referring a student to their supervisor removes any ethical question marks as to whether intervention is appropriate (pp. 179-180).

Turning to Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2010) research, this study differentiated between in-text corrections and comments. As such, Sheila prefers to make in-text corrections to areas of grammar, syntax, spelling, and style but leave comments for more contentious issues of essays consisting mainly of quotes where the author's voice is not evident. This view was shared by Tom who also leaves questions when realising that additional information needs to be inserted as it is the responsibility of the student. Furthermore, Chloe clearly distinguished between corrections and comments in that she claimed the former would be considered proofreading whereas the latter could be deemed "proofwriting" (p. 60). Other instances in which proofreaders gave reasons for non-interventions concerned plagiarised texts; for instance, Eve explained that even though she had alerted a student completing a dissertation to possibly plagiarised text, her comments were ignored and the text remained in its original format. Therefore, Eve refused to edit parts of the dissertation that were clearly not cited and advised the student of suitable summary techniques. However, the student in question was unable to effectively summarise and ceased communication with Eve (p. 60).

With further regard to the interventions that proofreaders make, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2012) research identified five different roles of the proofreader that were helper, cleaner, leveller, mediator and/or teacher in which proofreaders had different interpretations for some of the descriptors. Regarding the roles attracting consensus, the helper was seen as providing support and reassurance. The proofreaders were also in agreement as to the role of a leveller in stating that they assisted students in meeting university standards and put L2 speakers on a level playing field with that of the L1 cohort. As such, markers would assess the work of both cohorts in terms of content rather than being distracted by L2 writers' faulty grammar. As a mediator, all participants agreed that their role was to conciliate the student with the supervisor either literally or via the text, but the finer details of this role showed slight differences. For instance, one of the proofreaders viewed herself as an intermediary whereby she offered

to accompany the student to speak to the supervisor when problems arose. However, another proofreader saw himself in a more “symbiotic” or “joint process” relationship in which significant changes would only be highlighted but not changed with the purpose of encouraging the student to discuss such issues with the supervisor (p. 576). Significant differences in opinion occurred when viewing the proofreader as a cleaner and a teacher. As a cleaner, some proofreaders believed that their role was to “polish” the text and correct errors, whereas others were more sensitive to the negative impact this may have on students once they become aware of the number of errors they had made and accordingly corrected more judiciously (i.e., selectively rather than comprehensively) (p. 575). In the capacity of a teacher, some of the proofreaders believed that they advanced a student’s academic writing skills and ensured writer autonomy through the use of comments. However, other proofreaders in the study had very different views and expressed that their role was to simply remove errors rather than provide some form of instruction. Furthermore, they also claimed that as students often hand proofreaders their work very close to deadlines, there is little time for students to refer to and reflect upon amendments (pp. 576-577).

Finally, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay’s (2012, pp. 578-579) research revealed interesting findings concerning the reasons why proofreaders use either direct or indirect forms of correction. Regarding indirect forms, Emma stated that for an L1 writer, she may initially correct an error but only highlight a reoccurrence. However, Emma advised that such a technique could be rather difficult for L2 students and in such cases, she would use direct correction insofar as providing the answer. Similarly, Karen and Jerry prefer direct correction with the former emphasising that to provide indirect feedback on areas of spelling through simple underlining techniques would mean that she is not doing the job that a student has paid her to undertake. Even though Jerry noted the benefits of indirect correction based on his experience as an English language tutor, he preferred to use a direct approach and cited reasons of students expecting forms of intervention that involve less time and effort to resolve.

As with Harwood, Austin and Macaulay’s previously mentioned studies, Alhojailan (2019) also sought to investigate proofreaders’ beliefs, practices, and experiences as well as other proofreading issues. As

such, Alhojailan conducted his research at an American University through semi-structured interviews. Certain questions were written by Alhojailan such as one which sought to determine how proofreaders evaluate their success when proofreading, and others were taken from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2009) research which included any doubts proofreaders may have concerning the help they provide. The participants in Alhojailan's (2019, p. 172) research were two doctoral students in the Department of English at the university in question. Said participants work part-time as proofreaders and provide proofreading services for native and L2 speakers of English; one of the proofreaders was a native English speaker (NES) and the other was a non-native English speaker (NNES). Both proofreaders are English graduates and graduate teaching assistants with teaching backgrounds, experienced in different academic writing styles. The results of Alhojailan's (2019, pp. 174-175) study revealed that both proofreaders would be prepared to make additional copy-editing changes including correcting spelling and words as long as it did not interfere with the meaning. Presentation changes would also be made in regard to page number, chapter titles, and page layout but not the contents page. Regarding proofreading interventions, the NES adopted a direct approach by asking students which part of their work they wanted specific help with and would clarify with the student if seemingly factual information was deemed to be incorrect. Conversely, the NNES made it clear that his role did not consist of changing content or rewriting a student's work and limited himself to underlining incorrect phrases as well as drawing students' attention to grammatical errors. In order to avoid ethical issues, both proofreaders advise students that they only focus on grammar, lexis, and sentence-level issues as opposed to areas of content and argument; although as previously stated, the NES mentioned that he would question information he believed to be factually incorrect so it could be that what happens in practice differs to the proofreaders' beliefs.

From the above studies, it can be once again seen that proofreaders have varying interpretations of their role as highlighted in sections 2.1.5 and 2.16. Having provided the reader with a view of the differing forms of text mediation made to L2 texts and the varying reasons why proofreaders/editors make such interventions, the next sections will focus on lecturer/English language tutor beliefs regarding proofreading practices in which it will become apparent that this cohort also has different perspectives

of a proofreader's role as already touched upon in section 2.16 when discussing Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) supervisor findings.

2.2 Lecturer and English Language Tutors Beliefs Concerning Proofreading

Regarding lecturer beliefs concerning proofreading, I present studies undertaken by Turner (2011 and 2012) with additional insights from Conrad (2019) and conclude with Alkhatib's (2019) research. Commencing with Turner (2011, p. 429), said researcher studied perspectives on proofreading with regard to academic literacies and the production and reception of written work of both home and international students at a UK university. As such, Turner held ten semi-structured interviews with academic staff from the humanities, social sciences, and visual arts disciplines. Turner used the term "professor" for the academic staff and explained that such status was important as said participants were anticipated to be very familiar with the topic of proofreading; therefore, when presenting Turner's findings, I will use "professors" to refer to the academic discipline-based staff and continue to use said term when discussing Turner's (2012) research later in this section. Regarding the content of the interviews, said professors were asked to discuss their perception of proofreading, issues surrounding the use of English as an international language, and if they advised students to consult the services of a proofreader. In addition, Turner's (2011, p. 429) research involved the participation of five EAP lecturers in which their viewpoints were garnered through a focus group discussion.

Turner's (2011, pp. 429-430) findings revealed that the professors agreed on the necessity of "conventionally 'correct', well written academic prose." In such cases, third-party interventions were deemed suitable and part and parcel of supporting the students throughout their learning process. Indeed, proofread work did much to alleviate feelings of annoyance at having to assess work which the lecturers found difficult to read or even had to proofread themselves (p. 429). Regarding the EAP lecturers, there was a consensus that a delineation needed to be made between their professional role and a proofreader's as they held the belief that proofreading has a non-pedagogic role. The EAP lecturers also expressed concern as to whether students benefit from proofreading and were worried about ethical concerns surrounding proofreading in terms of both the level of intervention that can be

afforded as well as students who are unable to procure such services. Furthermore, the EAP lecturers were dissatisfied with how some academic staff seemingly viewed their role and that of the writing centre as proofreading (p. 430).

Turner's subsequent (2012) paper further discusses proofreading issues revealed in her 2011 study in which she firstly highlights how easily students can access unregulated proofreading/editing services through the large number of advertisements found within university campuses. In this vein, Turner (2012) underscores that students having access to external proofreading sources which are not managed by the university raises ethical concerns amongst EAP staff as to whether such support is beneficial to students and does not take advantage of them (p. 20). Indeed, students' vulnerability to unscrupulous proofreading services was highlighted when Turner referred to a Taiwanese student who explained the difficulty in writing essays. Said student mentioned that along with other friends from Korea or Japan, they immediately exchange emails recommending certain proofreaders who offer professional and affordable services. Given the apparent urgency of having to procure the services of a proofreader, Turner (2012) wished to determine the perspectives of professors concerning proofreading practices with regard to student work. As such, Turner (2012, pp. 21-24) focused on six of the semi-structured interviews from her 2011 study which were conducted with the professor participants. The findings revealed that most professors believed proofreading to be the final stage in the writing process and the majority proofread their students' work. With regard to the specific areas that professors correct, Prof. 1 mentioned spelling, possessives, and punctuation whilst highlighting that L1 students also have issues with the correct usage of colons and semicolons. In a similar vein, Prof. 3 mentioned that proofreading in a technical sense concerns the removal of bothersome minor errors which Turner found to be a persistent issue amongst many of the respondents in that such errors lead to the professor lacking enthusiasm to read the text. When further discussing what proofreading means to the professors, a distinction was made by Prof. 3 between the work of a proofreader compared to that of an editor with the latter supposedly intervening far more in areas of meaning. Prof. 3 expanded on the distinction between the role of a proofreader and editor by mentioning that much proofreading could be undertaken by an individual who specialises in general language issues and would accordingly have a firm

understanding of grammatical and punctuation rules which would be helpful in ensuring that the writing meets publications standards. Prof. 3 further explained that an editor may undertake a similar role but also have far deeper knowledge of the writer's discipline and accordingly be at liberty to comment on the expression of ideas. The views of Prof. 3 were shared by Prof. 4 who also perceived proofreading to signify that the content was sufficient and that a proofreader should only be concerned with typographical issues and similar minor errors. However, Turner raised important concerns regarding the *number* of form or proofreading errors by mentioning that Prof. 3 corrects all issues of a grammatical or punctuation nature unless there are so many that it interferes with the reading of a text and understanding a writer's argument. In addition, professors appreciated the writing difficulties L2 writers face as Prof. 5 observed that East Asian students seemingly omit 'the' which gives rise to sentence structure issues. Importantly, Turner found that professors were ready to offer support on a one-to-one basis especially at PhD level. For example, Prof. 6 remarked that they are able to work with students who have difficulty expressing an argument but have clearly understood the topic in question and appeared to be accepting of persistent grammatical errors. Nevertheless, Turner highlighted that professors' tolerance levels were linked to the amount of correction that they were willing to undertake. As such, in relation to the previous comment concerning 'the', Prof. 5 remarked that he did not mind such issues but once it had been pointed out to the student, it would be their responsibility to correct such errors throughout their work. In fact, Turner commented that the professors agreed to making a certain amount of error correction but it should be formative and mistakes ought to be rectified throughout the work by the student rather than their supervisor. Furthermore, professors' tolerance seemed to diminish when faced with a large number of language errors or when receiving work that consistently contained mistakes. Turner underscores this sense of frustration by explaining that Prof. 6 had far greater expectations of postgraduate students and becomes rather annoyed when it is clear that time has not been set aside for proofreading as it shows either a lack of responsibility or even disrespect toward the reader. Prof. 3 emphasised the importance of a PhD thesis being of a very high standard and argued the need for the work to have been carefully checked. When reading a completed piece of work that had not been meticulously proofread and was still not to a perfect standard, Prof. 3 would refuse to read the text again and emphasised that it would be the responsibility of the student to ensure the work

meets examiners' standards. However, Turner importantly advises that even though students of such high academic levels are expected to produce work of a superior quality, it is very unclear as to what this means for them. Indeed, it was not clear what action should be undertaken if a student reached the point where their work could not meet certain standards and none of the participants appeared to be able to supply a solution to issues of ensuring that a PhD thesis is suitable for submission. As such, Turner emphasised that it is hardly surprising that students seek proofreading services and this apparent lack of willingness to understand the dilemmas L2 students face was typified in the response from Prof. 6 who advises students to consult a proofreader but will not provide recommendations. When Turner moved the interview direction toward ethical concerns regarding proofreading, the respondents expressed surprise at how issues could arise. Indeed, Prof. 3 stated that ethical concerns would only occur if they thought the ideas presented were not those of the student. Nevertheless, Prof. 3 added that doctoral students were privy to sessions with "special advisors" who had knowledge of "a specific theorist" (p. 24) of whom a supervisor would not wish to pass an opinion on; Prof. 3 was unsure as to what exactly happened during such sessions but imagined that support is provided in areas of editing.

In a similar vein to lecturers not knowing what happens during proofreading sessions, some academics are not even comfortable with students having work proofread in the first place as discussed by Conrad (2019, p. 176) who highlighted a case at Simon Fraser University in Canada whereby a tutor had been contacted by two students to proofread their work. Unfortunately, the tutor accidentally sent the two students the same proofread file which was later submitted to the same professor. Consequently, the professor failed both assignments and the student who wrote the original text complained. Therefore, a disciplinary panel instructed the professor to review the assignment but the request was refused due to the fact that the student had received outside help. This incident highlights a lack of certainty amongst professors as to the role of third-party help that was further exemplified in Turner's (2012, p. 24) research in a response given by Prof. 6 which Turner stated was hesitant and suggested possible unease and defensiveness. Indeed, Prof. 6 began by expressing that a proofreader should make the text more presentable but then did not finish an utterance explaining what a third party should *not* do. Furthermore, Prof. 6 stated that the proofreader should refrain from thinking which Turner remarked would be a

description that many third parties would be content with due to the fact that their work is primarily concerned with the conventions of making a text presentable. Finally, Turner advised that EAP staff are well aware of the effect one intervention can have upon another and that entire paragraphs may need restructuring in certain instances.

With further regard to the type of proofreading help that students can receive, Alkhatib's (2019) qualitative study of 42 members of academic staff at five British universities sought to determine the extent to which they advocate proofreading services of either a formal or informal nature, and whether a distinction is made between L1 and L2 students in recommending the use of a proofreader. Participants had extensive experience assessing student writing and delivered master's courses in a range of disciplines, namely English Language, Education, Computer Science, Marketing, and Law (p. 2305). In order to undertake her research, Alkhatib conducted a qualitative study using an open-ended questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis of lecturers' feedback on student theses. The questionnaire consisted of two parts in which the first concerned details regarding the participants' demographics (gender, department, university, and nationality) and the second sought to determine whether lecturers advise students to seek professional proofreading services and to provide the reasons. Eight of the 42 participants were involved in subsequent interviews where Alkhatib extracted further information regarding their reasoning concerning the (non-) consultation of a paid-for proofreading service. Alkhatib also amassed 25 feedback sheets from the interviews which were assessed to determine whether lecturers suggest students consult professional third-party editing services (p. 2304).

The results of Alkhatib's (2019) survey questionnaire revealed that the majority of lecturers (83%) refrained from suggesting that both L1 and L2 student writers seek the assistance of proofreaders due to financial costs and asserted that proofreading is a crucial step of the writing process which should be self-taught (p. 2305). Indeed, the results from one of the lecturer interviews highlighted that students are advised to consult university support services rather than have to pay for a proofreader. Furthermore, the same lecturer stated that students are advised to seek proofreading support from peers in exchange

for some form of reciprocal agreement. Similarly, another lecturer commented that they prefer to view the text and then intervene before passing often inaccurate judgements based on whether the work is produced by an L1 or L2 student. Such interventions involve meeting the student in order to pair them with a “reading buddy” or provide suggestions as to how work can be improved (p. 2307). Returning to the results of the survey, of the remaining 17% of lecturers who did advise proofreading, this advice was regardless of whether the student was an L1 or L2 speaker (p. 2305). Further, one of the lecturer participants stated at interview that third-party support is recommended when students are aware their writing has linguistic inaccuracies as having the help of a proofreader would assist in raising a writer’s level of work. Similarly, another lecturer at interview remarked that they may advise a student to have work proofread when faced with an overwhelming number of errors. Indeed, several lecturers expressed at interview that having a proofreader may be an effective strategy as the student mimics the writing style of their proofreader. However, it was acknowledged that such a philosophy may not always be appropriate (pp. 2308-2309), and a law participant noted on their questionnaire that the decision to ask students to consult a proofreader was made depending on a student’s set of circumstances rather than their L1 or L2 status. In fact, to differentiate between L1 and L2 students was seen by many of the lecturers to be a form of discriminatory behaviour held against second language students. An additional finding from the questionnaires revealed most lecturers agreed that the appropriate amount of third-party intervention depended on a student’s level of English. Indeed, one of the business academics echoed the views of the law lecturer in claiming that appropriate proofreading depends on the individual student as some need support whereas others are far more autonomous (p. 2305). Alkhatib highlights that the recommendation of proofreading services varies as not all students require help because many display a very good command of written English which is seemingly apparent in high International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores; this assertion was qualified by one of the lecturers at interview who stated that an IELTS score of 6.5 means students should be in possession of the language skills necessary to produce academic work (p. 2307). However, Alkhatib acknowledges that having a high IELTS score does not necessarily mean students are able to produce written work without third-party intervention (pp. 2305-2306). Indeed, from consulting IELTS’s (2020) webpage, even though the academic writing part of the exam assesses test takers on areas of task achievement,

coherence and cohesion, lexical resources, grammatical range and accuracy, the test only requires the completion of two short tasks of 150 and 250 words within a one-hour period. This is neither reflective of the typically lengthy and time-consuming forms of assignment, dissertation, or thesis that university students are expected to produce nor is it reflective of the number of revisions that a text may undergo.

Further insights were revealed from the survey questionnaire as Alkhatib (2019) stated that participants viewed proofreading as being an integral part of the writing process. This was exemplified by a history academic who noted that whilst they are prepared to correct grammar during the first six months, it requires much time and having a proofreader allows for the focus to be squarely on content; based on this assertion, Alkhatib deduced that both lecturers and examiners expect to read texts of a high standard but that this may be unrealistic when considering many students are unable to produce work of an appropriate level at the start of their course of study. In addition, Alkhatib stressed that some lecturers were preoccupied with the content of a text as detailed by a computer science academic; said academic stated that they only suggest a student has work proofread if the meaning is negatively affected by issues of grammar and structure (p. 2306). With regard to the interview findings, Alkhatib stated that 83% of lecturer participants did not suggest their L1 or L2 students obtain support from a proofreader as it was evident from the interviews that a student's language competency was not of concern. Instead, lecturers found that the more important issue was due to "composing in Academic Writing" and one of the participants discussed how L2 students frequently produce work of a level that does not necessitate third-party intervention whereas L1 writers sometimes produce work which is not to standard and on occasions, even incomprehensible (p. 2306). Alkhatib also commented that some of the lecturers prefer to train students in proofreading techniques and one participant stated at interview that such action is better than a student having to pay for proofreading services. This finding is especially pertinent when considering that 49% of the lecturers in Alkhatib's study were concerned that proofreaders may intervene in areas of accuracy and content which would result in the work no longer being that of the student. Furthermore, others were worried that proofreaders may alter the meaning of a piece of work (p. 2308). Regarding the results of the feedback sheets in which supervisors provided feedback to their students, Alkhatib commented that the latter were sometimes advised to consult proofreading services.

Furthermore, proofreading was even endorsed as the university in question had a pool of available proofreaders. Indeed, one of the education academics strongly advised their student on the feedback sheet to consult proofreading services as there were simply too many errors of a grammatical nature to correct. However, the aforementioned academic had to make a similar comment on a revised draft of the same student's work which led Alkhatib to observe that students are not always cognizant of the necessity to proofread work before submission (p. 2309). From Alkhatib's findings, it can be seen that lecturers' opinions regarding the ethicality of proofreading vary considerably which is in accordance with Harwood's (2018 and 2019) views from a proofreader perspective as mentioned in section 2.1.5 and Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) supervisors discussed in section 2.1.6. Having discussed some of the lecturer concerns which arise in regard to proofreading practices, the following now looks at student beliefs.

2.3 Student Beliefs Concerning Proofreading

With regard to student beliefs concerning proofreading practices, I draw upon studies undertaken by Turner (2011), Cottier (2017), and Conrad (2020 and 2021). Regarding Turner's study (2011), as mentioned in section 2.2, said researcher investigated perspectives on proofreading concerning academic literacies and the production and reception of written work of home and international students at a British university. With regard to the student participants, Turner conducted focus groups and semi-structured interviews with first and second language English speaking students who were studying at either undergraduate, master's or PhD level. The student participants were 35 in total and spread over several focus groups. Each group was led by two research assistants with the purpose of discussing students' personal experiences of proofreading and how they proofread their own writing. Turner advised that other possible discussion points concerned what students believed academics required of their writing, the contrast between L1 and L2 speakers' experiences, and their willingness to pay for proofreading services. In addition, Turner held one-to-one semi-structured interviews with four doctoral students regarding proofreading perspectives; one was an L1 student and the other three were L2 speakers. Turner's (2011, pp. 429-430) findings revealed that the students were found to share common concerns in regard to producing well written pieces of work that effectively communicated ideas to the

reader and also lacked confidence in their English skills. The students were also anxious that specific instruction had not been given regarding writing expectations and were upset that those who were able to afford proofreaders supposedly received better marks. However, even students who did consult external proofreaders were not always satisfied with the service and displayed annoyance at the seemingly continuous process of writing, rewriting, and proofreading.

Concerning Cottier's (2017) study, her research built upon Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010 and 2013) previously discussed studies by addressing the role of an editor from a student perspective. The research was conducted in Australia where all higher degree research (HDR) students are permitted to engage the services of an editor when writing a thesis. Cottier (2017) used the term 'thesis' to refer to both master's dissertations and PhD theses as the purpose of her research was to determine the needs of *postgraduate* students regarding the editing of theses. A total of fourteen participants were interviewed and two were English as second language speakers. Eleven of the students had completed their HDR and ten of these same students had used an editor. The remaining three participants were current students and had not yet consulted an editing service. The participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire rather than presenting a long list of editing tasks from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010) study which Cottier (2017) advises may have been "daunting and confusing" for her participants (p. 40) presumably because students would not be familiar with the interventions that editors make. As such, Cottier gave the participants several open questions in which they were asked to discuss what tasks they thought an editor would and would not be expected to perform (p. 40). Regarding the tasks that students believed an editor should undertake, references were made predominantly to addressing technical writing issues such as "checking and correcting spelling, grammar, punctuation, words, sentences, syntax, terminology, typos, technical errors, inaccuracies and inconsistencies" (p. 44). Formatting and presentation were also deemed to be nearly as important as addressing technical issues so that the students could meet the standards required by their university, and advice and feedback was of lesser importance. However, the students stated that advice from the editor could help with the flow of the text and provide guidance with areas of grammar and punctuation but the emphasis needed to be on technical issues and any additional comments should be formative in nature. Guidance with referencing

and APA style was treated as a separate category as the students placed much emphasis on this area in order to adhere to institutional thesis specifications and due to the specialist nature of referencing styles. Regarding tasks that students thought an editor should not do, content changes were deemed to be the most significant area in which intervention ought to be avoided. Furthermore, the students placed a significant amount of emphasis on author ownership and believed that certain changes should be discussed between the student and supervisor. Structural changes and interventions of writing quality and style were also noted to be the responsibility of the student. However, these areas were seen to be less crucial than those of ownership as most participants placed great importance on the thesis “belonging” to the student writer (p. 46). To conclude, Cottier’s results showed that students believed more copyediting tasks could be undertaken when compared to Kruger and Bevan-Dye’s (2010) study in regard to formatting and referencing tasks. These contrasting results show that students may not be aware that editors do not perform such tasks for the reasons stated in section 2.1.6 in that editors believe that copyediting skills either demonstrate a student’s ability to produce work which meets certain standards or that copyediting skills belong to the remit of a supervisor.

Turning to Conrad’s (2020) study, additional useful insights were revealed when investigating student proofreading experiences and the reasons for engaging such services at a university in Canada. Conrad’s research questions were as follows: 1) the demographics of students who engage proofreading services; 2) the reasons why students refer to proofreading services; 3) the nature and extent of proofreading services that students receive; and 4) whether there is a distinction between the proofreading services provided to NES “native or near-native speakers of English” (p. 5) and NNES students who “did not identify as native English speakers” (NNES) (p. 6). In order to collect her data, Conrad (2020) used an online multiple-choice survey which was completed by 145 respondents and semi-structured interview methods in which eight of the students agreed to participate (pp. 4-5). When reporting her results, Conrad (2020) highlighted that it would not be possible to generalise her findings to all higher education students as her survey was voluntary (p. 5). Nevertheless, Conrad’s research offers a valuable insight into proofreading practices from a student perspective which is much needed when considering that her research is the first empirical study to investigate student proofreading practices in a North American

university context (p. 1). In addition, Conrad advises that her research questions are addressed by mainly focusing on quantitative data from the online survey and only occasionally referring to the interview findings (p. 5).

Regarding the students' demographics, Conrad's (2020, p. 5) findings revealed that the majority of participants who had consulted proofreading services on at least one occasion were female and the mean age of participants was approximately 24 years old. A higher number of undergraduate rather than graduate students used proofreading services at 54.2% and 45.8% respectively. Interestingly, Conrad found that 58.6% of participants were home rather than international students and almost three quarters of respondents viewed themselves to be native or near-native English speakers. With regard to the reasons for consulting proofreading services, Conrad importantly highlighted that she did not find any discernible differences between the two cohorts of NES and NNES students. Regarding the specific reasons why students consulted proofreading services, the results revealed that students primarily wanted to improve their writing skills (69.7%) or obtain better grades (46.2%). Additional reasons were as follows: 1) an instructor/advisor had recommended proofreading services (21.4%); 2) the students wanted to ensure that plagiarism was avoided (15.2%); or 3) a journal editor/reviewer had advised the student to seek editing services (4.8%). Furthermore, 25.5% of the participants indicated in the "other reasons" category that they consulted proofreading services to avoid "typos" and "grammatical errors" as well as wishing to have a "second set of eyes" (p. 6). Conrad also referred to her interview data and reports that two of the participants had been advised to consult proofreading services by a supervisor whereas the others sought third-party help themselves to ensure their writing was clear and well expressed. Conrad added that one of the L2 participants (Elena) was worried that her writing would appear unprofessional if grammatical or sentence structure issues were present as she believed it would identify her as being a NNES student (p. 6).

Concerning the nature and extent of help provided, Conrad (2020, p. 6) reported that the majority of NES and NNES students at 71.3% and 67.4% respectively consulted proofreading services for help with course assignments or term papers. Proofreading services were also sought for job applications

(61% NES students and 51.2% NNES), and to a lesser extent for support with email communications (34.7% NES and 18.6% NNES) and grant applications (22.8% NES and 7% NNES). Whilst the aforementioned results are greater for the NES students, the NNES student results reported higher figures at 37.2% compared to 25.7% of NES when seeking help with research proposals. Regarding the types of correction which proofreaders provided, Conrad (2020, pp. 6-7) advised that both the NES and NNES cohort results most concerned issues of spelling, grammar, punctuation, and word choice. In addition, the majority of respondents had received proofreading intervention in areas of sentence structure and flow. Conrad's data also revealed that proofreaders had rephrased information (51.5% NES and 34.9% NNES) and similar figures were reported for both groups regarding summarising and/or paraphrasing (20.8% NES and 18.6% NNES). With regard to the nature and extent of proofreading, Conrad asked her participants if they paid for proofreading services. The results showed that 15% of all respondents paid to have their work proofread and the NNES students were in the majority. Indeed 27.9% of the NNES students stated that they had consulted a paid proofreading service whereas only 9.8% of the NES group reported using a proofreader.

Concerning the distinction between proofreading services offered to NES and NNES students, Conrad (2020, pp. 8-9) reported that the NES students were far more likely to consult a friend or a family member at 75.5% which is a sharp contrast to the NNES cohort in which only 25.6% sought help from such parties. The NNES students usually found their proofreader via internet searches (48.8%) whereas only 18.6% of the NES cohort secured proofreading services through such means. Importantly, Conrad highlighted that NNES students tended to procure proofreading services based on a friend, instructor, or internet source recommendation. In addition, the forms of communication between a student and the proofreader differed between the two groups. Indeed, 79.2% of the NES students had usually met their proofreader which was noticeably higher than the NNES group at 46.5%. Furthermore, the NNES group figures reported no contact at all with their proofreader at 37.2% which contrasts considerably with only 8.9% of the NES participants. Conrad mentions that the findings in this area diverged considerably from those of previous research and accordingly explored the social aspect of the student-proofreader relationship in her follow-up interviews. The results showed that four participants had received

proofreading support from a romantic partner, three from friends and family members, and one interviewee (Nora) had consulted a stranger. With further regard to Nora, Conrad reports that the proofreader had been consulted based on a supervisor's recommendation and that she had to procure the services of a previously unknown individual as no such support was provided by her university; instead, Nora found her proofreader through a fellow student and had to pay for the proofreading service which differed to the other seven interview participants as they all had an acquaintance within their social circles. Based on her findings, Conrad deduced that students are more likely to consult pre-existing acquaintances in the first instance before turning to other services. As such, Conrad advised that the NNES cohort's tendency to secure the services of a proofreader who does not belong to their social circle may imply that it is more challenging for them to access such individuals. However, Conrad offers an alternative explanation with regard to writing practices in that NNES students may prefer to use their social connections differently to those belonging to the NES group. Another discernible difference concerned the use of automated grammar checking services such as Grammarly in which 48.8% of NNES participants would consult such a source compared to a far lower number of NES students at 21.6%. Finally for this section, although Conrad's findings are based on students' self-reported perceptions of their learning outcomes, both the NES and NNES cohorts stated that the proofreader had helped improve their writing at 85.3% and 83.7% respectively. However, differences occurred between the two groups as the NES students reported far higher levels of improvement in areas of new vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation rules. Conrad attributes such distinctions to the difference between NNES students being possibly unaware of linguistic rules and thus having errors in their written work, and NES participants making mistakes in areas where the rules were already known but simply needed to be refreshed.

In Conrad's (2021) subsequent research, additional further insights into student perspectives were revealed through her design of a lesson developed for a first-year writing course at a university in the United States. Conrad explained that her lesson aimed to address one of the course learning outcomes regarding writing processes and sought to provide students with guidance concerning appropriate and inappropriate forms of literacy brokering. Conrad's lesson will be discussed in more detail in section

6.1 of the conclusion when explaining how it can be adapted for the purposes of my research. With regard to student perspectives, interesting results were provided when Conrad asked the lesson participants to provide written reflections on (un-)acceptable forms of academic behaviour. Concerning third-party interventions, most students perceived that such help should be determined according to the extent to which a student had written the original text themselves. As such, one student (Jonah) did not find it to be ethically questionable when using an internet source to repair grammatical inaccuracies. Another participant, (Marie) stated that academic institutions should take into consideration the amount of text which the student had produced or whether they only received assistance with corrections. In a similar vein, participants distinguished between in-text changes made to a students' text and comments. For instance, Elliott emphasised that help with grammatical inaccuracies is acceptable but the third party should refrain from making the changes themselves as it denies the writer the opportunity to improve the text themselves. Similarly, Mark commented that suggestions are more advisable than direct intervention in order for the student to learn from the writing process. The participants also distinguished between the type of third-party help which could be provided. For instance, Daniel commented that it was acceptable to have his father read a text concerning a topic which the latter had greater knowledge of as this was a form of peer review which could equally have been found through consulting a fellow coursemate or student support service employee. Likewise, Emilio remarked that when feedback was provided by another student as part of their lesson, it should not be viewed as an unacceptable practice because the original writer either accepted or rejected the reviewer's comments. Conversely, Emilio advised that it would be unacceptable if a student chose not to produce the work themselves and used that of another or consulted a website.

From presenting important issues which concern proofreaders, lecturers, and students, it can be seen that each party has different perceptions of proofreading practices and there is an apparent lack of consensus between each stakeholder group as underlined by Turner (2012) in mentioning how international students feel under enormous pressure to produce accurate texts in English and actively seek affordable yet professional proofreading services, whereas lecturers feel an apparent sense of unease regarding the role of proofreaders. Therefore, it would appear that improved proofreading and

editing practices are required across publishing industries and universities (Luo and Hyland, 2017; Harwood, 2018). Key to improved editing/proofreading practices is the necessity for widely disseminated proofreading policies and better communication between all parties as highlighted by Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010, p. 65) which will now be discussed in the next section.

2.4 Upholding Ethical Standards through Proofreading Guidelines and Improved Stakeholder Communication

Widely disseminated proofreading guidelines and improved communication amongst stakeholders lie at the heart of improved ethics in regard to proofreading practices (Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009; Harwood, Austin and Macaulay 2010; Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2012; McNally and Kooyman, 2017; Harwood, 2018; Kim and LaBianca, 2018; Alhojailan, 2019; Harwood, 2019; Kim, 2019). This is particularly important when considering that Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) found clear proofreading policies were either unavailable at South African universities or that guidelines which did exist were not always adequately detailed in content or clearly defined. Fortunately, the situation seems to be improving as Harwood (2019, p. 18) notes that several British universities have made proofreading guidelines available on their websites. However, Harwood cautions that much proofreading is currently undertaken by third parties who are not affiliated to a university and may not be aware of policies. Moreover, Harwood advises that the mere existence of policies does not necessarily ensure that proofreaders will adhere to them which is a view shared by Cottier (2017) who argues that even when stakeholders are aware of the guidelines, it does not necessarily mean that such policies will be properly consulted. This was exemplified by Cottier's (2017) previously discussed research which included an assessment of guidelines regarding the expectations and experiences of postgraduate students at two universities in Queensland. Cottier found that even though a large proportion of her student participants were aware of editing guidelines, a far lower percentage had in fact consulted them which led her to the clear conclusion that such policies needed to be communicated more effectively to both students and supervisors. Whilst Salter-Dvorak (2019) questions the feasibility of formulating proofreading policies in terms of human resources, expense, and time, she nonetheless emphasises the importance of establishing clear guidelines and opening lines of communication amongst stakeholders as exemplified

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of an L2 student, proofreader, and lecturers

by her research into the extent to which current language policies create social inequality for L2 master's students in British universities. Salter-Dvorak's case studies of two L2 graduate students demonstrated how conflicting advice from lecturers regarding the use of proofreading services led to one of the students being at a considerable disadvantage to the other. Worryingly, this occurred at the same university and highlights just how much needs to be done to ensure that guidelines are widely disseminated across faculties and that such policies are adhered to. Therefore, building upon the results of my research, I provide a draft proposal of proofreading guidelines in section 6.1 of the conclusion which could complement universities' currently existing policies in order to uphold academic integrity.

From presenting numerous revisions that proofreaders/editors make to L2 texts and having discussed proofreading practices from proofreader/editor, lecturer, and student perspectives, a number of research questions have evolved from the review of the literature which will now be presented.

2.5 Research Questions

The following research questions assist my investigation into proofreading practices from the perspective of the students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

Firstly, from a student perspective, the research: (i) explores their experience of consulting a proofreader; (ii) analyses their perceptions of a range of proofreader interventions in terms of ethical appropriacy and how they view the role of a proofreader; and (iii) assesses awareness and understanding of University proofreading guidelines.

Secondly, from a proofreader viewpoint the study: (i) explores what changes they make to a student text and why; (ii) probes what changes they decline to make to a student text and why; (iii) assesses what changes they find to be appropriate when proofreading a student text based on a range of possible interventions and how they perceive their role; (iv) analyses what they deem to be acceptable forms of request when contacted by students; (v) explores the extent to which they communicate the changes

made to a text to lecturers so that the latter are aware of the number of interventions made; and (vi) assesses awareness of University proofreading guidelines.

Thirdly, from a lecturer standpoint the study: (i) assesses their perceptions of a range of proofreader interventions in terms of ethical appropriacy and how they view the role of a proofreader; (ii) explores the extent to which they endorse proofreading practices; (iii) gauges the extent to which they are advised of proofreader interventions; and (iv) assesses their awareness of University proofreading guidelines.

Student Orientated Questions

1. What experience do students have with proofreaders?
2. How do students perceive a range of proofreader interventions in terms of ethical appropriacy and how do they perceive the role of the proofreader?
3. How aware are students of university proofreading guidelines?

Proofreader Orientated Questions

4. What changes do proofreaders make to a student text? Why?
5. What changes do proofreaders decline to make to a student text? Why?
6. What changes to a student text do proofreaders find to be acceptable based on a range of possible interventions and how do proofreaders perceive their role?
7. What do proofreaders deem to be acceptable forms of proofreading requests when contacted by students?

8. To what extent do proofreaders communicate the changes made to a text to lecturers so that they are aware of the amount of intervention?
9. How aware are proofreaders of university proofreading guidelines?

Lecturer Orientated Questions

10. How do lecturers perceive a range of proofreader interventions in terms of ethical appropriacy and how do they perceive the role of the proofreader?
11. To what extent do lecturers endorse proofreading practices?
12. To what extent are lecturers advised of proofreader interventions?
13. How aware are lecturers of university proofreading guidelines?

Chapter 3 Methodology

The first part of this chapter presents my research design which was a mixed methods study that incorporated triangulation whilst following a single-case study approach. Next, I discuss the participants recruited in regard to their profiles and the reasons why they were selected for my research. Following this, I present the research instruments and procedures for: 1) my textual analysis taxonomy that measured the proofreading interventions made to the student's texts; 2) the student pre-interview task which asked the participant to indicate whether the changes made to their texts were ethically appropriate or not; and 3) the semi-structured interviews that were conducted with my student, proofreader, and lecturer participants to primarily determine their views concerning ethically appropriate forms of intervention; I also provide information concerning my research diaries which complement each interview. I then present the coding and analysis process for my taxonomy and interviews. The chapter concludes by discussing the ethical procedures undertaken to conduct my research.

3.1 A Mixed Methods Study Using Triangulation and a Case Study Approach

For my research, a mixed methods approach was decided upon as I quantitatively analysed the interventions made to a student's text and used a qualitative form of inquiry by conducting semi-structured interviews. My reason for choosing a mixed method approach is based on Dörnyei's (2007) argument that the advantages and disadvantages of quantitative and qualitative methods can improve the strengths of each one whilst eliminating the weaknesses of the other. Indeed, Dörnyei states that quantitative data collection, through the use of numbers, allows for an efficient and meticulous form of enquiry producing data which is not only reliable but applicable to other contexts due to the fact that it can be generalised. However, Dörnyei cautions that difficulties can arise in determining the underlying cause of a situation as quantitative data is not sensitive to individual cases. Regarding my research, I devised a taxonomy which allowed for an accurate quantitative analysis of the data. Further, by conducting qualitative semi-structured interviews, I was able to overcome issues regarding a lack of sensitivity by extensively exploring stakeholder perspectives concerning proofreading practices. An additional important point that Dörnyei (2007) raises concerns qualitative data's susceptibility to

researcher personal bias which is evident in its use of non-numerical forms of data collection such as interviews, and that due to its focus on individual cases as well as the high volume of data generated, resulting theories can be perceived as too narrow or excessively complex. Therefore, my quantitative data will help minimise researcher bias and the qualitative findings will provide a suitably rich picture. The findings will then be used to raise university awareness of acceptable and unacceptable forms of proofreading practice through a draft policy which will be presented in section 6.1 of the conclusion.

Having identified that a mixed methods approach would be appropriate for my research purposes, I adopted a process of triangulation. Patton (1999, p. 1192) states that triangulation is based on the theory that more than one method is needed in order to provide an answer to contesting accounts, which in the case of my study could arise if students, proofreaders, and lecturers have noticeably different perspectives concerning ethically appropriate proofreading interventions. Denzin (1970, p. 301) describes four methods of triangulation which are “*data* with these types; (1) time, (2) space, (3) person, and these three levels (1) aggregate (person), (2) interactive (person), (3) collectivity (person); *investigator* (multiple vs. single observers of the same object); *theory* (multiple vs. single perspectives in relation to the same set of objects); and *methodological* (within-method triangulation and between-method triangulation).” In order to address my research questions, I used the *data* form of triangulation. Scott (2007, p. 11) elaborates on Denzin’s description by stating that data triangulation is when “different data sets are collected at different times, with different samples, and in different contexts, and compared.” However, Denscombe’s (2010, p. 347) description varies slightly as he states that data triangulation involves the comparison of data from different informants (which in my study concerns the student and proofreader with the additional input of lecturers) *or* different times. Therefore, my research qualifies as featuring data triangulation based on the informant factor alone as even though the lecturers are not directly involved in the case study approach that I discuss below, they are nonetheless key players in my research and as such complete the student, proofreader, and lecturer triad. My research also featured time triangulation as I also collected data from the proofread writing drafts of the EdD student at different times throughout the proofreading process with follow-up semi-structured interviews. Returning to Denzin’s (1970) three other forms of triangulation, the investigator form was

not used as I am the sole researcher. The method of theoretical triangulation was also not employed as Scott (2007, p. 12) argues that such a form of data collection focuses on a transformative process generating varying hypotheses rather than a comparative emphasis which is the purpose of my research when comparing participant views. Finally, whilst the methodological form of triangulation would have been beneficial in allowing me to employ methods that are noticeably different and collect data by using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods with the purpose of obtaining a more informed understanding of the processes being investigated from varying perspectives, my research did not qualify for this method as the data was only taken from two sources, namely the L2 student's writing drafts and the semi-structured interviews.

With further regard to my research design, I chose to form a case study comprised of the student and proofreader. The lecturers were not directly involved in the case study to protect the identity of the student and proofreader; instead, such participants provided valuable perspectives regarding proofreading practices which complemented my research. I had initially planned to have a multiple-case study design as it retains the level of detail akin to an individual study (Herriot and Firestone, 1983, p. 14) but is more convincing and robust than that of a single case which often receives criticism for its unique and sometimes artificial nature (Yin, 2018, p. 54), and I had intended to establish the reasons for similar and contrasting results amongst case studies. However, due to the effects of COVID-19, I was unable to recruit as many participants as anticipated and circumstances dictated that I follow a single-case study approach. As such, my single-case study was comprised of the EdD student and her proofreader with the additional perspectives of two senior lecturers. As I ultimately had only one complete case study, I adopted an approach that followed an embedded rather than holistic design (Yin, 2018). I chose an embedded design from having both quantitative and qualitative data sources in the form of my textual analysis of the interventions made to the student text and the semi-structured interviews.

Even though I was unable to follow a multiple-case study approach, the extensive nature of the EdD student's thesis permitted me to analyse her writing over a number of chapters as well as conduct a

series of interviews with each stakeholder. This process enabled me to conduct in depth investigations into the interventions that are made to a student's text as well as investigate ethical perspectives concerning proofreading.

3.2 Participant Recruitment

Having received ethical approval to undertake my research, which is explained in more depth in section 3.5, I firstly contacted the lecturers via email to request permission to present my project in the lectures of the Master's in Applied Linguistics with TESOL course as this was the discipline with which I was most familiar. By presenting my research to said students, I also aimed to recruit their proofreaders. I initially recruited seven students between February and March 2020 from the previously mentioned course but only two of the students were able to participate due to COVID-19. The first student hailed from China and the second from Mexico. Regarding the first student from China, she emailed me to express interest in my research on 20th February 2020 and attached three copies of her master's assignment submitted the previous semester (autumn 2019); the first piece was her pre-proofread work, the second was the post proofread version, and the third was that which she submitted for assessment. Unfortunately, I was unable to recruit the student's proofreader despite the student advising them of my project. Concerning the second student from Mexico, she emailed on 17th February 2020 to express interest in my research and on 8th June 2020, she sent me an assignment from the spring semester of 2020. Again, I was unable to recruit this second student's proofreader. Both students were initially part of my piloting and as the first student's text had received extensive interventions, I was able to successfully interview the Chinese student and two lecturers. Regarding the Mexican student, I did not analyse her text as so few revisions had been made but I still managed to conduct an interview which proved valuable in helping me fine-tune my student interview schedule.

Regarding my third student participant, I recruited Sarah on 9th November 2020. Sarah is a native Spanish speaking student who was undertaking a four-year EdD degree. As well as studying toward a doctorate, Sarah also teaches EAP at a British university. I was able to recruit Sarah, as I participated in the data collection for her own research which had been conducted over the summer of 2020. At this

point, I wish to acknowledge that Sarah is an elite informant defined by Marshall and Rossman (2011, p. 155) as those “considered to be influential, prominent, and/or well informed in an organization or community.” Marshall and Rossman (2011) highlight the advantages of having such a participant in regard to their ability to communicate important information concerning an organisation’s policies (p. 155). Indeed, in the case of my research, Sarah was able to share a valuable insight into my home institution’s current proofreading landscape from her own experience of having tried to procure a set of proofreading guidelines which will be discussed in subsection 4.5.1 of the results chapter. With regard to my study, the downside of having an elite individual concerns the demands it places on myself as an interviewer to portray a sense of competency and credibility through showing awareness of my field of research (Marshall and Rossman, 2011, p. 156). Therefore, as Marshall and Rossman (2011) highlight, careful questioning allows the interviewer to show their awareness of a particular issue. Indeed, I revised my interview schedules and interviewing techniques several times whilst piloting before feeling confident enough to undertake my data collection.

My proofreader participant was Jane who is Sarah’s ex-teaching colleague and friend as well as a professional proofreader working for an international proofreading company on a freelance basis. Jane is a native English speaker who proofreads approximately twenty texts per month on a fee-paying basis; however, in Sarah’s case, Jane proofread for free as they are friends. Jane proofreads in all subject areas including education, sciences, social sciences, history, and law. She receives many postgraduate MA and MSc assignments and dissertations as well as PhD level texts. Furthermore, Jane also proofreads non-academic texts that include psychiatry reports for doctors, medical reports, and terms and conditions for a law firm, a company of surveyors and two property investment companies. In addition to her proofreading background, Jane completed a Master’s in M.Ed TESOL (EAP) in which she completed her dissertation in formative feedback on EAP. Furthermore, Jane has taught EAP at British universities including summer pre-sessional courses.

Regarding the lecturer participants, I recruited a total of four academics. The first two were lecturers in the department of English Language and Linguistics and their interviews were based on the Chinese

student's master's assignment. The third academic, Michael, was a senior lecturer based in the same department who has worked with international students and second language speakers since the start of his career. However, international students and second language speakers have never comprised the majority of any class that Michael has taught and he tends to encounter a higher percentage of such learners in postgraduate teaching and research. Said students come from China, Cyprus, India, Kosovo, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, and Saudi Arabia. At the time of writing, Michael taught around eight international students/second language speakers and around 40 overall across all levels i.e., undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and research. The fourth academic, Emily, was a retired senior lecturer formerly based in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at a UK university who currently proofreads tertiary level students' written work for assessment and academics' texts for publication. Although Emily joined my study in the capacity of a lecturer participant, her proofreading work offered a unique insight into proofreading practices from both an academic and proofreader's perspective. Having presented my research design and participant recruitment, the following sections provide details of my research instruments and the procedures that were undertaken.

3.3 Research Instruments and Procedures

This section begins by presenting and discussing the procedure underlying the design of my textual analysis taxonomy which was used to measure the (non-) interventions proofreaders make to student texts. Next, I discuss the student pre-interview task and its procedures in which participants were asked to indicate whether the changes made to their texts were ethically appropriate or not. Following this, I present the semi-structured interviews and procedures for my student, proofreader, and lecturer participants in which each stakeholder was asked to discuss their perspectives concerning the changes made to a student text as well as their opinions of current proofreading practices; I also provide details of my research diaries which were designed to complement the interviews by recording my thoughts post-interview.

3.3.1 Textual Analysis Taxonomy Selection and Procedure

Regarding my taxonomy, I predominantly referred to those used by Harwood (2018) and Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) in order to conduct an analysis of the changes that a proofreader does or does not make to a student text so as to address research questions 4 and 5. In devising my taxonomy, I largely incorporated Harwood's (2018) framework based on the fact that it focuses specifically on the proofreading of student writing and was deemed a suitable basis for my own research instrument. Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge, Harwood's taxonomy is the only framework that was designed for the analysis of L2 student texts in particular. Whilst Harwood's (2018) taxonomy provides the basis of my research instrument, Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010) taxonomy has been incorporated due to the fact that it is very finely grained and has 66 tasks which fit into four categories of copyediting, stylistic editing, structural editing and content editing. Kruger and Bevan-Dye based these four categories on those proposed by Mossop (2007, cited in Kruger and Bevan-Dye, 2010, p. 159) (see subsection 2.1.6 of the literature review) as Kruger and Bevan-Dye believed that each category clearly distinguishes the varying types of editing task. In short, Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 159) follow Mossop's description of each category by stating that copy editing covers areas of rules such as those pertaining to grammar and spelling and is focused on the correction of a text. Stylistic changes are those which are not only made to ensure that a text is easy to follow but also to improve areas such as lexis and sentence formation so said text is appropriate for the type of reader. Structural editing improves the presentation of a text and content editing includes tasks such as verifying facts or advising the writer to add or remove material. The much larger number of tasks provided in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010) taxonomy in comparison to that of Harwood (2018) is to be expected as the former researchers' framework arose from *professional editors'* description of their interventions when working with dissertations and theses and is naturally extremely detailed. In addition, I chose to incorporate Kruger and Bevan-Dye's taxonomy due to its flexible nature in that it can be used with different stakeholders as exemplified by their 2013 research concerning supervisor perspectives of an editor's role, and Cottier's (2017) study that measured student expectations of editors. In devising my own taxonomy, amendments have been made to that used by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) due to the fact that it was created to investigate editors' *perceptions* of the role and responsibilities of an editor whereas my

research is designed to investigate proofreading *practices* as well as perceptions. Harwood (2018, p. 527) adds weight to this point by emphasising that Kruger and Bevan-Dye mixed “revision strategies (e.g., *Correcting incorrect spelling*) and motivations for making revisions (e.g., *Correcting to ensure that text conforms to the higher education institution’s house style or house rules*).” Finally, I have also incorporated Kruger and Bevan-Dye’s (2010, pp. 163-164) “editing methods” and “methods of raising queries and comments” to determine whether the students in my study are involved in the editing process or if corrections are simply made without the student having to analyse them.

In basing my research on the finely tuned research instruments of Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) and Harwood (2018), my study endeavoured to ensure a systematic and sufficiently detailed analysis of the proofreader interventions made to a student’s text. By doing so, I was able to acquire adequate material for my semi-structured interviews in which the results of the textual analysis were discussed in greater depth to understand the motivations as to why proofreaders do or do not make changes to a text. This ultimately enabled me to address Harwood’s (2019, p. 40) recommendation that, “a greater understanding of stakeholders’ views on ethical proofreading” is needed.

In regard to testing and developing my taxonomy, I began piloting it with my Chinese student participant after having received her master’s assignment and decided to focus on the text in its entirety as the assignment was short at approximately 2800 words in length. In order to analyse the proofreading interventions, I referred to Track changes which showed interventions made in text and the proofreader’s comments. I used said text to pilot my taxonomy (see Figure 5 below) three times and made additional adjustments at various stages based on my analysis of Sarah’s EdD texts and three inter-rater reliability tests conducted with my supervisor. Further, I have specified in italics throughout the taxonomy instances where either my own research has been referred to or that of other authors which apart from Harwood (2018) and Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) also involves studies undertaken by Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Rebeck (2014), and Cottier (2017); further, I wish to acknowledge that the minor, meso, and major categories were devised by Luo and Hyland (2016 and 2017) and later refined by Harwood (2018) as noted in subsections 2.1.2 and 2.15 of the literature review.

Figure 5 Textual Analysis Taxonomy

Minor = Revisions of 5 words or fewer (applicable to the categories of Addition and Deletion)

Meso = Revisions of 6 to 9 words (applicable to the categories of Addition, Deletion, Rewriting)

Major = Revisions of 10 plus words (applicable to the categories of Addition, Deletion, Rewriting)

The **Rewriting** category is reserved for either **Meso** or **Major** revisions

Adapted from Harwood (2018)

Please note that the following descriptors apply to both in-text and comment section interventions. However, some interventions only apply to those made in the comments section and this has been specified where relevant.

1) ADDITION *numbers 1 to 3 and the examples below are from Harwood (2018, p. 517)*

1. Addition of words, phrases, or sentences – minor (5 words or fewer)
2. Addition of words, phrases, or sentences – meso (6 to 9 words)
3. Addition of words, phrases, or sentences – major (10 plus words)

Examples

Original: *in second language*

Proofread text: *in **a** second language*

Original: *opinions of the effort*

Proofread text: *opinions of the **amount of** effort*

4. Advice to add more information – (*from my piloting/analysis*) this applies to comments-only interventions, for instance when the proofreader has advised the student that more information needs to be added but the number of words is unknown. Examples include but are not limited to instances where the proofreader has:
 - i. advised the student that a sentence is incomplete;
 - ii. noted that a citation needs to be added to support a claim; and/or
 - iii. indicated that more information is needed to provide greater clarity e.g., through the use of a question mark or by advising the student that the text is ambiguous/unclear. N.B. If the proofreader also provides a suggested piece of text, the word count would be apparent. Therefore, such an intervention would be coded under 1.1, 1.2 or 1.3 depending on the number of words.

2) DELETION *numbers 1 to 3 and the examples below are from Harwood (2018, p. 517)*

1. Subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences – minor (5 words or fewer)
2. Subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences – meso (6 to 9 words)
3. Subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences – major (10 plus words)

Examples

Original: *received **the** equal results*

Proofread text: *received equal results*

Original: *53 new students **were** acted as participants*

Proofread text: *53 new students acted as participants*

3) SUBSTITUTION *This category was adapted from Harwood (2018, p. 517) which includes his subcategories below of numbers 1, 4, and 5. All other subcategories are based on my piloting/analysis*

The substitution or replacement of one word in the writer's text that falls under the following subcategories:

1. verb tense e.g., *design* → *designed*
2. form e.g., *creative* → *creation*
3. preposition e.g., *at* → *in*
4. number errors, such as replacement of nouns erroneously thought by the writer to be countable

with the correct uncountable equivalent e.g., *feedbacks* → *feedback*

5. agreement e.g., *both group received* → *both groups received*
6. informal to formal form e.g., *get* → *obtain*; *did a task* → *completed a task*
7. a new word entirely e.g., *that* → *on*
8. American English to British English spelling e.g., *analyze* → *analyse*
9. Miscellaneous – any other form of substitution not already mentioned above.

4) STRUCTURAL EDITING *Point 1 is from Harwood (2018, p. 518). Points 2 to 5 were adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 168) structural editing tasks: T46, T47, T48 and T49 respectively. Point 6 was added based on my piloting/analysis.*

1. Repositioning of words, phrases, or sentences

Examples

Original:	<i>then teacher would give</i>
Proofread	<i>teacher would then give</i>
Original:	<i>no tutorial combined</i>
Proofread text:	<i>no combined tutorial</i>

2. Reordering/repositioning of an entire paragraph to ensure that the argument is logically structured.
3. Reordering/repositioning sections or larger units to ensure that the argument is logically structured; sections or larger units refer to text which is in excess of a single paragraph.
4. Inserting or changing paragraph breaks in order to create a more logical structure.
5. Inserting/creating textual 'guideposts' to help the reader orientate him-/herself in the text.
6. Moving text to another chapter.

5) REWRITING *The descriptors and examples below are adapted from Harwood (2018, p. 518)*

1. Replacement of 6 to 9 (meso) consecutive words in the writer's text OR the replacement of the writer's text by 6 to 9 (meso) consecutive words by the proofreader.
2. Replacement of 10 plus (major) consecutive words in the writer's text OR the replacement of 10 plus (major) new consecutive words by the proofreader.

Examples (with 6 words)

Original:	<i>It is easily to see that</i>
Proofread text:	<i>As we might expect</i>

[= replacement of 6 consecutive words of writer's original text]

Original:	<i>a positive effect on students' rewrite</i>
Proofread text:	<i>a positive effect on the quality of the revised piece</i>

[= replacement of writer's original text by 6 consecutive words by proofreader]

6) RECOMBINING *The descriptor and example below are from Harwood (2018, p. 518)*

Combining of one or more sentences, or division of one sentence into two or more sentences.

Example

Original:	<i>equal results, that is to say</i>
Proofread text:	<i>equal results. Thus,</i>

7) MECHANICAL ALTERATION

1. **Punctuation** *from Harwood (2018, p. 518). Points 1 and 2 were added from my piloting/analysis.*

1. If the proofreader replaces a full stop with a comma this would be counted as 7.1 mechanical alteration – punctuation. The fact that the following word would change from beginning with an upper to lower-case letter is not counted as an intervention because it is a natural consequence of the change in punctuation rather than an error on the student writer's part

e.g., currency. Namely → currency, namely. The same applies to the opposite i.e., a comma being replaced by a full stop which would result in the following word beginning with an upper instead of a lower-case letter e.g., currency, namely → currency. Namely

2. If the proofreader adds in a word such as ‘however’ that naturally needs to be followed by a comma, this is coded as 1.1 addition only. The comma is not coded as this is a consequence of adding the word (however) and not due to any error on the student’s part.

2. **Spelling** from *Harwood (2018, p. 518) including typos from my piloting/analysis*

3. **Numbering** from *my piloting/analysis*

Examples include but are not limited to:

- i. a number e.g., 5 being replaced with another number e.g., 6; for when the student has erroneously written the same number (5) twice in the same sentence;
- ii. listing numbers under ten in word form and those above as numerals;
- iii. chapter numbers being written in number rather than word form i.e., Chapter four becomes Chapter 4;
- iv. incorrect use of decimal points; and
- v. incorrect cross-referencing of numbering e.g., the student writer mentions the number seven but in another part of the text shows a calculation of three plus five thus making eight instead of seven.

4. **Capitalisation**

Changing a lower-case letter to an upper case/capital letter and vice versa. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T9 copy-editing*

This subcategory also encompasses capitalisation in regard to referencing style guidelines e.g., APA. *From my piloting/analysis*

5. **Abbreviations, Acronyms & Ampersands**

1. Changes to abbreviations. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T6 copyediting*
2. Changes to acronyms. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T6 copyediting*
3. Replacing an ampersand in the text with ‘and’. *From my piloting/analysis*

6. **Font Type and Font Size** *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p.167) T22 copyediting*

7. **Text Layout and Appearance**

1. Correcting to ensure consistency in terms of layout. *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T17 copyediting*
2. Doing document layout and design. *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T28 copyediting*
3. Correcting to ensure that there are no widows or orphans *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T25 copyediting*
4. Correcting running heads where applicable. *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T24 copyediting*

8. **Headings** *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T12 copyediting and based on my piloting/analysis*

This subcategory concerns headings in regard to numbering (including punctuation such as full stops after numbers) and style; the subcategory can also include proofreader suggestions to add a heading.

9. **Correlating Parts**

1. Correcting to ensure consistency in terms of cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, and the table of contents. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T11 copyediting*

2. Checking to ensure that page numbers are correct and consecutive. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) T20 copyediting*

10. Citations and References

1. Correcting referencing style for in-text references. *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167): T13 copyediting*
2. Correcting to ensure that all references in the text appear in the bibliography/reference list, and that all sources in the bibliography/reference list are referenced in the text. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167): T14 copyediting*
3. Correcting bibliography/reference list in accordance with the prescribed house style. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167): T15 copyediting*
4. Correcting, where necessary, bibliographical/reference list information for accuracy. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167): T16 copyediting*

11. **Misc.** for any other miscellaneous forms of mechanical alteration not mentioned in this category
Based on my piloting/analysis.

8) MEANING AND CONTENT

1. Correcting words that have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning. *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 167) T5 copyediting*
2. Checking for plagiarism and alerting the author (in the case of my research this would be the student writer). *From Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 168) T63 content editing*
3. Alerting the author to text which could be judgemental. *Adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 168) T65 content editing*

- 9) **ERRONEOUS CORRECTIONS** *Based on Rebeck (2014, p. 11) and Harwood (2018, p. 500) who report that some proofreaders introduced errors into a text.*
Instances where the proofreader has modified the text incorrectly.

10) PHATIC COMMUNICATION *Based on my piloting/analysis*

1. Positive comments where the proofreader provides the student writer with encouragement.
2. Comments which are forms of interaction/communication with the student writer but do not involve any changes to the text. For example, the proofreader makes a joke about a possible word that was said by a participant in the student writer's study which was written as XXX. Such forms of communication serve no proofreading or pedagogic purpose but act as a type of 'chat' between the proofreader and student.

11) WEB LINKS TO ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INSTRUCTION *Based on my piloting/analysis*

This category applies to comments only interventions and are instances where the proofreader provides the student with web links to additional sources of material that could serve an educational purpose.

- 12) **NON-INTERVENTION** *Based on Harwood (2018, p. 522) who reports that some proofreaders will only correct language and not content.*
Instances where the proofreader appears not to make changes to erroneous parts of a text.

13) EDITING METHODS *Points 1-6 are from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 163), and point 7 is from Cottier (2017, p. 61)*

1. Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function, and letting the author decide which suggested changes to accept/reject electronically.
2. Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, without tracking changes (i.e., returning a print-ready document back to the author of the dissertation/thesis).
3. Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function and providing the author with a hard-copy print format of the electronically edited

document, and letting the author input the suggested changes him-/herself, without doing a proofread of the final document.

4. Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function and providing the author with a hard-copy print format of the electronically edited document, letting the author input the suggested changes him-/herself and then doing a proofread of the final document.
5. Editing by hand on hard copy, and letting the author input corrections, without checking input corrections.
6. Editing by hand on hard copy, letting the author input corrections, and doing a proofread to check that the corrections have been input correctly.
7. Editing electronically in a word processing programming like Microsoft Word, using the change-tracking function, and returning two versions of the document to the student – one with the changes and comments showing (so the student can see the changes if desired) and one with the changes accepted (i.e., a print ready document).

14) METHODS OF RAISING QUERIES AND COMMENTS *Points 1-3 are from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 164) and Point 4 is from Cottier (2017, p. 61)*

1. Listing queries and comments in a separate document (either handwritten or electronically).
2. Using the comments function in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word to add queries and comments directly to the edited document.
3. Writing queries and comments on the hard-copy edited document or using stick-on notes to add queries and comments to the hard-copy edited document.
4. Typing queries and comments directly into the edited document but not using the comments function (e.g. typing in different-coloured text or highlighted text).

3.3.2 Student Pre-Interview Task and Procedure

Once I completed the textual analysis of the writing drafts, the students were sent a pre-interview task which was based on research undertaken by Harwood (2018), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and Willey and Tanimoto (2012) (see Figure 6) that asked students whether the changes made to their texts were ethically appropriate or not. The reason for having a pre-interview task was to provide the students with a succinct exercise that focused on specific areas of my taxonomy with examples from the student's own text so as to ensure relevance and authenticity. Furthermore, by having a pre-interview task, I endeavoured to allow student participants with possibly lower levels of English sufficient time to gather their thoughts and reflect upon interventions so that they would be ready to discuss each one at interview. In categories of the pre-interview task where no interventions had been made to a student's text, I asked the participant to refer to descriptors for each category during the interview rather than providing my own examples as they may have had little relevance or context for the student. Identifying specific parts of the text to discuss also allowed me to focus on such areas when interviewing the proofreader and lecturers.

From piloting the student pre-interview task with my Chinese student, I found that I needed to better define ‘ethically appropriate’ changes as in the majority of cases the student tended to explain why the change was made rather than providing reasons as to the ethical appropriacy of such interventions; this adjustment was reflected in the instructions on how to complete the survey where I specified that in the case of my research, ethically appropriate means that the student feels that the type of changes the proofreader made to their work are acceptable based on their opinion of the help that a student can receive from a proofreader in writing for assessment. Whilst piloting, I also realised that the number of different types of possible interventions that corresponded to my taxonomy for substitution could have been overwhelming and time-consuming for a student to consider as I had included seven different intervention subcategories. As such, I decided to limit the number of forms of intervention to two examples for substitution and the similarly lengthy mechanical alteration category. In order to address the remaining subcategories for both substitution and mechanical alteration, I showed the students a list of possible forms of intervention in each subcategory during the interview and asked the participants to discuss any which they found to be ethically unacceptable. Regarding the Mexican student participant, I decided not to send the pre-interview task as the proofreader had only noted eleven comments using the Track changes function. Instead, I chose to discuss ethically appropriate changes with the student in question during the interview itself. However, during the interview, when analysing example forms of intervention which I had taken from Harwood (2018, pp. 517-518) to compensate for the lack of interventions in the student’s work, the student advised me post-interview that a brief pre-interview task with such examples would have been helpful. This advice from the student confirmed my decision to always send a student pre-interview task and use examples adapted from Harwood (2018, pp. 517-518) if necessary.

Finally, on 1st December 2020, I sent my EdD student the pre-interview task and made another notable update to said task whereby I added in part A in which students are asked a number of background questions regarding their proofreader. Such questions saved time during the interview and allowed me to probe any responses where relevant. I received the aforementioned completed student pre-interview

task on 4th December 2020 and found the inclusion of part A to be very useful in helping me determine the experience that a student has with their proofreader in order to address research question 1.

Figure 6 Student Pre-Interview Task



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Survey Regarding The Interventions A Proofreader Makes To A Student's Text

Thank you very much for participating in my research. Your thoughts and perceptions are greatly appreciated and will contribute considerably to my studies.

Instructions on how to complete the survey

The survey asks you to decide which types of proofread interventions you think are ethically appropriate and the reasons why; interventions can be changes or suggestions made by the proofreader. For my research, ethically appropriate means that the interventions made to your writing are acceptable based on your opinion of the help a student can receive from a proofreader for work to be assessed at undergraduate/postgraduate/doctoral level. To complete the survey:

1. Please note your answers for part A that concern your proofreader in the space provided.
2. For part B concerning the proofreader's interventions:
 - a. read the definition in bold for each section;
 - b. look at your original text and the proofreader's version in the table for each section;
 - c. look at the first example of the intervention made to your writing in the proofread version;
 - d. decide if you think it is ethically appropriate or not;
 - e. write your answer next to number 1 in the part that asks 'Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?'; and
 - f. repeat the above process with the other examples in each section.

If anything is not clear or you have questions about the survey, please contact the researcher, Fiona Richards, at fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Part A – Your Proofreader

- 1) **How did you come into contact with your proofreader?**

- 2) **How many times have you consulted your proofreader?**

- 3) **What is your relationship with your proofreader? (e.g., coursemate, friend, family member, partner, professional proofreader etc.)**

- 4) **Please could you specify whether the proofreading service was paid or unpaid? *You can leave this question blank if you prefer not to answer.***

- 5) **If you are happy to answer question 4 and you noted that you did not pay to have your work proofread, could you specify whether you would be willing to pay for a proofreading service? Again, if you prefer to not answer, you can leave this question blank.**
-

Part B – Proofreader Interventions

- 1) **ADDITION- this means that words, phrases or sentences have been added by the proofreader to your text.**

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

- 2) **DELETION- this means that the proofreader has deleted words, phrases, or sentences from your text.**

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

- 3) **SUBSTITUTION-this means that the proofreader has either:**
1. replaced 1 to 5 consecutive words of your original text; or
 2. replaced your text with 1 to 5 new consecutive words.

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

- 4) **REORDERING – this means that the proofreader has moved words, phrases or sentences in your text.**

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

5) STRUCTURAL EDITING -this means that the proofreader has:

1. reordered a paragraph or paragraphs to ensure that the argument is logically structured;
2. reordered sections or larger units to ensure that the argument is logically structured;
3. inserted or changed paragraph breaks (a single line space or indentation) in order to create more logical structure;
4. inserted or created textual ‘guideposts’ to help the reader orientate him/herself in the text e.g. ‘*However, Therefore, Furthermore etc.*’; or
5. moved sections of a text to another chapter.

Your original text	The proofreader’s version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

6) REWRITING - this means that the proofreader has either:

1. replaced 6 or more consecutive words of your text with new words; or
2. replaced words from your text with 6 or more consecutive new words.

Your original text	The proofreader’s version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

7) RECOMBINING -this means that the proofreader has either combined one or more sentences or divided one sentence into two or more sentences.

Your original text	The proofreader’s version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

8) MECHANICAL ALTERATION-this means that the proofreader has made formatting or cosmetic changes that do not affect meaning.

Your original text	The proofreader’s version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

9) MEANING AND CONTENT - this means that the proofreader has:

1. corrected words which have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning; and/or
2. alerted you to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental.

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.

10) ADVICE TO ADD MORE INFORMATION - this means that the proofreader has given advice to:

- 1. add more information;**
- 2. add more information and a suggestion was provided;**
- 3. add information to support a claim; or**
- 4. add information to provide greater clarity.**

Your original text	The proofreader's version
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

Are the interventions made to your text ethically appropriate? Why/Why not?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

The student pre-interview task is based on the works of the following authors:

Harwood, N. (2018) 'What do proofreaders of student writing do to a master's essay? Differing interventions, worrying findings', *Written Communication*, 35(4), pp. 474-530.

Kruger, H. and A. Bevan-Dye. (2010) 'Guidelines for the editing of dissertations and theses: A survey of editors' perceptions' *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 28(2), pp. 153-169.

Willey, I., and K. Tanimoto. (2012) "'Convenience Editing' in action: Comparing English teachers' and medical professionals' revisions of a medical abstract', *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, pp. 249-260.

3.3.3 Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures

For the third part of my data collection process, I conducted semi-structured interviews in order to address my research questions detailed in section 2.5 of the literature review. I specifically chose semi-structured interviews rather than unstructured or structured formats as Kvale (1996, p. 27) advises that in order to ensure an interview does not follow the unstructured format of a free-flowing exchange of ideas similar to a conversation nor an exceptionally controlled line of questioning, a semi-structured style of interviewing allows the interviewer to concentrate on specific subject matters with the aid of

prepared questions. This view is supported by Leavy (2014, p. 286) who states that semi-structured rather than structured interviews allow for the development of knowledge through discussions that permit the interviewer to probe in greater depth areas of importance from the perspective of the interviewee. Furthermore, Leavy advises that semi-structured interviews allow the researcher more opportunity to be viewed as suitably informed rather than being script dependent and that the interview can be more easily directed by the researcher to areas of importance within the study. In regard to recording the interviews, I initially used audio devices for my two pilot student interviews and my two lecturer pilot interviews. Depending on whether the participants consented, I later decided to video record my interviews through Google Meet interviews as a form of back up in case the audio recordings contained inaudible words. Even though I decided to video record the interviews, I chose not to focus on non-verbal cues as I would not have had enough time to analyse such data. Furthermore, some participants may not have wished to have been video recorded so this type of data could not be used across my thesis. Concerning the transcription of my interviews, I used ELAN software (Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive, 2020). I made this decision as it was software available through my University's IT services and therefore deemed to be a reputable program to upload the audio recordings and transcribe the interviews. In order to protect the identity of my participants, I ensured that I only saved the ELAN transcriptions on my university drives and an encrypted USB stick. To ensure the reliability and validity of my semi-structured interviews, participants were provided with transcripts of the audio-recordings (Koulouriotis, 2011, p. 5) upon request to account for any uncertainty that may have arisen but not been discussed during the interview. Finally, the participants were advised that they could email me at any time post-interview in order to arrange a meeting to discuss concerns.

The subsections below describe the schedules and procedures for the student, proofreader, and lecturer participants' semi-structured interviews in which I adapted questions, prompt cards, and intervention descriptors from the research of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and Harwood (2018). Before commencing, I wish to advise the reader that once the interviews had been completed, I spent time contemplating the interactions which occurred and noted my observations in

research diaries. The purpose of the research diaries was to account for interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but which added an important context when analysing the data recorded (Kvale, 1996, pp. 128-129). My diary entries were semi-structured in design and modelled on that of Altrichter and Holly (2005, p. 30). The templates used for my research with the students, proofreaders, and lecturers followed the same numbering and questioning pattern as that of the interview schedules which will be discussed in the next subsections. Each table had three columns as follows: 1) the first detailed stretches of recording which I wanted to further pursue in a subsequent interview; 2) the second concerned my interpretation of said stretches of recording; and 3) the third was reserved for researcher questions which arose from completing the interpretation section of the diary. Questions that arose were then asked at a future interview and the following is one such example. Hence, in Sarah's first interview, I asked whether it is a good idea to always use a proofreader and subsequently noted her reply as follows in the first column of my research diary: 'Erm so I think I don't see anything wrong with having a proofreader for a dissertation, but yeah for the dissertation when you're engaging with knowledge. I think something like a little essay in the summer school when they're looking at whether you can manage or not then no, cos that can be quite deceiving erm but yeah when we're not, I'm not being assessed on my ability to write in English.' In the second column of my diary, I made the following observation based on Sarah's reply: Having a proofreader can be beneficial depending on the type of text. As a researcher, I need to identify if the student thinks having a proofreader can be beneficial at different stages of the writing process in cases where third-party help would be acceptable. Finally, in the third column of the diary, I prepared a question for the second interview in which I asked: 'In our first interview, in reference to always using a proofreader, you mentioned that it can be beneficial for certain types of texts such as a dissertation. In your opinion, would it be helpful for a student to have a proofreader at each stage of the writing process or only at the end?'. I found the research diaries straightforward and easy to complete and they allowed me to effectively probe further into participant responses. Having provided the background to my interviews, I will now describe each one for Sarah, Jane, Michael, and Emily.

3.3.3.1 Student Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures

To address the three student research questions detailed in section 2.5 of the literature review, I began by piloting my student interview schedules with the Chinese and Mexican students, and I have detailed below salient issues that arose. Firstly, for the Chinese student's interview on 30th April 2020, she initially focused on the grammatical nature of the changes that the proofreader made when asked to discuss the ethical appropriacy of the proofreading interventions which was to be expected as she did the same during the student pre-interview task (see subsection 3.3.2). Therefore, I had to ask further questions to determine her view of the ethical appropriacy of interventions and the student more readily commented on the reasons why she thought the proofreader changes were appropriate as the interview progressed. For the interview schedule that I used with the Mexican student on 25th June 2020, issues arose regarding a question in which the student was asked to comment on proofreader interventions that she had declined to accept. The student advised me post-interview that she was uncomfortable being shown her submitted proofread work and did not want to see it again once it had been handed in. Therefore, I decided for future interviews to not show the student their work in its entirety but instead displayed no more than three or four changes that were declined in tabular form on a prompt card. However, based on my supervisor's feedback regarding this issue, I also decided to have the entire paper to hand should the student wish to see in context the change they declined to make. Through my piloting, I was able to produce a schedule which I used for Sarah's first interview on 11th December 2020 that was split into three parts as will now be discussed.

Part one focused on research question 1 concerning a student's experience with their proofreader, and research question 2 in regard to how a student perceives the role of their proofreader. As such, the interview questions asked Sarah to discuss: 1) her experience of consulting a proofreader; 2) any negative experiences with another proofreader; 3) a term or terms that describe the type of help Sarah sought i.e., proofreading, error correction, language correction, text improvement, text editing, writing tutorial or other (adapted from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, p. 186); 4) whether Sarah believed it is a good idea to always use a proofreader and the reasons; 5) to what extent Sarah agreed that feedback from a proofreader helped improve her writing skills by indicating on a five-point Likert

scale whether she strongly agreed, agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 6) in which specific areas Sarah felt her writing had improved with the help of a proofreader, covering spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, word structure, word order, sentence structure, paragraph structure, organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs, academic register, content, line of argumentation, formatting and presentation of text, referencing, and any other areas (adapted from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, pp. 187-188); and 7) if there were other areas of Sarah's writing in which she wanted to receive more help from the proofreader.

The second part of the interview focused on research question 2 concerning the ethical appropriacy of a range of proofreader interventions. Therefore, Sarah was asked to discuss the ethical appropriacy of the interventions made to her literature review based on the student pre-interview task responses which allowed me to determine how she perceived the role of the proofreader. In addition, Sarah was asked to discuss any other areas where ethically appropriate changes could or could not be made, and to comment on examples from her text in which she declined to make the proofreader's suggested changes. Finally, for the third part of the interview which addressed research question 3 concerning a student's awareness of the University's proofreading guidelines, I asked Sarah to discuss: 1) her awareness of the University's proofreading policies; 2) whether she had been informed by a member of staff about proofreading practices; and 3) what she believed the University can do to best advise all stakeholders of the type of help that can be afforded in regard to writing help.

Having conducted the first interview with Sarah, I later held two further interviews on 5th February 2021 and 15th April 2021. The schedules for the second and third interviews did not include questions 2, 3 and 4 of part one or questions 1 and 3 of part three as they had already been sufficiently addressed. As such, I have detailed below the revised schedules for the second and third interviews.

For the second interview, I asked Sarah to discuss the following in part one: 1) her experience of consulting a proofreader since our first interview, 2) whether it would be helpful to have a proofreader at each stage of the writing process or only at the end as she had mentioned in our first interview that it

can be beneficial to have a proofreader for certain types of texts such as a dissertation; 3) if her opinion remained the same as the first interview in that she neither agreed or disagreed that a proofreader can help improve a student's writing skills; 4) whether there were any additional areas from our first interview where she felt her writing had improved with the help of a proofreader i.e., spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, word structure, word order, sentence structure, paragraph structure, organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs, academic register, content, line of argumentation, formatting and presentation of text, referencing, and any other areas (adapted from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, pp. 187-188). For part two, from analysing Sarah's pre-interview task that was based on her findings chapter, I had already gathered sufficient information concerning her ethical perspectives of proofreading interventions in areas of addition, substitution, rewriting, mechanical alteration, and advice to add more information. Therefore, in the interview, I only required Sarah to provide further clarity in areas of deletion, reordering, and structural editing. In addition, I asked Sarah to discuss her reasons for declining to make certain proofreader suggestions. Finally, for the third part, Sarah was asked if she had been informed by a member of staff about proofreading practices since our first interview.

Regarding Sarah's third interview, I asked her to discuss the following in part one: 1) her experience of consulting a proofreader since our second interview; 2) whether there were any additional areas from our second interview where she felt her writing had improved with the help of a proofreader i.e., spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, word structure, word order, sentence structure, paragraph structure, organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs, academic register, content, line of argumentation, formatting and presentation of text, referencing, and any other areas (adapted from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, pp. 187-188); and 3) the extent to which Sarah felt having a proofreader had helped improve her writing when looking at the thesis as a whole in which I asked her to consider the same areas mentioned in question 2 i.e., spelling, punctuation, etc. For the second part, I referred to our first interview in which Sarah and I discussed the ethical appropriacy of meaning and content changes in regard to correcting words which have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning which was from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167) copy editing task 5, and alerting the

writer to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental that was adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 168) content editing task 65. To expand on this area of meaning and content, I asked Sarah questions regarding the ethical appropriacy of a proofreader making interventions in the following areas which were also from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 167-168) content editing tasks 60, 61, 62, and 63: 1) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary, at paragraph level (I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'addition' category of my taxonomy); 2) rewriting sections to improve content; 3) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content, at paragraph level (I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'deletion' category of my taxonomy); and 4) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author. Finally, for the third part, Sarah was asked questions in relation to the third proofreader interview in which Jane and I had discussed the feasibility of in-house and outsourced proofreading services. Hence, I asked Sarah to discuss: 1) her thoughts on the University providing an in-house proofreading service for instance through the Writing Advisory or Study Skills Services; and 2) her opinions on the university outsourcing proofreading services to an external company.

3.3.3.2 Proofreader Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures

I was unable to pilot the proofreader interview schedule as my Chinese and Mexican students' proofreaders did not participate in the study. However, from having developed my student interview schedule, I was able to build upon this framework and devise the questions detailed below for my first interview with Jane on 18th December 2020 in order to address the proofreader research questions detailed in section 2.5 of the literature review.

For the first part of the interview, my questions sought to determine Jane's proofreading background to have a fuller picture that complemented my research questions and give further insight into the profile of proofreaders currently working on student texts at the University. As such, I asked the following questions which were adapted from those used by Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009, pp. 186-187) and Harwood (2018, pp. 508-509): 1) the description that best fits Jane's role as a proofreader which was shown via a prompt card with categories of i) a professional proofreader who works either for a

company or on a freelance basis; ii) a student who proofreads coursemates' work; iii) both a student and a professional proofreader; and iv) none of the aforementioned (if Jane had chosen this fourth option, I would have asked her to provide details as to how she describes her proofreading role); 2) the number of texts that Jane proofreads a month (if fewer than one text a month she would have been asked how many she proofread a year); 3) the reasons why she proofreads with categories of: i) on a fee-paying basis; ii) as a favour to a friend; iii) to help a family member; iv) to help her own student(s); v) as part of a service offered by a university department; and vi) other; 4) the subject areas Jane specialises in when proofreading; and 5) the types of texts Jane has proofread such as: i) undergraduate term assignments; ii) postgraduate (MA/MSc) term assignments; iii) undergraduate dissertations; iv) postgraduate (MA/MSc) dissertations; v) MPhil student level texts; vi) PhD student level texts; and vii) articles, chapters, or books which students wish to publish.

For the next stage of the interview, I asked Jane to discuss the interventions that were or were not made to a text and how she perceived her role in order to address research questions 4, 5, and 6. As such, I showed Jane excerpts from Sarah's literature review that were the same as those shown for her (Sarah's) student pre-interview task. I asked Jane to comment on why she did or did not make changes for each category and the ethical appropriacy of each one. As with the student interviews, by commenting on the ethical appropriacy of each category, this allowed me to determine how a proofreader perceives their role. Following this, I asked Jane to discuss whether there were any additional changes and instances of non-intervention in the student's overall text that she would like to speak about. Next, in order to address research question 7 concerning the type of request that proofreaders receive when contacted by a student, I asked Jane: 1) what type of proofreading requests students usually make: 2) if she finds them to be ethically appropriate; and 3) how the situation was managed if a request was deemed inappropriate. I also asked Jane whether she usually communicates with Sarah by email, phone, or face-to-face throughout the proofreading process; if communication did occur, I asked three additional questions regarding the frequency of such communication, the type of things discussed, and whether Jane meets up with Sarah post-proofreading and again what issues are discussed.

To address research question 8 concerning the extent to which proofreaders advise lecturers of the changes made to a student text, I asked Jane to discuss 1) whether lecturers are advised that she has proofread a student's text; 2) if Jane liaises with a student's lecturer regarding the types and number of changes that are made to a text; and 3) whether there have ever been any disagreements on the part of lecturers regarding the type and number of interventions made. Finally, to address research question 9 regarding a proofreader's awareness of the University's proofreading guidelines, I asked Jane to discuss her awareness of the University's proofreading policy and what recommendations she would provide to advise all stakeholders of the help that students can receive with their writing.

Similarly to Sarah, I conducted two further interviews with Jane on 12th February 2021 and 13th April 2021. The subsequent interviews were shorter in length as many of my research questions had been addressed in the initial interview. Indeed, I omitted questions regarding Jane's proofreader background, the types of student request that she receives, communication with Sarah's supervisor, and advice Jane would give the University concerning proofreading practices. As such, the revised schedules will now be detailed.

For the second interview, in part one I asked Jane to discuss the interventions she made to Sarah's findings chapter in areas of addition, deletion, substitution, reordering, structural editing, rewriting, mechanical alteration, and advice to add more information. For the second part, Jane was asked to further discuss a question from our first interview concerning meeting a student post-proofreading. Jane had initially replied that she does not meet students and communicates via the computer. As such, I asked Jane in our second interview if there was any particular reason why she chooses to communicate with her students through the computer and if she would ever consider having a meeting with a student post-proofreading. Finally, for the third part of the interview, I asked Jane if she had become aware of any information that the University provides regarding students having a proofreader since our last interview.

Regarding the third interview, for part one I asked questions that had arisen in our second interview concerning intervention categories of deletion and mechanical alteration. As such, when discussing deletion in our second interview, Jane had mentioned that she does not guarantee students a word count because she views it as a form of editing. Therefore, I asked Jane whether she adheres to a set of guidelines to help distinguish proofreading and editing. Concerning mechanical alteration, Jane had mentioned in our second interview that there are many students with an IELTS six doing a PhD at a UK university and this means that she has to go above and beyond what would be classified as traditional proofreading such as rephrasing a sentence. As such, I asked Jane to define traditional proofreading and the type of help she may need to provide L2 students, and if there were any other areas where she would need to help an L2 student who had an average IELTS score. For the second part, I referred to our first interview in which Jane and I discussed the ethical appropriacy of meaning and content changes in regard to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental which was based on Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p.168) content editing task 65. To expand on this area of meaning and content, I asked Jane questions regarding the ethical appropriacy of a proofreader making interventions in the following areas which were from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 167-168) editing tasks 5, 60, 61, 62, and 63: 1) correcting words which have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning; 2) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary, at paragraph level (recall that I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'addition' category of my taxonomy); 3) rewriting sections to improve content; 4) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level (recall that I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'deletion' category of my taxonomy); and 5) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author. Regarding part 3 of the interview, Jane was asked to discuss questions concerning the extent to which Sarah had shown improvement when viewing her thesis as a whole by focusing on specific areas of spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, word structure, word order, sentence structure, paragraph structure, organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs, academic register, content, line of argumentation, formatting and presentation of text, referencing, and any other areas (adapted from Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, pp. 187-188). Finally, for the fourth part of the interview, Jane was asked questions about her proofreading company that she mentioned in her first interview. Questions concerned: 1) the reasons for choosing the company; 2)

whether training is provided; 3) if guidelines or an ethics code need to be adhered to when proofreading university students' work; and 4) the feasibility of having an in-house proofreading service or whether it would be better to outsource to an external company such as her own.

3.3.3.3 Lecturer Semi-Structured Interviews and Procedures

To address the four lecturer research questions detailed in section 2.5 of the literature review, I conducted semi-structured interviews with lecturers who were not the student's supervisor in order to ensure anonymity. Regarding the pilot interviews which were conducted with two lecturers on 26th and 27th May 2020, I will discuss salient issues which arose after having presented the format of the interviews that I used for my actual data collection. Hence, for my data collection, I conducted three interviews with two senior lecturers (Michael and Emily) using Sarah's proofread texts on the following dates: 1) Michael on 3rd February 2020, 18th March 2021, and 23rd April 2021; and 2) Emily on 9th and 19th March 2021 and 16th April 2021.

In order to address research question 10 that assesses how lecturers perceive a range of proofreader interventions in terms of ethical appropriacy and how they perceive the role of the proofreader, part one asked participants to discuss the ethical appropriacy of proofreader changes by presenting excerpts of the interventions that were or were not made to the student's text from Sarah's pre-interview task. Following this, I asked the lecturers if there were any other types of interventions which were different to the ones discussed where they thought changes could or could not be made. As with the student and proofreader interviews, the lecturers were able to evidence their view of the role of the proofreader through the changes which they did or did not find to be ethically appropriate. For the second part of the interview and to further address research question 10, I showed the lecturers several pages of Sarah's text in order to have a sense of the scale of changes made and I asked if they thought the number of interventions were ethically appropriate or not. I also asked the lecturers to comment on examples of non-intervention and to discuss their thoughts in this area.

To address research questions 11 regarding the extent to which lecturers endorse proofreading practices and 12 that assesses to what extent a lecturer is advised of the interventions made to a student's text, part three asked lecturers to discuss: 1) whether they advised their students to use proofreading services and the reasons; 2) to what extent lecturers agreed that students should be allowed to consult professional proofreading services and non-professional proofreaders such as fellow coursemates, friends and family; 3) to what extent lecturers agreed that students would benefit from consulting professional proofreading services and non-professional proofreaders such as fellow coursemates and friends/family by indicating on a five-point Likert scale whether they strongly agreed, agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 4) the terms that best described the type of help that students should seek if they do procure third-party help with categories of proofreading, error correction, language correction, text improvement, text editing, writing tutorial, and other (based on Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2009, p. 186); 5) whether the lecturer had ever been advised by a proofreader as to the type and amount of intervention made to a student's text; and 6) if lecturers agreed with the type of help that had been provided or whether they found it to be problematic. Finally, for part four of the interview that addresses research question 13 regarding lecturers' awareness of the University's proofreading guidelines, the participants were asked to discuss their awareness of such policies and whether any directives or training had been provided. I also asked what recommendations the lecturers would provide to the University regarding the help that students can receive with their writing. As with Sarah and Jane, the second and third interviews with Michael and Emily were shorter in length as I omitted parts three and four of the interview format detailed above because many of my research questions had been addressed in the initial interview. As such, the revised schedules for the second and third interviews will be presented below.

For the second interviews, in part one, Michael and Emily were asked to discuss the ethical appropriacy of interventions Jane had made to Sarah's findings chapter in areas of addition, deletion, substitution, reordering, structural editing, rewriting, mechanical alteration, and advice to add more information. For part two, Michael and Emily discussed the interventions Jane had made to three pages of Sarah's findings chapter to have a sense of the scale of changes made and whether they thought that the number

of interventions were ethically appropriate or not. Further, the lecturers were asked to discuss instances of non-intervention. The third part of the interview had different questions for Michael and Emily. As such, Michael was asked to expand on an issue he mentioned in his first interview concerning students benefiting from proofreading services in which he said there should be input from the students when changes are made to their text. Therefore, I asked Michael if he thought that students could benefit from face-to-face or online consultations with their proofreader throughout the proofreading process and/or post-proofreading. Michael was also asked if he had become aware of any information that the University had provided regarding students having a proofreader since our last interview. With regard to Emily, her question referred to our first interview in which she mentioned that it worries her if students blindly apply proofreader changes. Therefore, I asked Emily if she thought it would be beneficial for students to have a face-to-face meeting with the proofreader to discuss the changes made throughout the proofreading process and/or post-proofreading.

Concerning the third interviews, Michael and Emily's schedules were different for the first part. As such, Michael was asked to discuss an issue mentioned in our second interview regarding the mechanical alteration category in which he would distinguish citations and references from categories such as spelling and punctuation. Therefore, I asked Michael to comment on the ethical appropriacy of a proofreader intervening in the following areas which were adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 167) copy editing tasks 13, 14, 15, and 16: 1) correcting referencing style for in-text references; 2) correcting to ensure that all references in the text appear in the bibliography/reference list, and that all sources in the bibliography/reference list are referenced in the text; 3) correcting the bibliography/reference list in accordance with the prescribed house style; and 4) correcting, where necessary, bibliographical/reference list information for accuracy. For Emily's first part of her third interview, she had mentioned in the second interview that the use of apostrophes is an area of proofreading intervention that should be considered so I accordingly asked her to expand. In addition, when viewing the text as a whole in our second interview to have a sense of the number of changes made, Emily stated that there was a difference between a developmental editor and proofreader which I also asked her to elaborate upon. The second part of the interview was the same for Michael and Emily

and I referred to our first interview in which we discussed the ethical appropriacy of meaning and content changes in regard to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental. To expand on this area of meaning and content, I asked the lecturers questions regarding the ethical appropriacy of a proofreader making interventions in the following areas which were adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 167-168) editing tasks 5, 60, 61, 62, and 63: 1) correcting words which have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning; 2) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary, at paragraph level (recall that I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'addition' category of my taxonomy); 3) rewriting sections to improve content; 4) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level (recall that I added 'at paragraph level' to distinguish it from the 'deletion' category of my taxonomy); and 5) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author. Finally, for the third part, this was also the same for both lecturers in which I asked questions in relation to the third proofreader interview where Jane and myself discussed the feasibility of in-house and outsourced proofreading services. Hence, I asked the lecturers to discuss: 1) their thoughts on the University providing an in-house proofreading service for instance through the Writing Advisory or Study Skills Services; and 2) their opinions on the University outsourcing proofreading services to an external company.

As mentioned previously, I will now discuss the two pilot lecturer interviews which were based on the Chinese student's text and present pertinent issues that arose. For part one of the interview, both lecturers advised me to have more example interventions on the prompt card that displayed the types of proofreader changes to allow for sufficient comparison. However, I decided to have a maximum of two interventions so as not to overwhelm the participants with too many examples which could have become rather time-consuming to discuss. For the second part of the interview, I initially presented the text as a whole. However, after the first pilot interview, the lecturer and I realised that looking at the student text in its entirety was rather time-consuming. Therefore, I decided to only focus on three pages of a student's work for future interviews but the lecturer could still view the whole text if they so wished. For part three of the interview, concerning the extent to which students should be allowed to consult proofreading services, I was advised to distinguish between professional and non-professional proofreading services as I had initially only asked to what extent lecturers agree that students should be

allowed to consult proofreading services; this amendment is now reflected in part 3, question 2 of the first interview schedule. With further regard to students consulting proofreading services, the same lecturer also advised me to add a question asking whether students could benefit from proofreading services which is now reflected in part 3, question 3 of the first interview schedule. Finally, I had a question in my pilot interviews which asked the lecturers to choose a term that best describes the role of a proofreader, based on Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2012) descriptors of cleaner, helper, leveller, mediator, and teacher. The terms which I presented via a prompt card were cleaner or tidier, helper or mentor, leveller (helps reduce the disadvantages that L2 students experience), mediator (helps bridge the gap between students and their supervisors), and teacher. I was advised that the distinction between helper and mentor was not clear and that better definitions were needed. Therefore, I decided to remove this question for all stakeholders as my supervisor advised me that it could cause confusion because participants may have varying interpretations of the definitions of a proofreader.

3.4 Coding and Analysis

The following sections will discuss the coding procedure undertaken for my textual analysis taxonomy and the inter-rater reliability test that my supervisor conducted. Following this, I discuss the coding procedure administered for my semi-structured interviews and detail the steps taken in regard to an *inter*-rater reliability test for the lecturer transcript as well as *intra*-rater reliability tests for the student and proofreader transcripts.

3.4.1 Coding for the Textual Analysis Taxonomy

On 17th August 2021, my supervisor and I discussed the results of my first inter-rater reliability test undertaken in late 2020 for my quantitative data in which a total of 42 interventions were coded from the first few pages of the EdD student's literature review using a codebook based on my taxonomy at the time. The results of the test showed that we agreed with the coding for all interventions *if* the proofreader made in text changes to the student's text. However, confusion arose in regard to the category of Consultation/Teaching Points (instances where the proofreader has addressed questions, commented, provided suggestions, given the student alternatives from which to choose, or pointed to

problematic parts of the text) in which my supervisor remarked that we may have differed in the way we coded comments and corrections (in-text changes); my supervisor advised me that if the proofreader had not made an in-text change but only commented, he would automatically categorise that as a comment i.e., a consultation/teaching point. In contrast, I applied my taxonomy/codebook descriptors to both in-text and comment section interventions which meant that *all* categories would be applicable to in-text changes as well as comments. Therefore, to avoid confusion, I removed the consultation/teaching points category and incorporated it into category 1.4 of addition (see figure 5) as all points were related to advice to add more information. Taking into consideration the aforementioned issue as well as others of a less significant nature, the results of the first inter-rater reliability test showed that there were a total of 22 problematic codes. This meant that only 20 of the 42 possible codes showed agreement and the inter-rater reliability test calculation is as follows:

Number of coding agreements 20 ÷ the total number of interventions 42 x 100 = 47.61%

On 6th September 2021, I sent my supervisor an updated version of my codebook and he conducted a second inter-rater reliability test on the same date using the first page of the EdD student's findings. The results of the test showed that there had been some improvement since the first round of coding. For this second round, I noted that there were a total of 44 coded interventions but 11 had not been coded either by my supervisor or myself as they had not been identified. The end result was that my supervisor and I agreed on 25 of the interventions which gave the following calculation:

Number of agreements 25 ÷ the total number of interventions 44 x 100 = 56.81%.

Based on the result of the second inter-rater reliability test, my supervisor and I undertook 'collaborative coding' (see Smagorinsky, 2008, pp. 401-403) on 10th September 2021 to discuss the interventions that we did not code as well as those where there were disagreements. The results of this meeting are detailed in the first table of Appendix A. As a result of our collaborative coding, my supervisor and I decided that we would undertake a third inter-rater reliability test in which I would identify and tabulate all

forms of intervention to be coded using Google Docs. Google Docs was used as proofreader changes are easier to spot in this format due to colour coding and comments for every type of intervention which allowed us to ensure that all forms of intervention were recorded. Hence, on 14th September 2021, I conducted the third inter-rater reliability test and two days later my supervisor did likewise. The results of this third test are shown in the second table of Appendix A and the calculation of the third inter-rater reliability test is as follows:

Number of agreements 27 ÷ the total number of interventions 36 x 100 = 75%

From the above process, I was able to design a codebook on 21st September 2021 to effectively categorise the proofreading interventions made to the student text which is shown in the third table of Appendix A.

3.4.2 Coding for the Semi-Structured Interviews

I began coding my semi-structured interviews on 25th February 2021 by summarising and categorising each of the informants' views in the margins of the text of the following interview transcripts: 1) the Chinese student's pilot interview based on the proofreader's interventions to their master's assignment; 2) Sarah's first and second student interviews based on Jane's interventions to her EdD literature review and findings chapters respectively; 3) Jane's first and second proofreader interviews based on the interventions that she made to the EdD literature review and findings chapters respectively; 4) the first and second pilot lecturer interviews that were based on the proofreading interventions made to the Chinese student's master's assignment; and 5) Michael's first lecturer interview which was based on the proofreading interventions made to Sarah's EdD literature review. This process of summarising and categorising the aforementioned interview transcripts allowed me to identify a series of themes which I later listed in a separate document for each of the informants. However, I had too many themes and some overlapped. In order to reduce the number of themes for each stakeholder to a manageable list, I focused more on the precise topic that the stakeholder discussed such as addition, deletion, and substitution; this had the added benefit of corresponding nicely with my textual analysis taxonomy.

From this part of the process, I devised a single list for each type of stakeholder in order to cover all informants' views for my three separate groups of student, proofreader, and lecturer. I then verified the effectiveness of my single list of themes for the lecturers by using the transcript of an interview that I had conducted with Emily (my senior lecturer participant). Through this process, I was able to effectively assign a theme to Emily's transcript and although additional student and proofreader interviews were yet to be conducted, I was confident that my theme list for each type of stakeholder was at a satisfactory stage; therefore, I was able to devise a provisional list of codes and themes for all three stakeholders.

On 23rd March 2021, I applied the provisional codes and themes to my first student, proofreader, and lecturer transcripts. Following this, I contacted three PhD students and asked if they would be available to conduct inter-rater reliability tests. Even though the three students' research did not directly concern the analysis of writing, some common ground was ensured based on the fact that their studies lay in the field of applied linguistics. Furthermore, from attending departmental events and meetings, I became aware of the three students' studies and knew that at least two of them had engaged in qualitative research in which they conducted interviews and accordingly had experience of qualitative coding. Additionally, I felt confident that the students would be thorough with the inter-rater reliability tests from having viewed their in-depth presentations delivered at departmental meetings. Of the three students contacted, one agreed to participate so I sent him the lecturer transcript as it was the longest of the three. Whilst I realise the tester was burdened with the lengthiest transcript, I knew this student to be especially diligent and meticulous, and wanted to ensure that there would be as substantial an amount of analysis and feedback as possible to improve my coding systems. As such, I began by testing the lecturer coding system which will now be discussed.

3.4.2.1 Lecturer Coding System

Having coded 42 stretches of my lecturer transcript on 23rd March 2021, I sent the same script to the inter-rater tester to be coded the following day. The inter-rater tester returned his coded transcript on 7th April 2021 and marked 71 stretches of the transcript. The results of the inter-rater tester's coding

meant that he listed 29 or approximately 40% more stretches of transcript than I did which was mainly due to my undue or unwarranted focus on the interview question rather than the content of the interviewee's reply. Of said 29 additional stretches of transcript, 17 were included in other interventions that I had already double-coded, and the remaining 12 were areas of the text which had not been coded by myself. Furthermore, the inter-rater tester did not code three areas of text that I had coded. The aforementioned resulted in my basing the total number of coding decisions on the higher number of 71 which were assigned by the inter-rater tester. Therefore, the result of the inter-rater reliability test score was as follows:

Number of coding agreements 27 ÷ the total number of coding decisions 71 x 100 = 38.02%

As the result of the inter-rater reliability test was far below the accepted percentage of 70% (see Multon and Coleman, 2018, p. 865), I clearly had to rework my provisional codebook and examine the reasons for the disagreements between the inter-rater tester and myself, and later needed to undertake a second round of inter-coding. Fortunately, when returning the coded transcript, the tester suggested we meet to discuss our choice of codes, which we did on 8th April 2021. Having the opportunity to compare my coding decisions with that of the tester's proved to be extremely beneficial as I realised that the main issue was to avoid excessively focusing on the question as stated previously and I was able to clarify differences of opinion. In addition, I have provided examples of the most noteworthy discrepancies in Appendix B, Figure 1.

3.4.2.2 Student Coding System

As mentioned in subsection 3.4.2, I initially coded one of my student transcripts on 23rd March 2021 and from conducting the lecturer inter-rater reliability test, I used my revised coding to administer an intra-rater reliability test on 11th April 2021 for the student transcript. My initial coding system highlighted 41 interventions whereas my intra-rater reliability test on 11th April 2021 noted 70. In order to determine the intra-rater reliability test score, I based my calculation on the 70 interventions which I coded on 11th April 2021 and obtained the following result:

Number of coding agreements 34 ÷ the total number of coding decisions 70 x 100 = 48.57%

Before discussing the discrepancies in my coding, I would like to advise the reader that even though my coding system had been updated based on that of the lecturer inter-rater reliability test, I realised that due to the low result of 48.75% for the student intra-rater reliability test, I needed to once again review my codes for the students. Consequently, I also reviewed the codes for the proofreaders and lecturers where relevant. Returning to the discrepancies in my student coding, Appendix B, Figure 2 presents the most noteworthy anomalies between my first and second coding.

3.4.2.3 Proofreader Coding System

As with the student and lecturer tests, I initially coded one of my proofreader transcripts on 23rd March 2021. Having conducted both the lecturer and student tests, I administered a proofreader intra-rater reliability test on 12th April 2021. Regarding the results of my test, the initial coding system highlighted 65 interventions whereas my second coding noted 111. In order to determine the intra-rater reliability test score, I based my calculation on the 111 interventions which I coded on 12th April 2021 and obtained the following result:

Number of coding agreements 63 ÷ the total number of coding decisions 111 x 100 = 56.75%

From only having obtained a result of 56.75% for the proofreader intra-rater reliability test, I realised that I needed to revise the codes for my proofreader coding system. Consequently, I also reviewed the codes for the students and lecturers where relevant. Regarding the discrepancies, as with the lecturers and students, Appendix B, Figure 3 displays the most noteworthy anomalies between my first coding and second coding.

3.4.2.4 Additional Changes

On 6th and 7th September 2021, my supervisor and I conducted a second round of testing based on the fact that the highest score I obtained for my inter/intra-rater reliability tests was 56.75%. This test

proved more fruitful as there were a total of 76 coded stretches of transcript with 56 agreements and 20 disagreements. As such, I calculated the following:

Number of agreements 56 ÷ the total number of coding decisions 76 x 100 = 73.68%

This was a noticeable improvement on my previous inter and intra-rater reliability test scores but an issue remained as my supervisor and I had different coding systems. By way of explanation, I thought I had to apply a code every time the interview switched between the interviewer and the interviewee even if the two speakers were discussing the same topic. However, from my supervisor's coding, I noted that stretches of dialogue had been attributed with the same code in order to apply context; I realised that this system was far more sensible and would be a lot easier for me when later coding my transcripts. Regarding the results of our coding, Appendix B, Table 1 shows the list of agreements and disagreements and in regard to the differing coding systems, I have noted 'same code as above' under my supervisor's column when his stretch of coding applies to several stretches of my coding. Furthermore, on 10th September 2021, my supervisor and I discussed our coding rate of agreement which resulted in further changes to the lecturer codebook as well as those of the student and proofreader. On 7th October 2021, I began coding all of my interviews and made some final adjustments to my participant codebooks; the final versions can be found in Appendix B, Table 2.

3.5 Ethics

The following subsections describe how ethical approval for the project was secured and where the reader can find my participant information and consent forms.

3.5.1 Ethical Approval

In order to undertake my research, I initially requested permission from my University's Research and Ethics board to: (i) establish contact with the students, proofreaders, and lecturers; (ii) collect the pre and post proofread writing of the students along with their proofreader's interventions; (iii) present students and proofreaders with the option of forwarding me their email; (iv) email the students a pre-

interview task; (v) conduct audio-recorded, transcribed, semi-structured, interviews with students, proofreaders and lecturers; and (vi) keep research diary entries of my thought process post-interview. Hence, my first ethical application was sent to my supervisor on 6th December 2019 and then submitted to the ethics review board on 13th December 2019. The form was returned on 6th January 2020 with compulsory changes to be made. The main changes were connected to the fact that I needed to better define the term ‘ethically appropriate’. The ethical reviewers believed that not having a sufficiently clear definition of ethical appropriacy could cause problems for both the students and myself in regard to the former having to admit to benefitting from unethical behaviour and the latter being conflicted as to whether such behaviour should be reported. Therefore, in the application form I resubmitted on 2nd February 2020, I specified in my information sheets and consent forms that if a student were to plagiarise or should the proofreader ghostwrite the text, I would be morally bound to report such forms of academic dishonesty. However, I also emphasised that the purpose of my study was to determine what proofreaders do and if they adhered to university proofreading policies. Further, the focus was not on uncovering academic offences, and students and proofreaders who engage in such practices would most likely not have volunteered to participate in my research. Importantly, as investigations into proofreading practices are scarce, the point of my research was to attempt to add to the current lack of literature surrounding proofreading practices. Having addressed this main issue, I received ethical approval to conduct my research on 3rd February 2020 (see Appendix C, Figure 1) using participant information sheets and consent forms in which research purposes were made clear to all parties and assurances were provided that identity would be protected as names were pseudonymised.

As mentioned in section 3.2, in the initial data collection stages many of my student participants from the Master’s in Applied Linguistics and TESOL course withdrew from my study due to the effects of COVID-19. Therefore, I made amendments to my previously approved ethical application form, information sheets, and consent forms and reapplied for ethical approval on 23rd October 2020. The main changes concerned broadening the scope of my research to include undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral level students from across the University and extending my piloting and data collection to the end of September 2021. Other updates made to my second ethical application form were based on

observations I made when piloting the master's text in early 2020 regarding amendments to my research instruments, conducting the semi-structured interviews via Google Meet, providing clearer definitions regarding the terms 'lecturer' and 'proofreader', ensuring that students and proofreaders are in agreement to have proofread work analysed by myself, the recruitment of participants and advertising methods, obtaining consent, and data confidentiality, storage and security. I received approval from the Ethics Review Panel on 2nd November 2020 to continue my research as proposed.

Finally, on 13th November 2020, Sarah (my EdD student participant) brought another important issue to my attention by advising me that as I intend to reproduce excerpts from parts of a text that would become her thesis, Turnitin would flag said excerpts as being similar depending on who submitted their thesis second. Furthermore, the University of Sheffield routinely obliges doctoral students to run their work through Turnitin as part of the submission process. Therefore, I spoke to my supervisor on 26th November 2020 about this issue and he suggested I write a letter for the student and myself to bring it to the attention of supervisors, markers, and examiners. This was then incorporated into my student information sheets and consent forms and approved on 14th December 2020 via email.

3.5.2 Appendices Location of Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms

For details of my participant information sheets which were used following the ethical approval I received on 2nd November 2020, please see Appendix C, Figures 2, 3 and 4 for the students, proofreaders and lecturers respectively; the consent forms can be found in Appendix C, Figures 5, 6 and 7 for each stakeholder again in the order of student, proofreader, and lecturer.

Chapter 4 Results

Regarding the organisation of the results chapter, section 4.1 presents the findings of the quantitative textual analysis of the EdD student's work to address research questions 4 and 5 concerning the changes that the proofreader did or did not make to the student's text. Next, sections 4.2 to 4.5 present the findings of the qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews conducted with the EdD student participant, her proofreader, and the two senior lecturers in which: 1) section 4.2 addresses research questions 2, 6, and 10 concerning the role of the proofreader and the ethical appropriacy of proofreader interventions, plus lecturer perspectives concerning the number and frequency of interventions and their views on non-interventions; 2) section 4.3 addresses research question 11 regarding lecturers' endorsement of proofreading practices with the added perspectives of the student and proofreader. In addressing research question 11, consideration is given to students consulting a professional or non-professional proofreader and the possible benefits of such types of support, in-house and external proofreading services, the frequency of consulting a proofreader, and face-to-face consultations with a proofreader; 3) section 4.4 considers communication amongst all stakeholders in order to address research questions 1, 7, 8, and 12 that respectively ask i) what experience students have with proofreaders; ii) what proofreaders deem to be acceptable forms of proofreading request when contacted by students; iii) the extent to which proofreaders communicate text interventions to lecturers; and iv) to what extent lecturers are advised of proofreader interventions; and 4) section 4.5 shows all stakeholders' awareness of proofreading guidelines and presents advice that they would provide to the University regarding proofreading practices to address research questions 3, 9, and 13 regarding student, proofreader, and lecturer awareness of University proofreading guidelines respectively.

4.1 The Proofreading Interventions Made to the EdD Student's Text

This section presents the findings of the quantitative textual analysis of Sarah's EdD thesis to address research question 4 regarding what changes proofreaders make to a student text and will also allow the reader to view which types of intervention were *not* made so as to address research question 5 concerning what changes proofreaders decline to make. I begin reporting my findings in Table 1 which

displays the total number of interventions made by the proofreader for all proofread work; please see Appendix D for a series of tables showing the number of interventions for each chapter.

Table 1 Total Number of Proofreader Interventions

Codes and descriptors	Total of all in-text and comment interventions	Total of all in-text interventions	Total of all comment interventions	Total of all minor interventions	Total of all meso interventions	Total of all major interventions
1.1 Addition minor	247	180	67	247		
1.2 Addition meso	3	1	2		3	
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0			0
1.4 Addition comments	73	0	73			
2.1 Deletion minor	230	182	48	230		
2.2 Deletion meso	1	0	1		1	
2.3 Deletion major	15	0	15			15
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	158	106	52			
3.2 Substitution – form	96	81	15			
3.3 Substitution – preposition	74	59	15			
3.4 Substitution – number errors	2	0	2			
3.5 Substitution – agreement	162	135	27			
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0			
3.7 Substitution – a new word entirely	299	152	147			
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	49	44	5			
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	2	1	1			

Codes and descriptors	Total of all in-text and comment interventions	Total of all in-text interventions	Total of all comment interventions	Total of all minor interventions	Total of all meso interventions	Total of all major interventions
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases, or sentences	41	29	12			
4.2 Structural editing - paragraph	4	0	4			
4.3 Structural editing - sections/larger units	0	0	0			
4.4 Structural editing - paragraph breaks	1	0	1			
4.5 Structural editing - guideposts	0	0	0			
4.6 Structural editing - moving sections	4	0	4			
5.1 Rewriting Meso	7	2	5		7	
5.2 Rewriting Major	6	1	5			6
6 Recombining	1	0	1			
7.1 Mechanical alteration - punctuation	1224	1165	59			
7.2 Mechanical alteration - spelling	42	34	8			
7.3 Mechanical alteration - numbering	43	30	13			
7.4 Mechanical alteration - capitalisation	356	330	26			
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration - abbreviations	51	23	28			
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration - acronyms	12	7	5			

Codes and descriptors	Total of all in-text and comment interventions	Total of all in-text interventions	Total of all comment interventions	Total of all minor interventions	Total of all meso interventions	Total of all major interventions
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	3	3	0			
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	28	15	13			
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	219	209	10			
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	16	6	10			
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0			
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0			
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	240	205	35			
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	1	0	1			
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0			
7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	665	573	92			
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	17	0	17			
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	1	0	1			
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	11	8	3			
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	2	0	2			

Codes and descriptors	Total of all in-text and comment interventions	Total of all in-text interventions	Total of all comment interventions	Total of all minor interventions	Total of all meso interventions	Total of all major interventions
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0			
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0			
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	1	0	1			
9 Erroneous correction	18	17	1			
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	14	0	14			
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	3	0	3			
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	2	0	2			
Reference list interventions (see note 1 below)	1133	976	157			
Grand Totals	5577	4574	1003 (see note 2 below)	477	11	21

Notes

1) The reference list interventions were treated separately to subcategories 7.10.1 to 7.10.4 which concerned reference/bibliography changes made for the main body of Sarah's text i.e., the literature review, findings, and chapters 4 to 7.

2) Regarding comment interventions, a total of 903 were made by the proofreader. However, the final result is 1003 because some comments contained more than one form of intervention.

Table 1 shows that a total of 5577 interventions were made to the student's proofread texts which amounted to 124,341 words i.e., 4.48 interventions per 100 words. Regarding in-text changes, there were 3.67 interventions per 100 words. Whereas for comments, the figure was noticeably lower at 0.80 interventions per 100 words. Interventions of a minor nature saw the highest number of changes with 0.38 adjustments made per 100 words compared to a mere 0.008 changes for meso forms and 0.016 for major changes. The highest number of interventions by far were made in the mechanical alteration category with a total of 2931 interventions (2.35/100 words). Particularly noteworthy subcategories of mechanical alteration were punctuation and in-text reference interventions; punctuation had a total of 1224 changes (0.98/100 words) with over 95% being in-text, and 665 adjustments were undertaken in regard to in-text references (0.53/100 words) with 86% being in-text. Other noteworthy categories were those of capitalisation at 356 (0.28/100 words), headings at 240 (0.19/100 words), and text layout at 219 (0.17/100 words). Following the mechanical alteration category, significant interventions were made to the reference list with a total of 1133 changes (0.91/100 words) in which 86% were in-text.

Another category in which many changes were made was that of substitution which amounted to 842 interventions (0.67/100 words). Substitution subcategories which saw the highest number of interventions were: 1) a new word entirely at 299 (0.24/100 words); 2) agreement at 162 (0.13/100 words); 3) verb tense at 158 (0.12/100 words); and 4) form at 96 (0.07/100 words). Unlike mechanical alteration and the reference list, the substitution category saw a more even balance between in-text and comment interventions; the latter amounted to 264 which out of a total of 842 meant that almost a third were in comment form. Other relatively high values were seen for the minor subcategories of addition (0.19/100 words) and deletion (0.18/100 words) with very few changes made at meso and major levels. Comment interventions for the minor addition (27%) and minor deletion (20%) subcategories were not as disproportionate as the mechanical alteration and reference list categories in which 11% were made in the former and slightly under 14% in the latter. However, the figures of 27% and 20% were less than those of the substitution category in which 31% of interventions were made in comment form.

Far fewer changes were made in regard to structural editing at 0.04/100 words which is significantly lower than the other categories mentioned above. Furthermore, the majority of interventions were made in regard to reordering words, phrases, or sentences within a paragraph at 82% with other subcategories seeing minimal or no type of change. Interestingly, there was a relatively even balance between in-text and comment interventions for the structural editing category at 58% and 42% respectively. Other categories which saw very little form of intervention were those of rewriting meso and major, recombining, and meaning and content. Whilst phatic forms of communication and web links to other sources were also low at 17 interventions for the former and only two for the latter, they are nonetheless unique and strictly speaking are forms of communication intended to act as support. The reader will also note that there are a number of areas in which no form of intervention was made; this issue of low or no intervention will be discussed in section 6.5 of the conclusion chapter in regard to proposals for future research. Having presented the quantitative data, the following sections will now display the qualitative findings from the semi-structured interviews.

4.2 The Ethical Appropriacy of Proofreader Interventions

Before presenting the finding of the qualitative data, I wish to advise the reader that for each piece of transcript presented in this chapter, I have removed instances of repeated words, pauses, fillers such as ‘erm’ and ‘er’, words that carry no meaning in the context of the excerpt such as ‘oh right, yes I see’, and pieces of text that do not make sense or the grammar is unclear. This has been done for ease of reading and due to the fact that I am focusing on participants’ views of ethically appropriate proofreading practices as opposed to conducting an analysis of the discourse/conversation (please note that I have provided three transcripts in Appendix E, Figures 1, 2, and 3 which display one of the student, proofreader, and lecturer interviews). As such, subsections 4.2.1 to 4.2.3 present proofreader interventions that were made to the student text which the lecturers deemed ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable respectively; importantly, the aforementioned sections contain tables which display Sarah’s original text and Jane’s proofreading intervention. As such, these textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology. In addition, each lecturer account is complemented with the corresponding student views

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of an L2 student, proofreader, and lecturers

as well as the proofreader’s perspectives and the reasons for making the changes. Following this, subsections 4.2.4 to 4.2.6 present the findings of interventions that were not made by the proofreader which the lecturers deemed to be ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable with the corresponding student and proofreader perspectives; I wish to elaborate on the interventions not made by the proofreader in order to provide additional insight into the types of interventions which are or are not acceptable with the aim of contributing to proofreading guidelines. Finally, to further probe lecturers’ views of the interventions made to a student text, subsections 4.2.7 and 4.2.8 present their perspectives concerning: 1) the number and frequency of interventions; and 2) areas in which the proofreader did not intervene.

4.2.1 Ethically Acceptable Interventions Made by the Proofreader

This subsection details interventions that the proofreader made which the lecturers found to be acceptable in areas of addition and advice to add more information, substitution, and meaning and content regarding possibly judgemental text.

4.2.1.1 Minor Addition and Advice to Add More Information

For the category of addition, participants were asked to comment on the proofreader’s interventions noted in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7 Minor Addition

Sarah’s original text	Jane’s proofreading intervention
1) Thus, while the first FL principle may be closely linked to social constructivism, the second FL principle could be connected with a broader understanding of constructivism.	1) Thus, while the first FL principle, flexible environment , may be closely linked to social constructivism, the second FL principle could be connected with a broader understanding of constructivism. (in-text)
2) Ridley (2012) further explains how this also influences the formulation of RQ as well as the justification for researching this topic.	2) The proofreader suggested ‘as well as providing/strengthening the justification for researching a chosen topic’?’ (comment)

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Michael stated that adding words is ethically questionable if the student had not previously referred to the ideas contained in the suggested addition, and he found suggestions to be more appropriate than in-

text changes. Emily found addition to be acceptable when making the text clearer as long as the meaning is not noticeably altered. Similarly, Sarah noted on her student pre-interview task that both interventions were ethically appropriate and remarked that the change shown in the second example ensured that her language was ‘in line with the rhetoric of my prospective audience/community of practice’. Jane provided reasons for adding words insofar as improving cohesion without interfering with content. With regard to ethical appropriacy, she claimed the intervention in the first example was an ethically borderline form of intervention. However, Jane believed this ‘stays within the ethics of the academic world’ as the content is not altered and the cohesion, flow, and clarity are improved.

Regarding advice to add more information, participants were asked to comment on interventions in which the proofreader gave advice to: 1) add more information; 2) add more information and a suggestion was provided; 3) add information to support a claim; and 4) add information to provide greater clarity. Most of the interventions were seen as relatively unproblematic and noteworthy issues only arose in regard to the second form of providing a suggestion which the senior lecturers found to be questionable.

4.2.1.2 Substitution

For the category of substitution, participants were asked to comment on the proofreader’s interventions noted in Figure 8 below.

Figure 8 Substitution

Sarah's original text	Jane's proofreading intervention
1) ...which requires exploring the explicit relationships among ideas expressed;	1) ...which requires exploration of the explicit relationships among ideas expressed; (in-text)
2) If done successfully, students would be able to actively engage as they would have already slid through Bloom's inverted taxonomy	2) The proofreader suggested that 'slid' be replaced with 'worked' (comment)
3) 'However, only 8 actually participated in the interview.'	3) 'eight'. Make sure you use a consistent format for numbers. As a rule of thumb, numbers up to 10 should be written as words and over 10 and numerals. (comment)
4) 'The two participants (6.7%) who agreed or strongly agreed with the most critical perceptions of FL were both over 40 and teaching in the 10-week pre-sessional course.'	4) Course durations are inconsistently presented. Previously, you have written 'ten weeks'. I would argue this version, '10-week', is more accurate. You could use Find and Replace to change all instances to be consistent with this format. (comment)

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah's EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

This category was generally viewed as being ethically appropriate by all participants. Michael stated that he preferred suggestions to automatic changes, and he did not find the first two interventions to be problematic. He also remarked that the comments advising the student to write 'eight' instead of '8' and '10-week' or 'ten weeks' to be useful academic conventions that could serve a pedagogic purpose. Similarly, Emily commented that the proofreader's replacement of certain words were better forms of vocabulary that she deemed ethically appropriate. Like Michael, Emily also remarked that the 8/eight and 10-week/ten week issues were useful standard conventions that could be explained to students. Sarah noted on her student pre-interview tasks that she should have recognised the errors herself in regard to form and substituting one word with another, and that the '8'/eight and '10-week'/ten weeks issues were ethically appropriate interventions whilst recognising the need for consistency. Jane discussed her reasons for substituting the words shown in the first two examples insofar as making the text sound more natural and ensuring that a word is appropriate for the context. Regarding the 8/eight and 10-week/ten weeks comments, Jane stated that regardless of what style is used, a writer needs to be

consistent and that the advice given was based on the fact that the student followed APA seventh edition referencing which has very clear guidance on how numbers should be displayed.

4.2.1.3 Meaning and Content – Judgemental Text

The participants were asked to comment on the proofreader's advice that part of the student's text could appear to be judgemental; Sarah had written in one of her literature review figures that she had viewed another researcher's presentation and it was 'bad'. As such, Jane made the following comment:

I might be tempted to also block out the 'which was bad' phrase. Although I'm sure it was terrible 😊, it sounds unnecessarily judgemental here to the reader who wasn't at the presentation.

Michael viewed the proofreader's advice to be 'the sorts of things that students need to learn how to do' and that it was acceptable as a suggestion. Emily stated that even though she may not comment on such an issue and highlighted that it was a matter for a tutor or marker, the intervention itself was not unethical. Sarah also commented on her student pre-interview task that she found the intervention to be ethically appropriate and explained during the interview that she did not want to appear judgemental. However, this was an issue which she found hard to emotionally detach herself from and accordingly appreciated the proofreader's advice. Jane advised me that she made the comment as Sarah and her had been friends for a long time and attended many bad presentations together; as such, this was a form of banter but the point was serious in that a more diplomatic word was needed. Similarly to Emily's observation, Jane questioned whether it was the role of the student's proofreader or academic tutor to highlight such issues and stated that strictly speaking it should be the latter. However, Jane remarked that in general, academic tutors do not scrutinise the text as much as a proofreader which means that they (proofreaders) are apparently more likely to find such details.

4.2.2 Ethically Questionable Interventions Made by the Proofreader

This subsection details interventions that the proofreader made which the lecturers found to be ethically questionable in areas of deletion, reordering, structural editing, and mechanical alteration.

4.2.2.1 Deletion – Removing Non-Content Words in Transcripts and Repetitive Paragraphs

I presented the participants with the proofreader’s interventions displayed in Figure 9 below in which the student had been advised to use ellipsis for non-content words in a transcript and to remove a repetitive paragraph.

Figure 9 Deletion – Removing Non-Content Words in Transcripts and Repetitive Paragraphs

Sarah’s original text	Jane’s proofreading intervention
1) ‘Well, my favorite thing is I can arrange my time freely. Um, I don't have to. I don't have to. You know, I don't have to start to start for the whole day, in a classroom...’	1) Phrases/sentences like this that don’t add any content could be replaced with ellipses to reduce word count and make it easier for the reader to find the main idea. (comment)
2) ‘It has also been acknowledged that insightful reflections have not been included due to the shift in focus of the research imposed by the constraints of this format. Nevertheless, these exciting findings will be further explored and disseminated in future papers.’	2) This has been repeated too often, and I think it is starting to detract from the importance of the things that are within the constraints of the paper. It is also the focus of your ‘conclusion thoughts’. Could you delete it here? (comment)

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Michael commented that the first intervention could be problematic and compromise the mark in certain disciplines such as linguistics where a student should include everything mentioned by a participant. Michael also explained that although such words do not add to the content, they do add contextual information to the sentence and that this was potentially ethically suspect albeit inadvertently on the part of the proofreader who was trying to do a particular job. Emily also commented on the problematic nature of such an intervention by noting that it depends on the type of research that was being undertaken and that if discourse or thought processes were being analysed, it may be advisable to avoid removing such text. Conversely, Emily highlighted that if you want to focus on a particular point, ellipsis may be more suitable. Jane explained the reason for intervening as Sarah had advised her that the word count was being exceeded; despite the fact that Jane does not guarantee a word count because she views this as editing, clients often ask her to point out areas of redundancy so the use of ellipsis was a suggestion to reduce the word count by only keeping in the words from the quotation that have meaning. Sarah accordingly noted on her student pre-interview task that she found this intervention to

be appropriate due to the word count issue but acknowledged that she needed to check with her supervisor if she can have ‘polished’ in-text quotes and leave ‘messy ones’ in the appendix.

Regarding the second intervention, Michael suggested that instead of advising the student to move a section or delete text, which would not require much effort, it would be more developmental to advise the student to review their work and find instances where it is being repeated and consider the impact on the reader. Emily also took issue with this type of intervention and observed that whilst it was appropriate insofar as the comment being a suggestion, it does depend on whether the student is being assessed on their ability to avoid repetition. Jane advised me that she always draws a student’s attention to text that repeats either exact sentences or paragraphs and Sarah noted on her pre-interview task that it is indeed helpful to hear how the text is perceived by the reader.

As the examples in Figure 9 are very specific forms of deletion at meso (example 1) and major (example 2) levels, I also asked the participants to discuss the ethical appropriacy of removing six to nine or ten plus words in general without showing specific examples. Differing views occurred as while Michael did not take issue with the proofreader deleting ten words, Emily found this to be intervening too much and claimed that it could even be classified as rewriting. However, Emily noted that in instances where the student presents particularly lengthy explanations, she might put a comment in the margin stating that the text seems to be going around in circles. Sarah remarked that it was difficult to determine whether deleting six to nine or ten plus words was appropriate as writers tend to ‘waffle so much in their writing’ and questioned whether it was the role of the proofreader to delete such types of text. Instead, similarly to Emily, Sarah thought it would be more ethically appropriate for the proofreader to advise the writer to be concise. In addition, Sarah remarked that a proofreader having to delete six to nine words of a text could mean there is something wrong with a student’s academic writing style but at the same time recognised it may be an isolated case. With particular regard to the actual words that a proofreader deletes, Sarah clearly expressed the need for caution in regard to words which carry content. Further, Jane commented that she would only delete six to nine words if it is an obvious repeat of a sentence written in error.

Finally, I also asked participants to discuss minor forms of deletion by showing two examples in which two and five words had been removed in-text and via the comments section respectively. The lecturers found such changes to be far less problematic than in Figure 9 as the proofreader made grammatically inaccurate sentences easier to read. In addition, Sarah noted on her pre-interview task that she did not find the examples to be a particular issue and stated it made her text more concise. Furthermore, Jane explained her reasons for deleting words as avoiding redundancy and removing text which did not affect the content. In addition, in certain instances, Jane would leave a comment rather than make an in-text change as it could be a matter of author style, and text may have been included for a specific reason.

4.2.2.2 Reordering

In regard to reordering, participants were presented with interventions concerning word order and sentence placement and I have chosen to focus on the latter as this was deemed problematic. As such, Figure 10 below displays two forms of sentence placement that I presented which were made in comment form.

Figure 10 Reordering

Sarah's original text	Jane's proofreading intervention
1) 'The rationale behind adapting FL from an institutional point of view (RQ1), with a particular focus on underpinning pedagogies.'	1) Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence. (comment)
2) 'Although participants acknowledged the importance of the IC, as the quote below illustrates, it can be seen, not only from Omar's quote above (Omar Pos 48) that not all participants felt completing the IC necessarily prepared them to better participate in the sessions.'	2) There are a lot of parenthetical ideas in this sentence. How about moving this phrase to a separate sentence at the end, e.g. 'This sentiment is echoed in Omar's quote above...'. (comment)

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah's EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

In general, my participants did not have much of an issue with repositioning of words within a sentence but more noticeable issues arose when reordering sentences within a paragraph. Michael found the first intervention above to be acceptable but took issue with the second. Indeed, whilst he recognised the difficulty in understanding the original text in the second example, the fact that a suggestion was provided made the intervention questionable and he stated:

‘With that suggestion it makes it slightly less OK but then there’s a lot to do with that sentence, the student does need to think about how to split this into two or more sentences, the proofreader’s given them a bit of a suggestion but hasn’t done it for them necessarily so this isn’t, ‘Have a look at this’ which I think is fine and it isn’t, ‘I’ve rewritten it for you’ and it’s in Track changes, this is somewhere in the middle so this is more ethically appropriate I think than just replacing it and slightly less ethically acceptable than highlighting and saying, ‘Well it’s difficult to read’.’

Similarly to Michael, Emily took little issue with the first intervention but for the second example, she also noted the slightly problematic nature of such an intervention and commented that this means ‘intervening in the actual assessment of the piece of work’. Therefore, Emily advised me that she may make a comment depending on how incomprehensible the text was and possibly provide a suggestion.

Regarding the extent to which a proofreader should intervene, Emily commented:

‘I mean in one sense the comment makes sense, how far [you] actually go in doing it as a proofreader I think is more dodgy.’

Concerning Sarah’s views, during her first interview, she made an interesting observation regarding moving whole sentences within a paragraph which she found to be problematic. In such instances, Sarah suggested that a proofreader should bring it to the student’s attention and make a comment such as ‘maybe you wanna look at your theme and rheme and something like that’. This view of making suggestions rather than direct in-text changes was qualified in Sarah’s following interview when asked to comment on the ethical appropriacy of the second intervention in Figure 10 as noted below:

‘I think in this case it’s just about suggestions and adding clarity and I know my chapter is a bit muddy so it’s nice to hear, ‘Hey, this particular section needs a bit of reordering’.’

With further regard to reordering, Sarah importantly, highlighted that it is her decision as to how sentences should be reordered, and that such interventions are helpful because a doctorate can be quite isolating and she sometimes feels insecure about her writing. From Jane’s perspective, for the first intervention, she explained that it appeared as if a typo had been left in the text and that it was an incomplete sentence which needed to flow with those before or after it. As such, this was a general comment for the student to review the text. Regarding the second example, Jane stated:

‘I got lost in the second one... as I’ve said with the parenthetical ideas, so I made a suggestion for her to break it down basically and split it into two sentences.’

Jane advised me that the above course of action is something that she has to do frequently with more advanced writers and expanded by commenting:

‘They get carried away sometimes with the sentence because she’s (Sarah) got the ability to write very complex sentences with lots of clauses but sometimes the reader can get lost and this was one of the ones where I felt as the reader, I got lost which is where this comment came from.’

4.2.2.3 Structural Editing

I presented participants with the two structural editing interventions displayed below in Figure 11 in which the entire student text for each example was commented upon.

Figure 11 Structural Editing

Sarah’s original text	Jane’s proofreading intervention
1) ‘This section presents the quantitative and qualitative findings obtained to address RQ3. Quantitative findings are presented first, and quotes from the semi-structured interviews are used to further explore the data obtained. It can be challenging to present both quantitative and qualitative findings cohesively (citation); this dissertation follows this approach as it can not only effectively allow the quantitative data to be better understood and contextualised but it is also fairly common in published articles (citations) reporting on MMR.’	1) Commented: Up to here, this paragraph sounds like general information on your approach to the findings, so I wonder if it is in the right place here. Would it be better with the introductory information above?
2) ‘Interestingly, only 10% of the participants felt that students could not see the rationale behind completing the IC.’	2) Commented: This sound[s] like discussion to me. Could you leave it for the next chapter?

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Regarding the first intervention, Michael commented that even though the proofreader made a suggestion rather than reordering the entire paragraph, it would be relatively straightforward for the student to simply move the text. Michael would have found it to be more acceptable for the proofreader to highlight the text in question and advise the student to think about the ordering in this particular area and consider the information that had appeared before. Concerning the second intervention, Michael noted that the writer’s text appeared to be a discussion and that if it only included the sentence in question, the student still has some work to do to incorporate the sentence into the next chapter and as

such, did not see this as particularly problematic. Instead, Michael viewed the intervention as a form of advice in which the writer may possibly be ‘getting a bit ahead’ of themselves and might need to include it at a later stage. Michael further posited the amount of work that the student would still need to do by stating:

‘It’s not as if the proofreader has said ‘move this to page fifty-six three paragraphs down and it’ll fit perfectly there’.’

Concerning the second intervention, Emily emphasised its problematic nature by commenting that it was ‘getting into the realm of supervision’. However, Emily added that although it was a difficult area, she appreciated the comments for both examples being phrased as questions and would personally advise the student to check with their supervisor. Importantly, Emily also shared similar views to Michael regarding the important distinction between making a suggestion as opposed to an in-text intervention by noting that it is the student’s decision as to whether the change should be made; indeed, Emily stated:

‘I think making a suggestion is different from actually cutting and pasting it yourself... yeah so that’s where I draw the line.’

Regarding the first intervention, Sarah noted on her student pre-interview task that it was ethically appropriate and useful to see how the text appears to a reader but emphasised that it was her decision as to whether she accepts the advice. Concerning the second intervention, Sarah stated it was also useful advice for her to determine how her work appears to the reader and highlighted that she was struggling in regard to linking her results with the rest of the thesis.

For both interventions, Jane stated that she is very engaged with the student’s text and views it globally rather than at sentence or even paragraph level. Indeed, unlike other proofreading work that Jane has undertaken, she proofreads all sections of Sarah’s work. Furthermore, the fact that they are friends facilitates discussions in which Jane provides recommendations as to when a piece of text could be moved to the next chapter because she is aware of what is to follow. With specific regard to the first intervention, Jane stated her reasons for providing a suggestion as follows:

‘I think that’s something that I would do as and when those thoughts occur to me, I would leave someone a comment as a proofreader. If I don’t do those things I would still be fulfilling my basic role... I think [this] is perhaps going the extra mile... but I do try to do it, I think it’s helpful’.

4.2.2.4 Mechanical Alterations – APA Referencing Style

During the first interview, I presented the participants with the proofreader’s interventions displayed in Figure 12 below in which both changes concerned APA referencing style.

Figure 12 Mechanical Alterations – APA Referencing Style

Sarah’s original text	Jane’s proofreading intervention
1) As Licht (2014) explains, this may result in students working independently in their groups and actively taking ownership of their project which may look <i>chaotic</i> , but it allows students to actively take ownership of their knowledge construction and learning process.	1) As Licht (2014) explains, this may result in students working independently in their groups and actively taking ownership of their project which may look ‘ chaotic ’, but it allows students to actively take ownership of their knowledge construction and learning process. (in-text change)
2) (This was in reference to the word ‘and’ being replaced by an ‘ampersand’)	2) Commented: I’ve replaced ‘and’ with ‘&’ in all bracketed citations in line with APA.

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Regarding the first intervention, Michael stated that he did not know in either case why the word chaotic would need to be emphasised but that it would only be acceptable if it were in comment form. Furthermore, he observed that it could be problematic if a student were being assessed on such criteria insofar as being able to use appropriate academic conventions and follow particular styles but acknowledged that the proofreader may not necessarily be cognizant of such issues. Similarly, Emily stated that she was not sure why either form was needed and that it did not seem to make much difference either way. Emily also commented on the style issue and stated that the proofreader may have a set of protocols as to when italics or inverted commas should be used. However, Emily reiterated that it does not make much difference for her personally and that she probably would not even emphasise it. Contrastingly, Sarah took little issue with the proofreader’s intervention and commented on her pre-interview task that it was merely cosmetic and she should have checked Mendeley. Jane advised me that she had made the change due to Sarah following APA referencing which has very specific usage for italics such as when introducing a key term for the first time. As Jane realised that

‘chaotic’ was not a key term, she suggested the use of scare quotes instead as Sarah clearly wanted to highlight the word.

Concerning ampersands for citations, Michael stated that it appears to be acceptable as it is a suggestion but emphasised that a student may have been told to use a particular referencing style, and again distinguished between comments and in-text changes. Importantly, Emily remarked that she usually questions the student as to whether it is acceptable to use an ampersand in accordance with university or tutor stipulations and would advise the student to look at their writing guidance regarding such issues. Similarly to the previous intervention, Sarah found the intervention to be appropriate and realised that she needed to have checked Mendeley. As with the first example, Jane advised me that this was again in accordance with APA referencing.

4.2.3 Ethically Unacceptable Interventions Made by the Proofreader

This subsection details interventions that the proofreader made which the lecturers found to be unacceptable in areas of restructuring in regard to providing advice to change the order of the writer’s research questions.

4.2.3.1 Restructuring – Changing the Order of the Writer’s Research Questions

During the second interview, I presented the participants with the proofreader’s intervention displayed in Figure 13 below in which the student had been advised in their findings chapter to change the order of her research questions.

Figure 13 Restructuring – Changing the Order of the Writer’s Research Questions

Sarah’s original text	Jane’s proofreading intervention
Therefore, this chapter presents the results obtained in this mixed-methods study informed by the proposed RQs. Firstly, it explores findings related to RQ3, student participants.’	Just a thought...As RQ3 seems to have turned into the key RQ, could you re-number them and make this RQ1? It would make it easier to follow. (comment)

N.B. The above textual extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Regarding the proofreader's advice, Michael commented that he considered it to be a more major form of intervention and elaborated as follows:

'This is gonna perhaps change the student's approach and way of thinking about how they present their data, how they talk about their methodology to start off with, how they frame their research questions, so I think this could actually turn into quite a major change.'

Michael further stressed that the intervention could be problematic as there may have been 'subject specific good reasons what research questions are ordered in the way they are'. As such, Michael posited that it may have been useful for the proofreader to advise the student to speak to their supervisor. Emily held very similar views to Michael concerning the contentiousness of such an intervention by commenting that it was 'quite [a] heavy duty thing about the whole structure of the research'. Therefore, if Emily were to comment on such an issue, she would advise the student to talk to their supervisor but was unsure whether she would make a comment similar to that of the proofreader as it seemed to be 'getting right into the whole structure of the research' and 'changing the emphasis of the whole thing'.

Jane also realised the seriousness of such a form of intervention by remarking:

'I think this is probably beyond what I should be commenting on in here... you know, how she numbers her research questions...it's really up to her.'

However, Jane explained the reason why she chose to intervene by stating:

'I got very lost in that paragraph...and she was referring to RQ three as the overarching research question which seemed odd to me because usually your first research question would be your overarching research...question so it just it just struck me as being odd and [I] wanted to comment on that or let her know that it struck me as being a bit strange.'

In regard to Sarah's views, her student pre-interview task appeared to indicate that she did not find it as problematic as the lecturers and proofreader. Indeed, Sarah found the intervention to be ethically appropriate as it did not affect meaning and was a suggestion. Nevertheless, Sarah was also aware of the seriousness of the intervention in discussing her reason for declining the proofreader's suggestion:

'I want to present the findings bottom up so I wanna talk about the student and then the teacher and then management because I think if you start with management it's just boring and also a lot of the things from management answer the kind of issues that students and teachers highlight, and I think to me it's maybe more logical to see the issues that the students are

highlighting and then how the teachers perceive it and solve them and then what management says.’

Based on the above, Sarah had made a careful decision to order her research questions in a particular fashion and showed clear evidence of being a conscientious student who does not simply accept all suggestions proposed by the proofreader. In addition, Sarah advised me of her thought process when deciding to accept or decline interventions made in the comments section of her literature review and explained that she views them one by one because her text (literature review) had changed as the research developed. As such, some comments are pertinent and enhance her writing whereas others may not be so relevant, or she did not agree with them. However, Sarah pointed out that she understood the proofreader’s reasoning behind the comments and it was not a question of the suggestions being inadequate.

4.2.4 Ethically Acceptable Interventions Not Made To The Student’s Text

The following subsection details ethically acceptable interventions that were not made by the proofreader in regard to recombining.

4.2.4.1 Recombining

The proofreader did not make any interventions in the area of recombining (combining one or more sentences or dividing one sentence into two or more sentences) for the literature review or findings chapter which my interviews were based upon, and only made one suggestion in this area for chapter six of the student’s EdD thesis. Michael commented that he found this type of intervention to be acceptable as long as it was a suggestion rather than an automatic change. Similarly, Emily took little issue with recombining as joining short sentences would not change the meaning. Furthermore, Emily divides sentences that are too lengthy in nature as it makes the text easier to read and does not change the meaning. Sarah also found recombining to be acceptable regarding issues with punctuation but not insofar as meaning or addressing too many ideas; similarly to Michael, Sarah prefers comments for such interventions as removing text could result in her missing ideas that she wants to communicate.

Finally, Jane also found recombining to be ethically appropriate and often does so in the interest of being concise, as mentioned by Emily, or when avoiding the repetition of ideas.

4.2.5 Ethically Questionable Interventions Not Made To The Student's Text

The following subsections detail ethically questionable interventions that were not made by the proofreader concerning meso and major forms of addition, and meaning and content in regard to correcting words which have been used incorrectly in terms of meaning.

4.2.5.1 Meso and Major Addition

Michael acknowledged that as a researcher I need to have a cut-off point for my analysis to distinguish minor and major forms of intervention but suggested this may not be so well defined in reality. Indeed, Michael observed that if words were added, the student may not necessarily need to reflect on them which was deemed problematic as they would not have been produced by the writer. Emily observed that she had not previously considered the degree of addition to depend on the number of words added as it depends more on what the words are and how the essay is expressed. For parts of the text that are unclear, Emily would ask a question and exemplified this by stating 'you may need to clarify this or something like that'. Similarly to Michael, Sarah found the addition of six to nine words to be problematic as the proofreader is helping with words that the student may not be capable of producing themselves. In such cases, Sarah emphasised that 'they're not their work anymore' and was unsure as to the ethical appropriacy of adding this number of words. Jane commented that the purpose for such a form of intervention was of more importance than the actual number of words and remarked that it is acceptable when making already existing content more readable. However, Jane did not find it acceptable if words are added because content is missing.

4.2.5.2 Meaning and Content – Correcting Words Used Incorrectly in Terms of Meaning

Regarding correcting words that had been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning, Michael stated, 'I think that's ethically dodgy' if a blanket correction had been applied in which the student was not involved in the decision. However, in regard to bringing such issues to the student's attention, Michael remarked that he would pick up on such issues and advise the student to proofread their work carefully.

Emily's views differed to those of Michael by remarking that she does tend to make such interventions depending on the context as detailed below:

'You could see it's a close word and you know they've heard it said and they've written it down wrong, I'm trying to think of an example but it does come up a lot especially with people whose first language isn't English. I do tend to correct those because you can see what they're trying to get at.'

However, Emily stated that she advises the student when the meaning is unclear and that she finds this to be acceptable in general, thus aligning with the previously expressed views of Michael. Indeed, similarly to Michael, Emily recognises the contentiousness of such forms of intervention by stating 'it can be blurry at the edges'. From Sarah's perspective, this type of intervention was problematic and her views aligned closely with those of Michael as noted below:

'I think this a bit of a tricky one cos...if it's a collocation type of thing I think it's all right to highlight it...yeah I think meaning it's, that's probably something like you wanna highlight... but maybe not a good idea to use a verb if you don't wanna change it cos you don't know what the author actually means.'

Finally, Jane advised me that using words incorrectly is an issue that would occur more with lower-level international students and described the action she would take in such instances as detailed below:

'If I'm really sure that they mean x instead of y then I will just change it but if I'm not one hundred percent sure then I'll leave a comment to say, 'meaning is unclear here, do you mean this?'.'

As such, it would appear that Jane's opinions appear to align more with the previously mentioned views of Michael than Emily insofar as leaving a comment rather than making an in-text change. However, as noted above, Emily did acknowledge that such forms of intervention are rather ethically hazy.

4.2.6 Ethically Unacceptable Interventions Not Made To The Student's Text

The following subsections detail ethically unacceptable interventions that were not made by the proofreader and such interventions concern: 1) rewriting; and 2) meaning and content in regard to writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level, rewriting sections to improve content, deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level, and checking for plagiarism and alerting the author.

4.2.6.1 Rewriting

Regarding rewriting, I asked the participants to comment upon the ethical appropriacy of replacing six or more consecutive words of the text with new words *or* replacing words from the text with six or more consecutive new words. Before commenting on Michael's thoughts regarding rewriting, I would firstly like to advise the reader that he made a clear distinction between the proofreader making in-text changes and providing a suggestion from the outset of the interview when discussing the category of addition. Indeed, when discussing addition, Michael commented that he did not find suggestions to be as problematic as in-text changes because the student has the opportunity to reflect and the writer is at liberty to receive feedback on their work. As such, when discussing rewriting, Michael remarked that this could be problematic particularly if one were to apply a suggestion/automatic change divide proposed when considering addition as it would be difficult to distinguish how the proofreader's comment which provided a possible rewrite could be merely a suggestion. Emily's views were similar to those of Michael in that she would not necessarily replace words. However, when working in her role as a proofreader, Emily was prepared to change the word order of a sentence to enhance the writer's intended meaning as discussed below:

'I will move them around just because you get to the middle of the sentence and then you find the qualifying phrase that should have been at the beginning of the thing.'

Nevertheless, similarly to Michael, Emily clearly saw rewriting to be a problematic area in stating that:

'I probably would not want to do too many words, I do replace some words but I'd be drawing the line around about six words or less, I mean again depending on the context, but that's starting to become rewriting.'

Similarly to the views expressed by Michael and Emily, Sarah also found rewriting to be problematic and when I communicated that no changes had been made in this area in our interview, she replied 'I would be offended if she did though'. When asked to expand, Sarah explained that it is her work, and she wants to be responsible for such changes as detailed below:

'I wanna be the one rewriting it so I need to be told where things are not working cos obviously, I might not be able to see because I'm super immersed in my work and whatever but I wanna be the one that rewrites it and the one who improves. If my proofreader rewrites where I've gone wrong then it's not just my work anymore is it, it's our work.'

Sarah clearly takes ownership for her work and emphasised that if a proofreader were to make changes it would be upsetting for her and exclaimed ‘I’d be like how dare you!’. Instead, as can be seen from the above lengthier quote, Sarah prefers to be *told* that adjustments need to be made rather than the proofreader making in-text changes in the area of rewriting. However, if such a strategy were to be ethically appropriate according to Michael’s perception of rewriting, this would mean that the proofreader would need to limit themselves to simply indicating that an area of text is not clear without providing any form of suggestion.

In regard to Jane’s views of intervening in the area of rewriting, she commented in her first interview that it depends on the student’s English language level. As such, Jane informed me that if a student has a lower level of English, sentences may appear in which ‘you know exactly what they want to say but they just haven’t used the right words’. If Jane clearly understood the message that the student wished to convey, she would take the following action:

‘I would be very likely to highlight that string of six or ten words and make a comment saying ‘meaning is unclear here, do you mean...?’ and then write out what it is I think they mean... would be my usual approach when it’s a long string of words like that, so I might potentially give them a nicer string of six words to replace their original ones. I probably wouldn’t just change them in the text if it was that many words.’

Based on the above, Jane’s approach to rewriting seemingly conflicts with Michael’s views in that it would be hard to see how a comment could merely be a suggestion. However, Jane’s strategy still appears to conform to Sarah’s preference for suggestions rather than in-text changes. Nonetheless, Jane seemingly appreciated the contentiousness of rewriting which was reflected in her proofreading of Sarah’s thesis as she did not make any in-text changes in said area and only made a total of eight suggestions as follows: 1) one major rewriting suggestion in the findings chapter; 2) one major rewriting suggestion in chapter 6; 3) one meso rewriting suggestion and four major rewriting suggestions in chapter 4; and 4) one meso rewriting suggestion in chapter 5.

4.2.6.2 Meaning and Content – Writing Additional Material, Rewriting Sections, Deleting Irrelevant Content, and Checking for Plagiarism

With regard to meaning and content, as noted in subsection 4.2.1.3, the participants found the proofreader’s intervention concerning judgemental text to be ethically acceptable. Regarding other

areas of meaning and content, Jane did not make any changes concerning: 1) writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level; 2) rewriting sections to improve content; 3) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level; and 4) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author. Nevertheless, I have decided to detail my participants' views in the four aforementioned areas due to the controversial nature of interventions that concern meaning and content. Indeed, Harwood (2018, p. 498) states that proofreading which proposes changes concerning a writer's argument, ideas, and content goes "much further than traditional notions of proofreading". Further, Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) editors and supervisors viewed content interventions to be inappropriate as mentioned in subsection 2.1.6 of the literature review.

Concerning the ethical appropriacy of writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level, Michael stated that this was problematic and 'not what I'd consider to be proofreading'. Furthermore, Michael commented that such an intervention would be adding material that the student had not written themselves and that it 'goes well beyond proofreading' which could lead to the student running the risk of plagiarism if they do not know the source of the material and how it has been used before. Regarding rewriting sections to improve content, Michael remarked that this was also problematic. Instead, he stated it would be more acceptable if the proofreader highlighted that the paragraph did not make much sense so the student could rewrite it and possibly give one or two pointers and a comment such as a suggestion to place one sentence or piece of information before another. In such cases, the student still has to do the work so this would be acceptable but Michael reiterated that rewriting is problematic. Concerning deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level, Michael commented that as nothing was being added it was less contentious than the first example of writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level which he deemed to be the most ethically problematic form of intervention regarding meaning and content. However, Michael still preferred that the proofreader leave a comment rather than make an in-text change. Regarding checking for plagiarism and alerting the author, Michael stated that he did not know how such a task would be undertaken without having access to plagiarism software. Importantly, Michael reported that he was not sure of the policy on such forms of intervention but he clearly knew that doctoral students submit to Turnitin and receive an

originality index in which changes can be made based on the report. Michael added that access to the Turnitin report may not be problematic for international students where academic conventions may differ and would alert students to the plagiarism process if he had any doubts when giving comments on an essay. However, Michael also remarked that he would not necessarily expect a proofreader to highlight possible plagiarism issues whilst appreciating that if the proofreader did have such concerns, they would be remiss not to alert the writer.

Regarding writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level and rewriting sections to improve content, Emily held very similar views to Michael. Concerning the first form of intervention, Emily commented, 'that's starting to get a bit dodgy in terms of student work' and added that developmental editing guidelines would state 'it's starting to stray into ghostwriting' or even writing an entire essay for financial reward. Similarly to Michael, Emily also saw the problematic nature of rewriting sections to improve content and remarked that although she may ask questions concerning the logic of the text not being clear or ask where it came from, she would not rewrite the text. Regarding deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level, Emily again held similar views to Michael in that she did not find it to be too problematic and would leave a comment in certain instances. Indeed, Emily remarked that it depended on the number of words and noted that she may occasionally delete a word if a couple seemed repetitive. Concerning whole sentences, Emily may ask questions but leave it to the student to change and concluded that this type of intervention was 'fuzzy at the edges'. Finally, regarding plagiarism, Emily suggested that this would be difficult to detect if only proofreading or if the proofreader was unfamiliar with the student's field. Emily added that a proofreader may be alert to a change in tone in the writing but did not think she had ever encountered such issues. Emily reiterated the issue of not being familiar with a student's field and that she was not sure what she would do if she found a text which was clearly copied from another without having been cited. Emily evidently had a conflicted feeling as to the course of action she would take in such circumstances by stating:

'I don't know what the answer to this [is], I might say something like, 'where did this come from?' but I think that needs to be picked up by the plagiarism software or by the supervisor or the marker really.'

As such, it appears that Emily's views on alerting the writer to plagiarism align with those of Michael insofar as having appropriate software and alerting the student to potential issues. With regard to writing additional or supplementary material Jane held similar views to Michael and Emily by commenting 'I would never do that, never' and added that:

'Even with editing I think that's going a bit far if you actually start writing, you know there's a difference between editing and writing for someone as well so I definitely wouldn't do that at any level.'

Regarding rewriting sections to improve content, Jane agreed with Michael and Emily as to the problematic nature of such an intervention and her opinion was even more unambiguous as she stated:

'No, in terms of proofreading that for me that absolutely falls out of the realm of proofreading.'

Concerning deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level, Jane commented that the only time she would undertake such a task is if a writer had repeated the exact sentence or paragraph; she remarked that this sometimes occurs when copying and pasting as the writer forgets to delete from where it was originally. As such, Jane stated the course of action that she would take:

'If I know [it was] an exact replica I might delete it, I'm more likely to leave a comment saying, 'this is an exact replica of paragraph three in section two'.'

As such, Jane's views seem to align with those of Michael and Emily in that an intervention would be ethically acceptable but leaving a comment is more advisable. Finally, for checking plagiarism and alerting the writer, Jane specified that she has no such means and does not have access to Turnitin so could not offer this type of service. Furthermore, Jane stated that this is the student's responsibility and not an area in which she intervenes as a freelance proofreader. However, Jane pointed out that some proofreading companies, and possibly her own, do undertake plagiarism checks. Jane concluded by stating that she did not think there was necessarily anything wrong with checking for plagiarism and that it can be quite helpful for the student but she does not consider this to be part of the proofreading role, thus aligning with the views of Michael and Emily.

Regarding the proofreader writing additional or supplementary material if necessary at paragraph level, Sarah held similar views to the lecturers and proofreader by stating that such a form of intervention was wrong, although Sarah commented that it would be more acceptable if the proofreader questioned the writer as to whether they had enough content or more information could be provided as noted below:

‘If the proofreader is writing the additional or supplementary material that’s wrong but if the proofreader phrases a question like ‘is this enough or do you need more support’ I think I’ll be OK with that but I don’t [know] whether the rules would be OK but I’ll be OK with it, I don’t think it’s unethical.’

Concerning rewriting sections to improve content, Sarah’s viewpoints aligned closely with those of the lecturers and underscored the seemingly unethical nature of such an intervention by stating:

‘Rewriting yes that would be incredibly unethical because then it’s not the author’s work anymore and OK maybe as a reader you think that the writer means something or that I mean something so if you rewrite it, you could be missing the point completely so that would be unethical or wrong.’

With regard to deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level, Sarah held similar views to the lecturers and proofreader by stating that it would be more advisable for the proofreader to draw the student’s attention to a part of the text that may not be necessary or had already been explained. Finally, for checking for plagiarism and alerting the author, Sarah stated that her department has a Turnitin submission option whereby students can check their work for such issues. As such, checking for plagiarism is not something which Sarah would expect of a proofreader and that it is the responsibility of the student as it entails a considerable amount of work, thus aligning with the views of the lecturers and proofreader.

4.2.7 The Number and Frequency of Interventions

Regarding the number of comment interventions which had been made to three pages of the student’s proofread text, in our first interview, Michael remarked that the changes were quite different and there appeared to be a lot by just looking at the number of them. However, Michael commented that without having viewed all of the interventions he did not know if he would necessarily assign a number in regard to my question as to whether the number of interventions made to Sarah’s text were ethically appropriate or not. For instance, Michael observed that one of the comments was simply reassurance for the writer

as Jane had remarked she loved the student's paragraph and the points made; this intervention was viewed quite differently from another comment advising the writer to use find and replace to change everything wholesale. Michael noted that the latter example implies that the proofreader has 'done a lot when it's suited them'. He reiterated that it seemed many changes had been made and if the same proportion of interventions were made across the entire piece, it would appear the student had received a considerable amount of help. Nevertheless, Michael again acknowledged that some of the comments are not about changes the student needs to make and are more a form of reassurance that they are 'on the right track', whilst wryly adding 'maybe they're in there because there's a lot of changes'. Michael added that the proofreader is making and suggesting a lot so saying something is good at some point does not demotivate the student, and may have the effect that they call upon their services again and are accordingly paid. Emily's views differed to those of Michael as she thought the number of changes were 'fair enough' and that they were good comments by remarking:

'I mean that looks pretty reasonable to me yeah, I wouldn't call that massive rewriting or overstepping the boundaries.'

However, Emily remarked that the proofreader's comment concerning a part of the student's text being good could be bordering on giving the student false hope. As such, Emily did not know whether such forms of positive comment were ethical and stated that they were probably not advisable.

Concerning the number of in-text changes that the proofreader made, I advised Michael that 31 interventions had been made to the first three pages which he again stated seemed to be a lot. Michael reiterated the point about considering each type of intervention but that 'when you see them all sort of stacked up like this, it looks like a lot' and 'it looks like the student's actually had a lot of help'. Michael importantly added that he would be amazed if a student were to consider line by line the interventions made by a proofreader when there are so many. In such cases, Michael suggested that the student would 'blanket accept them and never look at the comments'. As such, this would leave little opportunity for learning as the student would not correct their work. Michael underlined that if this process has a role,

it should be to help the students learn how to write more effectively and summed up his thoughts of the proofreading undertaken on the student's text by stating:

‘So this looks like a lot of automatic changes even though they are all on the sort of lower end of ethically unacceptable for me.’

In the second interview, Michael again stated it seemed the student received a lot of help and that other students may not have such an advantage if they do not have a ‘sympathetic friend’ or cannot afford to pay for a proofreader which he highlighted could be problematic from an equality point of view. Emily remarked that she was not quite sure on her thoughts regarding the number of interventions made to the student's text but noted that many seemed to be minor stylistic changes and expressions; she also commented that expressions are a difficult area as she is tempted to ‘make the English more elegant’ which she acknowledges is not the point. Emily shared similar opinions to those of Michael by observing that upon first glance it would appear that many changes had been made and that possibly not all were necessary.

4.2.8 Perspectives on Non-Interventions

In our first interview regarding instances of non-intervention, Emily firstly clarified the definition of non-intervention by stating that either the proofreader had misunderstood the part of text, missed the issue completely, or had declined to intervene. I confirmed that this was an accurate definition and Emily replied that she imagines all three scenarios occur frequently. When viewing non-interventions of missing a space in between paragraphs as well as those concerning punctuation, Emily reiterated that it is very easy to miss such issues and difficult to determine whether it is a deliberate non-intervention or simply missing. As Emily continued to view the non-interventions, she noted that they were minor punctuation and formatting issues that were not ‘too massively a point’.

For Emily's second interview, she discussed instances of non-intervention and the account below gives a summary of the salient points raised. When viewing a non-intervention in which ‘six weeks course’ was not changed to ‘six-week course’ as had been done previously in the text, Emily importantly highlighted that when proofreading an extensive text or even a five or six thousand word essay it is

quite easy to miss things and this is to be expected. This sentiment was echoed when observing another non-intervention in which a colon had replaced a full stop before quotes in previous parts of the text but not in this instance; Emily observed that it seemed to belong to the category of an inadvertent issue which the proofreader and student both missed, and implied this was to be expected. Indeed, Emily suggested that the student should proofread their work and notice issues themselves before submitting. Emily further added that proofreaders are not infallible and problems can be missed especially when struggling with meaning. Emily reiterated that the students need to recheck their work and ‘take some responsibility, not just hand it in because some proofreader’s looked at it’. With a similar issue that arose later in the interview, Emily added it is ‘a very boring task’ to change full stops to colons before quotes but that the proofreader should try to review the text quickly before returning it to the writer, although she again mentioned that all such inconsistencies were easy to miss. For a non-intervention in which the quotes were in black and the text was in grey i.e., it should have been the other way around in accordance with the rest of the text, Emily observed that this was the proofreader’s responsibility *if* they had understood this to be the situation.

4.3 Proofreading Practices

For the second section of the qualitative data analysis, I will present lecturer views of proofreading practices with the added perspectives of the student and proofreader in regard to: 1) students consulting a professional or non-professional proofreader and the possible benefits of such types of support; 2) in-house and external proofreading services; 3) the frequency with which proofreaders can be consulted; and 4) face-to-face consultations with a proofreader.

4.3.1 Students Consulting a Professional or Non-Professional Proofreader

In regard to consulting a proofreader, Michael explained that he has not suggested students use a proofreading service partly because he is unfamiliar with the University policy, and he also feels that it is ethically questionable as highlighted below:

‘I haven't [advised] students to use a proofreading service and that's partially because I don't know what the University policy is...and partially because I do think it's perhaps ethically dodgy and I suppose the reason why it might be ethically dodgy is because a proofreader could

do these changes without having the student's input into them and the students might therefore not be presenting their own work on the more serious end of things.'

Furthermore, Michael stated that a student could be wasting their money by employing a proofreader especially if there are many non-interventions and even errors introduced. Michael underscored that students pay enough (presumably in fees) and that the University provides a Writing Centre. In addition, he emphasised that whilst tutors cannot look at drafts, they can view plans and structure; presumably Michael is only referring to undergraduate and master's students as lecturers do of course read doctoral drafts. In addition, Michael stated that he is always willing to provide students with the opportunity to revisit previously submitted work and view the marks and feedback to find common themes in which he can assist.

When I asked Michael whether he feels that students could benefit from consulting a professional proofreading service, he stated that it firstly depended on the definition of benefit. Michael elaborated by acknowledging the difficulty of writing in another language, even with a familiar subject, and explained that a student would benefit in terms of their mark when consulting a professional proofreading service. However, Michael emphasised that the mark is not the only important issue and highlighted the importance of learning as detailed below:

'So if the mark is the only important thing, which it isn't, then they would benefit from consulting a professional proofreading service but I don't think the mark is the point, I actually think the learning is the point...and for me it's about students' learning, learning about the subject but also learning how to express themselves well...in a written text and that is a skill.'

As such, Michael emphasised that he disagrees students would benefit from consulting professional proofreading services if the proofreader simply blanket changed the work without the writer's input as nothing would be learnt but reiterated that some students would benefit in terms of their mark. Similarly to Michael, Emily also highlighted the pedagogic possibilities involved in proofreading by stating that if proofread work is returned without any Track changes comments, students would not have any opportunity to learn. Emily added that she did not think professional or non-professional proofreading services would help that much in terms of students who were struggling with English as a second language; Emily did not elaborate on this point but remarked that she was 'a bit on the fence' as to the

benefits of both forms of help. With particular regard to non-professional help, Emily remarked that students should take the support in the right spirit and not expect their friends to do all the work for them.

With further regard to students being allowed to consult professional proofreading services, Emily stated that she had reservations as some of them are variable but did not elaborate as to the reasons. Contrastingly to Michael, Emily stated that she agreed in general as to students using professional proofreading services. In regard to whether Emily had advised her students to use proofreading services, she did recommend proofreading for major works such as dissertations or doctoral theses but not so much for essays; however, Emily remarked that this was ten years ago and much will have changed since then. Emily's comments were more similar to those of Michael in regard to the services that the University provides as she stated that if the student was struggling with an essay, she would suggest they attend English writing tutorials within the University. With further regard to the support that the University provides, from consulting the institution's Writing Centre (The University of Sheffield, 2021), extensive support is provided through individual writing consultations in the shape of the "logical organisation and linking of ideas, paragraph structure, sentence length and structure, grammar, punctuation and spelling, referencing, both within the text and in a bibliography, vocabulary, but nothing too subject-specific, register: formal vs. informal language, [and] overall structure of an essay, report or thesis, in general rather than specific terms." Interestingly, the website notes that proofreading help cannot be provided as appointments are designed for a student to clarify their expressions of ideas rather than having every word checked.

With regard to non-professional proofreading services, Michael posited that the University provides a level of support and very often there are informal support networks which students could use to look over their work and check it for sense, style, punctuation, and grammar. By informal networks, Michael mentioned that during student consultations, he may be advised the student had shown their work to a classmate or parent; Michael did not have a problem with this as long as the student thinks about how to improve their work and expressions based on the feedback received. However, this leads one to

question the difference between preventing students from consulting a professional proofreader and yet permitting the use of informal networks. Indeed, the reason why Michael agrees with informal help rather than a professional proofreading service is due to his belief that the former would not likely make wholesale changes and that there is a far greater probability of a two-way conversation occurring between the student and a coursemate, friend, or family member regarding suggestions and comments than there would be with a professional proofreader. Indeed, when I asked Michael his views concerning the frequency of consulting a proofreader, he mentioned that if a writer was struggling or had experienced difficulties when writing he would do as follows:

‘If a student came to me and said I’ve got particular problems with essays then I would say let’s meet, plan, see what you’ve got in terms of how you’re gonna structure things and what you’re gonna look at and who you’re gonna cite. Bring me a full plan and then I may say to that student, especially if [they] had issues with spelling, grammar, phrasing [and] word choice, it might be a good idea to show the work to somebody before you submit it or to give yourself a good few days between finishing and submitting. So I think I would always say in that case to students to proofread and if they felt that they couldn’t to perhaps show it to somebody else but I wouldn’t advise them to use a professional proofreading service’.

In regard to whether non-professional proofreading services can be beneficial, Michael was undecided between agreeing and neither agreeing or disagreeing that such help can be beneficial in terms of the mark and learning. Emily initially had different views to Michael concerning non-professional proofreaders by remarking that students are ‘taking an even greater risk’ than using a professional proofreading service. However, Emily then recalled a time in the 1980s when she advised students that if they could find someone to read their work, they should keep in contact with such a person. Nevertheless, she also advises students to be aware that such an individual may not be as effective as a professional proofreader. Instead, a non-professional proofreader would be able to advise the student as to whether the text makes sense or not. Importantly, Emily highlighted that the student needs to take final responsibility when consulting a non-professional proofreader and blame could not be given in the event of a failed piece of work. Regarding Emily’s views as to whether students would benefit from a non-professional proofreader, I have already touched upon her thoughts in the fourth paragraph of this section when referring to the pedagogical advantages of proofreading.

4.3.2 In-House and External Proofreading Services

Regarding having an in-house proofreading service, for instance through the University's Writing or Study Skills Services, Sarah was very pleased with such a suggestion and explained:

'That would be amazing cos then you[v'e] got people who are not gonna overstep or do anything wrong and then you know that you're getting something this end. That would be perfect and it's approved by the uni, that would be fantastic.'

Sarah also added that she would be willing to pay for such a service as she thoroughly enjoys working on her thesis and wants to publish. As such, she would certainly have it professionally proofread before sending her work to a journal and would much rather pay the University to do so as opposed to someone else. Concerning the University outsourcing proofreading services, Sarah stated that it would be acceptable as long as the proofreading was undertaken by a legitimate provider acting in accordance with the University policy. Furthermore, she stressed that the working conditions of the proofreaders should be satisfactory as in Sarah's experience, the University outsourcing results in teachers having unfavourable working conditions which could imply the same for proofreaders.

In regard to having an in-house proofreading service, Jane's views were more sceptical than those of Sarah as she stated that the University would need to employ proofreaders if proofreading were to be undertaken internally. Jane expanded by remarking that she does not think the University's Language Centre staff would be able to proofread as it is a different skill to teaching English and qualified this by stating that she completed a two-week proofreading course and already had prior experience. Jane posited that if the University's Language Centre staff were to undertake the course, it would require quite intensive training in order to adapt their feedback skills on writing to that of proofreading. Jane then questioned how much students would be charged for proofreading or whether it would be a free service; she importantly underlined that such an undertaking would be challenging in today's neoliberal universities as it is not a profit earner and questioned how it would be funded by stating:

'I don't know, are the students gonna pay for it, is the department gonna pay for it, someone's gonna have to pay for it and if you're gonna do it properly, it's gonna cost a lot of money.'

Jane also advised me that proofreading is not like the University's Writing Centre where each meeting only lasts an hour. Instead, Jane stated that when proofreading, a proofreader does not know how long it will take until a document is opened and it could be an hour or all day. Therefore, based on the

aforementioned points as well as Jane's experience of working as an English Language Tutor for the University, she thinks that it would be difficult to set up a proofreading service unless there was a dedicated team of proofreaders. Further, Jane was unsure whether the University's Language Centre would agree to such a venture as their revenues come from teaching international students, rather than from not-for-profit proofreading. Importantly, Jane then questioned who would check the proofreaders' work as another member of staff verifies her work when professionally proofreading. In this vein, Jane further questioned who would be responsible for checking the proofreaders' work so as to avoid issues of collusion and to ensure the punctuation is accurate; regarding this latter point Jane stressed that the proofreader is not a machine and can sometimes miss areas that require intervention. Indeed, this echoes Emily's comment made in subsection 4.2.8 regarding the proofreader not being infallible. As such, Jane advised that a process of checking would need to be actioned which she underscored by highlighting the consequences which could occur if the work is not accurate as follows:

'If you offer it as a service, you proofread your student's document and then they send it into their department and the department tutor comes back and says there's a load of punctuation errors, they'll say, 'well the XXX [University's Language Centre] proofread it for me'.'

Given the above, Jane believes it would be more advisable to outsource proofreading to a professional company such as the one that she works for as it is a large organisation and could offer very good rates. I agreed with Jane's point and remarked that by outsourcing, the University would be privy to a proofreading company's years of experience and training; I continued by stating that it would be a brand-new initiative for the University where measures are most likely not currently in place and that such a venture would need time to organise. Jane concurred and stated that the University would need to appoint someone to run the service who is a professional proofreader with the skills and background to oversee the operation and check other proofreaders' documents. She then added that rather than proofreading services being provided by the University's Language Centre, it would be better placed within broader Student Services. Jane expanded on this by stating that the University's Language Centre is very focused on international students but that proofreading should be for all students which would mean it could be outsourced and accessed through Student Services. Indeed, outsourcing through the University's Student Services could allay the concerns expressed by Sarah in regard to ensuring that an

external provider is legitimate and acts in accordance with University policies. Jane concluded by confirming that she would outsource a proofreading service as the University would struggle to monitor the quality of in-house proofreading and have difficulty locating the funds necessary to establish the service as mentioned above regarding funding a not-for-profit proofreading service.

Regarding the University providing an in-house proofreading service, Michael stated that it would be acceptable if it was the only one which could be used and had 'proper systematic guidelines' in which suggestions rather than automatic alterations were given. Similarly to Jane, Michael then questioned how the University might resource the service but he imagined that it would be 'heavily in demand'. He added that the service would need to be advertised so that all students have equal access which could result in it becoming rather costly to administer and support. As such, Michael questioned whether the University would want to take on such a venture and explained that it would become problematic for him if a proofreading service was arranged on a fee-paying basis as it would prevent equal access which again reflects the views expressed by Jane. Michael concluded by stating that in principle, he would not have a problem with in-house proofreading given that students are clearly accessing such services which are essentially unregulated; this echoes Sarah's viewpoint regarding proofreading services that adhere to university approved standards.

Concerning the University outsourcing a proofreading service, Michael expressed similar sentiments to those of Sarah in regard to ensuring it was a legitimate provider by stating that he was 'not particularly comfortable' with such an arrangement. Michael explained his position in that a student decides how much they are prepared to pay, approaches an external provider, and the external provider then provides the service at the student's price. However, according to Michael, the external provider then cuts the cost in order to provide the service to match the student's budget. As such, Michael worried about the potential for poor practice and exploitation of those undertaking outsourced proofreading; such concerns were also in line with Sarah's viewpoints on staff being unfairly treated. Michael continued by stating that the impact of such exploitation in which a proofreader who is not particularly well paid or is overworked could result in work of uneven quality being returned to the student. This could be

especially critical at busy times of the year when there is a high demand for proofreading services and there may be less accountability if outsourcing were to occur. Therefore, rather than outsourcing, Michael provided an interesting in-house suggestion as detailed below:

‘It might be a desirable thing to limit the scope of the service so that certain things wouldn’t be included within it or perhaps providing students with a quota [of money available to spend on proofreading] that they could use in the early stages of their studies so they can learn how to write effectively and then perhaps students could choose when to use the service so they wouldn’t have unlimited access to it, they’d have equal access but they’d have a number of pieces that they could use the proofreading service for. Obviously if you do that then you limit the service on the basis of cost. Then students who’ve got the means may seek proofreading services elsewhere.’

Based on the above, Michael stated that he was unsure as to why the University would outsource the service but added it would be on the basis of cost which he would not want them to do. Therefore, it could be more advisable to ‘ration’ the service to keep proofreading in-house. I then advised Michael of the point highlighted by Jane insofar as in-house proofreaders would need to receive training whereas an external company may already have trained proofreaders. Michael acknowledged that external companies may have trained proofreaders and that there would be initial costs if the service were to be provided in-house. He further discussed the difficulty in deciding whether to opt for an in-house or external proofreading service in regard to cost as follows:

‘I suppose you would eliminate that initial cost wouldn’t you by subcontracting the service but I do wonder, I suppose that’s one reason you would do it but I think another reason is so you wouldn’t have to pay lots of money in-house and therefore I worry about quality, but down the line the contract comes up for renewal and you change companies because they’re slightly cheaper, are you getting the same level of service?’

Concerning the University providing an in-house proofreading service, Emily’s views aligned with those of Sarah and Michael insofar as it being better if such a service would be provided by the University when considering that certain students clearly do have work proofread. Emily advised that the University would have more control regarding the administration of proofreading and be able to determine the guidelines which those involved in the service would agree to. In regard to outsourcing proofreading to an external company, Emily stated that she would be ‘pretty OK’ if it were written into the contract that they train their proofreaders according to the University’s requirements and agree to the ethical guidelines; these views correspond with Sarah’s regarding an outsourced company adhering

to University proofreading policies and Michael's concerns that a proofreader could produce a less than adequate piece of work in order to cut costs. Emily further added that whilst she believes that a proofreading service should be done in-house or by a closely monitored outsourcing company, she is unsure as to how one could control students simply sending their work to the 'cheapest, fastest turn around service like they do for the essay writing services'. Emily stressed that it is very difficult to manage such dilemmas and that whilst she does not know what the solution is, it is something to bear in mind when considering the abundance of such services in which quality is not always assured. As such, Emily suggested that it is a situation which universities and education departments need to investigate as she does have concerns about essay writing and buying essays because such problems cannot always be identified by plagiarism software and it is an area of major concern ethically as well as in terms of academic integrity.

4.3.3 The Frequency of Consulting a Proofreader

Regarding the extent to which students should always be allowed to consult a proofreader, Sarah stated that she did not think it is always a good idea and gave the example of when a student is assessed on language ability. However, when engaging with deeper meaning or content and aiming to publish, Sarah believes that a proofreader is necessary which she qualified by stating:

'You need a proofreader because you have a proofreader in the real world like if you're publishing a book, you've got someone editing. If you're publishing in a journal you get someone editing and that editing, I think it goes deeper than what a proofreader would do.'

As such, Sarah did not find it problematic to have a proofreader for a dissertation but she did find it an issue for a pre-sessional course essay which would be more focused on language issues; in such cases, proofreading would defeat the aim of the exercise. In her case, Sarah explained that she is not being assessed on her ability to write in English but whether she can put ideas together and engage with the wider context and literature, meaning that it would be acceptable to have a proofreader in such instances. Furthermore, Sarah stated that from a reader's perspective, she would not have much confidence in a dissertation which had a comma missing or a poor standard of punctuation, and that work needs to be

presented in a manner which makes it appear trustworthy. Like Sarah, Emily was also cautious about the frequency of showing work to a proofreader and stated that:

‘Well if it’s gonna make them lazy and not try to write properly, I do think there’s a tendency to just [say], ‘oh I’ll get someone to proofread it and then it’ll be fine’.’

Therefore, Emily advised that students should firstly try to work out themselves how to improve their writing but they can think about using a proofreader if lecturers return work with comments stating the student really needs help with their writing of some sort. Finally, Michael stated that he thinks it is always a good idea for students to proofread their work but acknowledged that it was not the same thing as students always using a proofreader. Michael also recognised the difficult nature of such a situation in stating that when writing academic articles, he advises doctoral students to write the piece and show it to him, the other supervisor, and some critical friends which is in accordance with Sarah’s views of having a proofreader for dissertations and texts which the writer intends to publish; furthermore, Michael importantly observed that it ‘seems as bit disingenuous to say that to PhD students but not to undergraduate or master’s students’.

4.3.4 Face-to-Face Consultations with a Proofreader

Leading on from canvassing interviewees for their views on consulting proofreaders, I asked Michael and Emily to discuss the extent to which students could benefit from having face-to-face consultations with their proofreader throughout the proofreading process and post-proofreading. Michael stated that he imagines this could be beneficial and the principle is that students should be learning what they are doing and the reason for changes. Therefore, Michael posited that clarification on such issues and some form of discussion would presumably be beneficial rather than simply subcontracting the work to a third party in which students are returned ‘a nice shiny essay that you get a better mark for’. Furthermore, Michael stated that rather than actually proofreading, the focus could be on the planning of essays and after having received feedback, he would urge students to have conversations with their tutors to presumably explain issues which had been discussed with the proofreader. Emily’s views slightly differed to those of Michael as she stated that it could be challenging to arrange face-to-face meetings if the proofreader were off campus. In addition, Emily highlighted that she tries to keep a

distance and acts as a 'textbook' proofreader when she proofreads student work (recall that Emily proofreads students' work as well as being a retired senior lecturer). However, Emily agreed with Michael insofar as students speaking to their supervisor or lecturer if queries arise. In addition, Emily advised me that a student could of course email her any questions regarding parts of proofread text which were unclear but similarly to Michael, she acknowledges the importance of the learning process insofar as students going through a text to determine the reason for changes and why they have been suggested in order to learn English better.

With regard to having a proofreader during the proofreading process or post-proofreading, Sarah held similar views to Michael and stated that it could be beneficial to have a proofreader at each stage to allow the student to consider their mistakes and ensure work is clearly expressed with effective links to previous or current theories. However, Sarah reported that it affects her confidence when grammar issues are highlighted as she is a teacher. Fortunately for Sarah, she had the opportunity to view the academic writing of a colleague who has a doctorate and is a native English speaker. Sarah found that her colleague's work contained the same mistakes as her own and she was comforted by the fact that others encounter similar issues with academic writing. Sarah further reported that it is very helpful to have a proofreader point out issues such as incoherent ideas and especially typos as she is unable to see her own mistakes. Regarding having follow-up meetings after each proofread, Sarah stated, 'I think from a student point of view it will be fantastic' but questioned the feasibility of such a venture as a proofreader may not necessarily be adept at explaining how to be concise. Instead, Sarah provided a solution in the form of seeking help from the Language Centre by stating:

'I think if your proofreader is a teacher then a follow-up meeting will be really helpful but I think it may be a bit dodgy if your proofreader is not a teacher to arrange a follow-up meeting because they might not be qualified to teach this but I guess from a student point of view, what could be helpful is 'OK so I've identified these issues, off you go and find help from a language teacher who can help you with this', so in our case it would be 'off you go to the XXX [University's Language Centre]'.'

Similarly to Michael and Sarah, Jane also saw the benefit of having a meeting with a student post-proofreading to discuss any questions the writer may have and whilst she would not make such arrangements as a matter of course, she would definitely take it into consideration especially for more

extensive work. Furthermore, Jane would always advise the student to contact her if any questions arose and remarked that she returns private work with a message asking the student to read the work and contact her with any questions (recall that Jane works for a proofreading company as well as doing freelance proofreading).

4.4 Communication Amongst Stakeholders

The third section of the qualitative data analysis presents and discusses the interview findings concerning the student's experience of consulting a proofreader and the communication amongst stakeholders. Regarding the relationship between the student and proofreader, Sarah advised me that Jane and she are friends and they met as colleagues working at the same university. Sarah engaged Jane's proofreading assistance as she did not feel in receipt of sufficient feedback from her supervisor at the time. Instead, Sarah's supervisor would apparently make seemingly superficial suggestions such as 'you're missing a comma here or you're missing a capital letter'. As such, Sarah spoke to Jane about these issues who advised her that:

'If it's issues with you're missing a comma or something like that, I'll proofread the work and then he (the supervisor) can comment on something else.'

Further reasons for engaging a proofreader were based on Sarah viewing the thesis to be 'a big deal' and that she wants to publish. Regarding publishing, Sarah highlighted that it is an accepted process within academia for a writer to receive reviewer comments that contribute to the research in the form of feedback. Whilst feedback that contributes to the research from an editor would most likely focus on content, Sarah's assertion highlights the point that those wishing to publish could possibly be held to a different standard to students writing for assessment.

In regard to her experience of having a proofreader, Sarah stated that it was 'fantastic' and that Jane was very supportive. In addition, the proofreading experience made Sarah more aware of minor errors such as inconsistent spacing. Furthermore, Sarah thoroughly appreciated having someone who was familiar with her work and observed that Jane acts as 'a sounding board' as no-one else reads the thesis

and understands what is happening. Indeed, Sarah finds it frustrating when others try to give suggestions as she feels that they are not familiar enough with the subject. As such, Sarah believes Jane to be very good at listening rather than telling her what to do; this gives Sarah the opportunity to discuss any concerns she may have and when Jane does offer advice, it is constructive as she is familiar with the work. The positive rapport between Sarah and Jane was also evident in their email communication which was very friendly in nature with supportive, useful advice in areas of : 1) Track changes; 2) accepting and rejecting comments; 3) text layout; 4) citations, abbreviations, and table and figure title formats being in accordance with APA; 5) some citations not appearing in the reference list; 6) overusing certain lexical items; 7) capitalisation; 8) extensive and possibly unnecessary reference to one of the appendices; 9) describing in the past simple rather than the present; 10) punctuation usage when referring to a participant; 11) incorrect numbering; 12) suggestions in regard to dividing demographic information and coded segments into separate appendices to make it easier for the reader to find; 13) finding all references to appendices in the main text and verifying that the correct appendix had been referred to; and 14) having descriptive headings as well as number titles for appendices so that readers can find what they are looking for from the table of contents. When I asked about any negative experiences with another proofreader, Sarah replied that she had not consulted such an individual before. Furthermore, Sarah importantly stated that she would not be comfortable having a proofreader who she did not know or was not ‘one hundred percent on board with ethical proofreading’; Sarah justified this stance by stating that she has seen essays which had been proofread (most likely in her capacity as an EAP Tutor) and it was clear that the student had not written the work as noted below:

‘It’s just been fabricated and I wouldn’t want that and as I feel like I would be losing ownership of my work, I want my work to be my work, ideally with more feedback but my work, I just want it to look good.’

Sarah’s comment regarding only consulting a proofreader who undertakes ethical forms of text intervention aligns with Jane’s ethos regarding proofreading and her views concerning communication with students will now be discussed. Firstly, with regard to Jane’s proofreading ethos, it has already been mentioned in subsections 3.3.3.2 and 4.2.2.1 that she does not guarantee a word count because she classifies such help as editing rather than proofreading. In addition, some students ask Jane to make

suggestions as to how the content can be improved but she again always underlines that this is not her job and limits herself to areas of language, punctuation, grammar, and cohesion. Based on Jane's clear policy when proofreading students' work, much private work is lost because she is 'not what a lot of international students want' and reiterated that there are many international students who expect the proofreader to help in terms of content as well as structure. Furthermore, Jane requires that students send their final draft to be proofread as it is not her job to give suggestions on how to improve the content of the first draft. Jane added that she proofreads a text once a student has their final draft and is satisfied with it from having spoken to their academic tutor. Importantly, Jane also commented that she chooses to undertake much of her work with her proofreading company because they manage the aforementioned issues and are very clear as to her role. Indeed, Jane likes her company's approach to academic proofreading and highlighted that not all organisations are as ethically sound. As such, Jane's company makes it very clear that they will not guarantee a word count nor touch content or structure. Instead, the company checks references and ensures that students are following the correct referencing guidelines as well as making sure the grammar is correct and reads as if written by a native speaker. Whilst Jane and Sarah's friendship naturally resulted in far greater communication than a student and proofreader with no prior contact, Jane still advised me that with private clients there would be an initial phone call as well as one or two emails once she proofreads the work. When I asked Jane if she meets with Sarah or any of her students post-proofreading she replied, 'No, not specifically to discuss the proofreading, I will do it all via computer.'

Regarding communication with lecturers, Jane remarked that she does not advise such persons if she has proofread a student's work and discussed the reasons as detailed below:

'I expect the student to do that and I know that on many of the PhD courses (Sarah's) for example, they were advised by their course director to get their dissertations proofread before they hand it in...and I know at that point they had a discussion about proofreaders, (Sarah) recommended me to of a couple of other people on it so I wouldn't think it's necessary for me to then get in touch and tell lecturers that their work's been proofread, I would expect the student really to discuss that with their tutor.'

It would appear that other proofreaders share a similar stance to Jane in regard to contacting lecturers as Michael advised me that whilst he was sure his students have used proofreaders, he had not received

any communication from a student or a proofreader as to whether such services had indeed been acquired. Emily also informed me that she had not been informed of a proofreader proofreading a student's text but she had directed students towards one of her contacts who worked for a University service.

4.5 University Proofreading Guidelines and Stakeholder Advice for the University

The final section of the qualitative data presents the interview findings concerning stakeholder awareness of proofreading guidelines and the advice that participants would provide to the University in regard to proofreading practices.

4.5.1 University Proofreading Guidelines

Sarah and I had already exchanged emails regarding proofreading practices at the University and she further expanded on this during our interview. As such, Sarah explained she had heard students have to declare the use of a proofreader but could no longer retrieve the information from wherever it had been sourced. Sarah added that it would be beneficial if the University clearly stated whether students could have their work proofread or not and the rules that need to be adhered to should proofreading be allowed. When I asked Sarah if she had been informed by a member of staff about proofreading practices, she provided a candid response as detailed below in regard to academics possibly not allowing students to have their work proofread:

‘Well like don't do it because you might fall into collusion' and I'm like that is so dishonest because they are having their works proofread...they publish it in journals where their work is proofread and they are having feedback on the research that they've done. So to stand in front of a group of PGRs and [say] 'like don't have your work proofread', I'm like really?’

In the same response, Sarah also gave her opinion on email communication that she had with the administrative staff in her department regarding procuring proofreading guidelines to verify whether having work proofread was acceptable and stated:

‘So I don't know, it feels weird, cos with that email it's like, 'I don't know the rules but here are a couple of people that can do the work for you'...I'm like actually on your webpage that you sent me, the link to it says that you don't endorse any proofreaders but yet...here you are recommending people.’

With further regard to the email mentioned above, the administrative member of staff had told Sarah what their understanding of proofreading was in regard to checking spelling and punctuation but that interventions in regard to meaning were not acceptable and provided the email addresses of two proofreaders who had been recommended by another department. In addition, the administrator apologised that they had been unable to retrieve any documentation pertaining to the rules on proofreading but would try to do so. Indeed, the administrator sent a further email with a link through the University's intranet to a blog concerning the ethics of proofreading for students. However, as the blog was an external source, it clearly did not state whether the University in question allowed proofreading or not.

Similarly to Sarah's experience regarding the University's provision of proofreading guidance, the dialogue that ensued between Jane and I also uncovered a lack of clear policy. To begin, Jane advised me that she knew there were a set of guidelines on the University website when she started proofreading Sarah's work. She reported that said guidelines very clearly expressed the circumstances under which students can instruct a proofreader, and that there were three or four bullet points stipulating the focus should be on language and grammar. In addition, it was made very clear as to what constitutes plagiarism and collusion. Jane added that when emailing a student she puts a link to the University's website to illustrate she has proofread according to the limits of the guidelines. As I was unaware of this link, I asked Jane if she would email it to me and explained that I only knew of advice which had been provided on the University's Study Skills webpage clearly stating the University does not endorse paid proofreading services (The University of Sheffield, 2020) and that it had a broken link to further information from the University's School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR). Jane kindly retrieved an email that she sends to students with the University link but when she clicked on it a message appeared stating that the page request can no longer be displayed. Jane then sent me the link through the Google Meet chat function and importantly observed that it referred to what constitutes plagiarism. Jane reiterated that the link was very specific as to what a proofreader can and cannot do and that the last time she had sent out the email to a student was 25th January 2019 so changes had been made some time after that date. I also remarked that said link was for ScHARR which may have been

the same broken link that is on the University's Study Skills webpage. Since interviewing Jane, I have been able to retrieve the link provided by ScHARR but the address is different to that which Jane sent me as it concerns unfair means rather than plagiarism. From accessing the link, I noted that it referred to the bullet points Jane mentioned as noted above. Based on the aforementioned, it appears that proofreaders would have quite a difficult time trying to locate a clear University wide proofreading policy. Furthermore, as the previously mentioned link did not contain any concrete distinctions and examples of ethically appropriate and inappropriate interventions, it could be challenging for a third party to determine what the University deems to be suitable proofreading.

As with Sarah and Jane's experience of University proofreading policies, Michael expressed uncertainty. Indeed, when I asked if he was aware of any information that the University of Sheffield provided regarding having a proofreader, he stated, 'No. I probably should be and if you are you'll let me know.' Michael and I continued to discuss where proofreading information could be accessed and I advised him of a link to the University's Study Skills Service (The University of Sheffield, 2020) that gives advice about paid proofreading services; when Michael viewed the page, he observed that there was a 'big caution sign' near said advice. I also informed Michael that the University did not have a proofreading policy or guidelines as such. Based on the webpage, Michael stated that:

'It's relatively reassuring to know that what I've been telling students is in line with what the University's policy is, i.e., ...to finish your draft, put it away for a bit, get it out, give yourself a couple of days and then go back and do it and go back and do your proofreading.'

Emily's feedback concerning University proofreading policies slightly differed to that of the other participants as she stated that when she worked at the University, there was a teaching and learning person in her department who used to talk to students in their first year of study. Furthermore, there were numerous posters on display regarding the varying types of help available. However, Emily's experience aligned with that of Sarah, Jane, and Michael with specific regard to the information she received from the University as she commented that:

'I don't think I personally ever sort of had a whole lot of information that I handed out but I did suggest going to this service or that service and going to our teaching and learning lecturer, so it was a bit more diffused than actually having specific information.'

4.5.2 Stakeholder Advice for the University

Regarding advice that Sarah had for the University, she continued the discussion regarding proofreading guidelines by stating that there needs to be a department wide policy detailing what is and is not acceptable when proofreading. Importantly, Sarah speculated that the University most likely has not produced guidelines because ‘they don’t actually know what they want from a proofreader’. Sarah stated that this was a shame as the University has experts who could easily write a policy without incurring any expense. Furthermore, Sarah underlined that every year the University has major incidents of misconduct and that one of the reasons why this occurs is due to the fact that there is no clear policy like at the University’s Language Centre. Sarah elaborated by stating that the Language Centre has a clear policy in that the student is not provided with a proofreader because the focus is on language. To this end, Sarah felt that the rest of the University does not have such a clear policy and that not everyone may know what is and is not ethical. Finally, Sarah emphasised the usefulness of having a proofreader but feels that it is discouraged by her department and explained that, ‘it can get like quite dodgy you know with like bad proofreaders and unethical proofreaders’. Therefore, Sarah reiterated that it would be very beneficial if the University devised clear guidelines and policies due to the much appreciated help that a proofreader can provide in advising the students if work makes sense, whether the punctuation is accurate, and building confidence.

Like Sarah, Jane also saw the importance of having a clear policy regarding proofreading practices by stating that the University should repost the webpage previously discussed in subsection 4.5.1 which ScHARR have since done albeit under a different link. However, Jane advised me that the page had never been easy to locate and that she previously had to search for plagiarism rather than proofreading. Jane also stated that as the course director of the EdD recommends all students have their dissertations (which I presume would also encompass theses) proofread before submitting, such advice should be accompanied with proofreading guidelines, and noted that this would ensure students know what type of proofreading to request. Jane emphasised that it is not only about the proofreader avoiding ‘getting in trouble’ (which I assume means from undertaking ethically inappropriate forms of proofreading or even providing such a service in the first place) but the students also avoiding problems and ‘undo[ing]

all their hard work'. Whilst Jane's assertion about the EdD course director recommending the use of a proofreader seemingly conflicts with Sarah's statement that she feels proofreading is discouraged by her department, their views appear to coincide in regard to students not knowing what is and is not ethically acceptable and the possible negative consequences of engaging a proofreader's services.

Regarding the advice that Michael would provide to the University concerning the type of help that a student can receive with their writing, he stated that 'there's clearly a grey area' from having viewed the Study Skills Services weblink that I had sent him when discussing the University's proofreading guidelines and policies which corresponds to the views expressed by Sarah and Jane. Michael also suggested that if we assume the University were to accept some form of proofreading, a policy could be developed around proofreading in which there should be a dual submission of work. Michael was not sure how such a policy could be enforced but asserted that the proofread version should be suggestions only. He acknowledged that such an initiative could be problematic for Turnitin as it would count both versions which would result in a score of hundred percent for the two documents but that the students would sign a declaration stating the work is their own. Michael also suggested that there needs to be another declaration stating whether a student had used a proofreader or not. He reiterated that it would be a difficult policy to enforce but that there is probably a minority of students using proofreaders who change a lot of the essay for it to then become seriously ethically problematic. Similarly to Sarah, Jane, and Michael, Emily stated that:

'The University needs to work out a set of protocols and guidelines because it is a very fuzzy area.'

Emily elaborated that there are issues with plagiarism and paying for essays off the internet and that the situation has become far more fraught than in previous times. As such, Emily posited that there need to be guidelines stipulating different forms of proofreading and acceptable forms of help which should be made much clearer to staff and students. Emily then asked me if there were any such guidelines at present and I advised her that this was currently not the case. Instead, I informed Emily that the University provides links through its Study Skills Service regarding how students can proofread their own text, and that there was a link for *staff* to view proofreading guidelines from other universities;

however, I am no longer able to retrieve said link. Nevertheless, I reiterated that the University does not have its own policy or set of guidelines per se at the moment. At this point of the interview, Emily highlighted that external professional proofreading services and proofreaders such as herself who are ‘sort of satellites on the outside’ would need to know what the University deems to be acceptable when proofreading. Additional to lecturers’ awareness of the University’s proofreading policies, I asked whether they had received any University directives or training about proofreading practices. Michael replied in the negative and as Emily is a retired academic, I asked if she had received any training and directives when in service to which she replied ‘No, no, no, as I say it was a long time ago, I’m sure things have changed’.

Having presented the findings of my textual analysis of the EdD student’s work, displayed ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention, conveyed lecturer views regarding proofreading practices with the added perspectives of the student and proofreader, detailed communication amongst stakeholders, and covered university proofreading guidelines, I will now revisit each of these areas and discuss them in the following chapter.

Chapter 5 Discussion

Regarding the organisation of the discussion chapter, section 5.1 discusses the findings of the quantitative textual analysis of the EdD student's work to address research questions 4 and 5 regarding the (non-)interventions that the proofreader made. To address research questions 2, 6, and 10 concerning the role of a proofreader from the perspectives of the student, proofreader, and lecturers respectively, section 5.2 analyses ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention; further, subsections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 discuss the method used by the proofreader to make changes regarding in-text interventions and comments, and perspectives on non-intervention respectively. Following this, section 5.3 analyses lecturer views of proofreading practices with the added perspectives of the student and proofreader to address research question 11 concerning lecturers' endorsement of proofreading practices; as such, subsections 5.3.1 to 5.3.3 discuss: 1) students consulting a professional or non-professional proofreader; 2) in-house and external proofreading services; and 3) the frequency of consulting a proofreader. After this, section 5.4 discusses communication amongst stakeholders to address: 1) research question 1 concerning the experience students have with proofreaders; 2) research question 7 regarding what proofreaders deem to be acceptable forms of proofreading request when contacted by students; 3) research question 8 concerning the extent to which proofreaders communicate changes made to a text to lecturers; and 4) research question 12 that asks whether lecturers are advised of proofreader interventions. Finally, to address research questions 3, 9, and 13 concerning student, proofreader, and lecturer awareness of university proofreading guidelines, section 5.5 assesses university proofreading guidelines in subsection 5.5.1 and stakeholder advice in 5.5.2.

5.1 The Proofreading Interventions Made to the EdD Student's Text

Concerning the proofreading interventions that were made to Sarah's text presented in section 4.1 of the results chapter, the following will compare my results with those of studies undertaken by Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Flowerdew and Wang (2016), Luo and Hyland (2017), and Harwood (2018) as they examined similar editing interventions such as addition and deletion. In addition, I have also drawn

upon the research of Rebeck (2014) regarding the number of interventions which his proofreaders made and their proofreading background.

Regarding minor, meso, and major types of intervention, comparisons will only be made between Luo and Hyland (2017), Harwood (2018), and my own findings as Willey and Tanimoto (2012) and Flowerdew and Wang (2016) did not make such distinctions. Before making comparisons, it should be noted that Luo and Hyland (2017) and Harwood (2018) reserved minor, meso, and major categories for in-text changes only whereas my results also include comment section interventions. Further distinctions need to be highlighted as Luo and Hyland (2017) assigned minor, meso, and major categories for interventions of addition, deletion, rewriting, reordering, recombining, substitution, and mechanical fixing whilst Harwood (2018) classified minor as addition, deletion, and substitution, and meso and major as addition, deletion, and rewriting. My own results followed those of Harwood but due to the numerous revisions made to my taxonomy, I adjusted the substitution category to solely apply to changes that involved only one word rather than Harwood's (2018) one to five words. Regardless of the aforementioned differences, the overwhelming majority of interventions made in the studies of Luo and Hyland (2017), Harwood (2018), and my own research belonged to the minor category. Differences occurred in regard to the meso and major forms of intervention; whilst both categories were far lower than those of a minor nature for Harwood's findings as well as my own, my proofreader made fewer changes in the meso category than the major. In contrast, even though three of Harwood's proofreaders did not make any meso or major interventions, the eleven who did, made more changes in the former category. With regard to Luo and Hyland's (2017) study, editors M2 and M3 showed similar results to my proofreaders as they both made noticeably fewer meso changes than major but editor M1 aligned more with Harwood's (2018) proofreaders as more changes were made in the meso category. The following will now discuss specific types of intervention reported by the researchers and compare them with my own findings.

Table 2 Specific Types of Proofreader/Editor Intervention

Researchers	Addition	Deletion	Substitution	Reordering	Rewriting	Recombining	Mechanical Alteration	Rearranging	Total Number of Interventions
Willey and Tanimoto (2012)	345 (31.4%)	252 (22.9%)	350 (31.9%)	52 (4.7%)	28 (2.5%)	28 (2.5%)	42 (3.8%) (see note 1)	N/A	1097
Flowerdew and Wang (2016)	800 (15.5%)	625 (12.1%)	2034 (39.4%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1511 (29.2%) (see note 2)	190 (3.6%)	5160
Luo and Hyland (2017)	42 (10.8%)	70 (18%)	43 (11%)	21 (5.4%)	49 (12.6%)	10 (2.5%)	153 (39.4%) (see note 3)	N/A	388
Harwood (2018)	783 (21.2%)	379 (10.2%)	1415 (38.3%)	152 (4.1%)	36 (0.9%)	76 (2%)	844 (22.9%)	N/A	3685
My Results	323 (7.3%)	246 (5.5%)	842 (19.1)	41 (0.9%)	13 (0.2%)	1 (0.02%)	2931 (66.6%)	N/A	4397
Totals	2,293	1,572	4,684	266	126	115	5,481	190	

Key

Red shading represents categories with high percentages of editor/proofreader intervention at 30% or more.

Orange shading represents categories with upper mid percentages of editor/proofreader intervention from 15% to 29.9%.

Yellow shading represents categories with lower mid percentages of editor/proofreader intervention from 5.1% to 14.9%.

Green shading represents categories with low percentages of editor/proofreader intervention at 5% or less.

Notes

1) Willey and Tanimoto (2012) named this category ‘mechanical’

2) Flowerdew and Wang (2016) named this category ‘correction’

3) Luo and Hyland (2017) named this category ‘mechanical fixing’

In order to make comparisons with specific forms of intervention, I have devised Table 2 above which charts the findings of Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Flowerdew and Wang (2016), Luo and Hyland (2017), Harwood (2018), and my own. The results have been calculated as follows: 1) for each category, I have noted the total number of changes made by *all* proofreaders/editors in each study e.g., Harwood (2018) had 14 proofreaders in his study who made a combined total of 783 addition interventions; 2) percentages have been calculated by taking the number of interventions for each category and dividing them by the total number of interventions made by *all* proofreaders/editors in each study e.g., Harwood's (2018) figure of 783 addition changes was divided by 3685 (the total number of interventions made by the 14 proofreaders) which gives a value of 21.2%.; and 3) as shown by the key, categories were divided into percentages of editor/proofreader intervention with high at 30% or more, upper mid at 15% to 29.9%, lower mid at 5.1% to 14.9%, and low at 5% or less. The following will now discuss parallels that can be drawn between the researchers noted in Table 2 and my own results.

With reference to my results, a high number of changes were made for the mechanical alteration and substitution categories as can be seen from the combined totals of 5,481 and 4,684 respectively. Indeed, mechanical alteration that concerned changes which did not affect meaning saw a large amount of intervention for all researchers and myself apart from Willey and Tanimoto (2012). Similarly, substitution interventions were frequent for Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Flowerdew and Wang (2016), Harwood (2018), and to a certain extent my own results, whereas Luo and Hyland (2017) did not see as much intervention in this category. Regarding the addition and deletion categories, a moderate to high amount of intervention was seen in these areas as can be noted in the overall figures of 2,293 and 1,572 respectively. Concerning addition, Willey and Tanimoto (2012) saw a sizable amount of intervention in this category at 31.4% which was almost as high as their substitution category (31.9%). Likewise, Flowerdew and Wang (2016) and Harwood (2018) also saw fairly substantial intervention in this area. However, my results aligned more with those of Luo and Hyland (2017) as less intervention was shown in regard to addition. Turning to deletion, this category saw less intervention than that of addition for all researchers including myself except for Luo and Hyland (2017). Finally, parallels can also be made in categories where fewer interventions were undertaken as can be seen in areas of

reordering and recombining in which combined totals amounted to only 266 and 115 respectively. Indeed, Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Luo and Hyland (2017), Harwood (2018), and my findings saw low levels of intervention in these areas and although Flowerdew and Wang (2016) did not have categories specifically named reordering and recombining, they did have one for rearrangement which also saw a low number of changes (3.6%). In addition, although Flowerdew and Wang (2016) did not have a rewriting category, it was another form of intervention which saw low numbers of change for Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Harwood (2018), and my findings whereas Luo and Hyland (2017) saw more changes in this area.

Regarding consultation/teaching points, whilst Flowerdew and Wang (2016) and Luo and Hyland (2017) did not report such interventions, I will discuss the results in said area by referring to the findings of Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Harwood (2018), and my own. Firstly, Willey and Tanimoto found the novice group made the most amount of consultation points interventions at 36 which was much higher than the control, health, and experienced groups with figures of 16, 6, and 10 respectively. Harwood's (2018, pp. 487-491) proofreaders were not separated into distinct groups like Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) as they had varying levels of proofreading experience ranging from two to fifteen years and had proofread texts from a variety of disciplines. However, Harwood's (2018, p. 493) findings also revealed variety in the number of comments made as one proofreader did not make any (Jackie) and another made 84 (Moir). My proofreader, Jane, made a relatively high number of consultation/teaching points as noted in Table 1 of the results chapter in which 17.9% of all interventions fell into such a category. My proofreader, Jane, who had received professional training made a relatively high number of consultation/teaching points as noted in Table 1 of the results chapter in which 17.9% of all interventions fell into such a category. This finding differs to Willey and Tanimoto's (2012) results as their experienced group, familiar with editing healthcare-related texts, left far fewer consultation/teaching points than the novice group who were not experienced in editing said texts.

With regard to the total number of proofreading changes, comparisons can be made with my research and the studies of Rebeck (2014), Luo and Hyland (2017), and Harwood (2018) as the number of words

for each text was provided with the aforementioned researchers' studies. Beginning with Rebeck (2014, p. 13), my result of 4.48 changes per 100 words is especially low when compared to some of his proofreaders: for instance, 60 corrections or comments on a 300-word excerpt (20 per 100 words). However, it needs to be acknowledged that in Rebeck's study, another proofreader made only 30 corrections or comments (10 per 100 words); nevertheless, the latter result is still more than double the number of adjustments made to my student's text. An important point to mention in regard to the fairness of making comparisons between my findings and those of Rebeck's research concerns a proofreader's background as the reader will recall that the proofreader in my study was a professional who worked for a company and had undergone training. However, whilst Rebeck's (2014) study gives an overview in his table 1 (p. 4) of the profiles of those involved in the research in regard to proofreading experience, it does not mention if the participants had undergone any form of professional training. Furthermore, Rebeck (2014) acknowledges that the proofreaders did not receive any "specific training" and were instead given information concerning the job requirements (p. 3). Concerning Luo and Hyland's (2017, pp. 425-429) research, my findings are again very low when compared to editor M1 who made a total of 226 interventions to a 1,520-word text (14.86/100 words). Instead, my results are more similar to Luo and Hyland's M2 and M3 editors who made 96 (6.31/100 words) and 66 (4.34/100 words) changes respectively. Regarding Harwood's (2018) research, I will compare the total number of *in-text* interventions made to his student's text and my own as he treated consultation/teaching points separately whereas I combined them. Further, in order to make a fair comparison, I have chosen to focus on Jackie, who was the only "professionally trained proofreader" in Harwood's research (p. 492). However, I would like to underline that my proofreader was working with a markedly better text than that of Harwood's in which his student only scored a bare pass of 50 percent (p. 481) and it is unsurprising that Jackie needed to make more interventions. Nevertheless, based on the fact that my proofreader and Jackie were both professionals, I will endeavour to draw comparisons. Regarding Jackie's interventions, she made 472 for the 2,511-word essay used in Harwood's study which means that 18.79/100 words were changed. This was in stark contrast to the findings of my research in which a total of 4,574 in-text interventions were made to 124,341 words resulting in a much lower norm value of 3.67 changes for every 100 words. However, it should be acknowledged that whilst the following

proofreader was not professionally trained, Harwood's research also revealed that Moira made far fewer changes at 113 meaning that 4.5 out of every 100 words underwent intervention which is a figure far more similar to my own. As mentioned above, the types of text which Jackie and my proofreader (Jane) proofread were very different and in a future study it would be interesting to compare professionally trained proofreaders' interventions for the same text. In addition, an interesting point to mention was that Jackie viewed her role as "editing and proofreading" rather than proofreading alone which not only explains her seemingly more liberal attitude to proofreading as highlighted by Harwood (2018, p. 497) but contrasts with that of Jane; Jane makes a clear distinction between proofreading and editing in that she does not guarantee a word count as in her view, this is not the role of a proofreader and would be classified as editing (see subsections 3.3.3.2 and 4.2.2.1).

Having discussed the quantitative aspect of my research in regard to my proofreader's interventions, the following sections will discuss qualitative findings concerning ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of intervention from the student, proofreader, and lecturer interviews.

5.2 Ethically Acceptable, Questionable and Unacceptable Forms of Intervention

Acceptable forms of intervention concerned minor addition and advice to add more information, substitution, meaning and content regarding judgemental text, and recombining. Regarding minor addition, Jane's assertion that she made changes in order to improve cohesion (see subsection 4.2.1.1 of the results chapter) would seemingly be an acceptable form of intervention in the eyes of other proofreaders when considering that: 1) the editors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 886) research strongly agreed this was the role of a proofreader editing a dissertation or thesis (see stylistic editing task 41 of "making text smooth and readable"); and 2) Flowerdew and Wang (2016, pp. 47-48) noted that such interventions were made to render texts more concise and to remove redundancies as mentioned in subsection 2.1.3 of the literature review. However, much depends on the number of words as meso and major forms of addition were deemed problematic by my participants (see subsection 4.2.5.1 of the results chapter). Indeed, the supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 886) research agreed to some extent that the aforementioned task 41 was the role of an editor as opposed to

a proofreader, and this could be reflected in the fact that the insertion of a larger number of words could result in the work no longer being that of the author as argued by Sarah. Similarly to minor addition, substitution would also appear to be an acceptable form of proofreading intervention as none of the participants in my research viewed such changes to be problematic (see subsection 4.2.1.2 of the results chapter). This is supported by Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 885) editor and supervisor results in that both parties found the following interventions to be acceptable: 1) copyediting task 4, "correcting incorrect word structure," which was the first example from Figure 8, i.e., changing a verb to noun; 2) copyediting task 5, "correcting words that have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning," which was the second example from Figure 8, i.e., replacing one word with another; 3) copyediting task 10, "correcting to ensure that text conforms to the higher education institution's house style or style rules," which was the third example from Figure 8, i.e., writing the full form of numbers under ten and; 4) copyediting task 3 of "correcting incorrect sentence structure," which was the fourth example from Figure 8, i.e., ensuring agreement insofar as '10-week pre-session course' being more appropriate than 'ten weeks pre-session course'. In addition, the four types of change noted above in reference to Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) research could correspond to Cottier's (2017, p. 44) category of technical writing issues; like Sarah, the students in Cottier's research also viewed such issues to be the role of a thesis editor. As with minor addition and substitution, the proofreader's advice regarding seemingly judgemental text would also appear to be an acceptable form of intervention, and the fact that it was written in comment form rather than being an automatic change would further justify such a change. Indeed, the editors and supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 887) research also found it to be acceptable to highlight content problems "without correcting the problems" (see content editing task 66). Finally, recombining would also appear to be an acceptable form of proofreading intervention as the participants in my research took little issue with this form of change (see subsection 4.2.4.1 of the results chapter). My participants' views are supported by the editors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 886) research in that stylistic editing task 40 of "making sentences more concise" was deemed to be appropriate. However, the supervisors agreed to a lesser extent that making sentences more concise was the role of the proofreader, although there was a far higher standard deviation than the editors which suggests some participants may not have been in agreement with such changes. In

addition, Sarah's views that sentence recombining is acceptable in regard to punctuation but not meaning seemingly align with the student perspectives in Cottier's (2017) research; Cottier's (2017) students believed that technical writing issues involving changes in areas of punctuation were the role of a thesis editor (p. 44) but not content interventions in which sentences were extensively edited (p. 46).

Questionable forms of intervention concerned deletion, reordering, structural editing, APA referencing, meso and major addition, and meaning and content regarding correcting words used incorrectly. In regard to deletion, the lecturers in my research found this to be problematic. Indeed, for deletion interventions, it may be necessary to have the proofreader's input as highlighted by Luo and Hyland's (2017) research in which such changes were made when the editor conferred with the writer/author as noted in subsection 2.1.2 of the literature review. However, from my findings detailed in subsection 4.2.2.1 of the results chapter, much depends on the number of the words that are removed as the removal of two and five words was deemed ethically acceptable by all participants in my study whereas meso and major level forms of intervention were more problematic. Similarly, the reordering of sentences was deemed problematic by the lecturers as noted in subsection 4.2.2.2 of the results chapter and such views are supported by the editors and supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 886) research who found "reordering sentences to ensure that the argument is logically structured" to be problematic (see structural editing task 45). However, the fact that Jane left a comment rather than making an in-text change would reflect Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 887) findings in that such interventions are acceptable in comment form (see task 51). Sarah's views concerning the problematic nature of reordering also align with those of the students in Cottier's (2017, p. 46) research because they viewed it as a content change. However, as the interventions that Jane made were in comment form, this would correspond to both Sarah's and Cottier's student views that such issues could be pointed out to the writer. As with sentence reordering, structural editing was also deemed problematic by my lecturer participants as noted in subsection 4.2.2.3 of the results chapter and their views correspond with those of the supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013) research who found such interventions to be contentious as noted in subsection 2.1.6 of the literature review. Likewise, Cottier's (2017, p. 46)

findings showed that students did not find structural editing changes to be the role of an editor as mentioned in section 2.3 of the literature review. However, Sarah's views differed in this respect as she appreciated knowing how her text appeared to the reader but the fact that they were made in comment form would align more with Cottier's findings regarding the role and relationship between a student and editor; indeed, the students in Cottier's (2017, p. 46) research emphasised the importance of effective communication when making changes and that the writer should be alerted to forms of intervention. Concerns were also expressed by my participants regarding APA referencing style (see subsection 4.2.2.4 of the results chapter). For the first intervention displayed in Figure 12 concerning a font change, such views differ to those of the editors and supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 885) research who found that "correcting to ensure that text conforms to the higher-education institution house style or style rules" (see copyediting task10) was an acceptable form of intervention. However, high standards of deviation were found amongst both the editors and supervisors which could reflect the divisive nature of such an intervention. In addition, Jane's second intervention in Figure 12 concerning the ampersand was also viewed to be problematic by the supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 885) research i.e., copyediting task 13 of "correcting referencing style for in-text references". However, the editors did not find it to be an issue which was in accordance with Jane's decision to make the change to adhere with APA referencing style. The contentious nature of intervening in areas of referencing was also evident in Harwood's (2019) research mentioned in subsection 2.1.5 of the literature review in which Helena refuses to make changes in this area as it would hinder a student writer from developing their academic literacy skills which contrasts with the students in Cottier's (2017) research mentioned in section 2.3 where students place much emphasis on receiving support in such an area to ensure they adhere to institutional guidelines. Finally, as meso and major forms of addition have already been discussed previously, the last category to consider for questionable interventions is that of correcting words used incorrectly in terms of meaning as detailed in subsection 4.2.5.2 of the results chapter. The overall views of my participants regarding correcting words to be problematic are in contrast with the editors and supervisors of Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 885) research who were more accommodating of such a change (see copyediting task 5). As such, the issue seems to be *how* students are advised of incorrect words as Michael and Emily thought it would be

more acceptable for a student to have such issues highlighted. These views are in accordance with those expressed by Connors (2000) and Myers (2003) insofar as second language writers needing support in terms of grammar and lexis so as to be able to effectively convey meaning. Similarly, Cottier's (2017, p. 44) research found that student participants agreed a thesis editor could help in the category of technical writing issues which included support with words and inaccuracies whilst not straying into content changes.

Finally for this section, unacceptable forms of intervention concerned changing the order of research questions, rewriting, and meaning and content in regard to Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 167) adapted tasks 60, 61, 62, 63 of: 1) writing additional material at paragraph level; 2) rewriting sections to improve content; 3) deleting irrelevant content at paragraph level; and 4) checking for plagiarism. Regarding changing the order of research questions, it appears that rather than the proofreader giving the student suggestions as to the numbering of the research questions, they should instead highlight that there is an issue and advise the student to speak to their supervisor as noted in subsection 4.2.3.1 of the results chapter. In such instances, the proofreader would act as a form of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2012, p. 576) "mediator" between the student and supervisor (see section 2.1.7 of the literature review). Concerning rewriting, the main issue appeared to be whether it was a suggestion or automatic change as well as the type of suggestion, and the number of words that were involved. As such, for issues of rewriting that a proofreader wishes to bring to their student's attention, consideration should be given to the type of comment that is left as noted in subsection 4.2.6.1 of the results chapter. For instance, the proofreader could simply advise the student that the sentence is awkward or unclear and if the student were unable to reformulate the utterance, such an issue could be discussed at a follow-up meeting. This is especially important in terms of ownership as expressed by Sarah in which the work is no longer that of the student. Indeed, having the opportunity to firstly consider rewriting the sentence and eventually view or discuss a reformulated utterance with the proofreader is an important issue when considering the views of Behm (1989, p. 6) who argues that writers do not work in isolation and input is usually received from at least one other person if not more. In order to find a middle ground in which ethical principles can be upheld, Behm (1989, p. 10) states that responsibility is the key to ensuring

students are accountable for their texts when determining what changes to accept or decline. Harwood, Austin, and Macaulay (2012, p. 576) reinforce Behm's (1989) viewpoints in stating that writing is indeed social and collaborative in nature as exemplified in their descriptions of the varying roles of the proofreader; the authors note that when viewing the proofreader as either a helper who acts as a mentor for students or as a type of mediator between the student and supervisor, writing becomes a collective form of action in which students aim to meet the expectations of lecturers and address a specific audience. Regarding Jane's decision to provide lower-level students with a better choice of words, for a future study, it would be interesting to compare her views with those of other proofreaders. Indeed, Kruger and Bevan-Dye's 2010 and 2013 studies that were discussed in subsection 2.1.6 of the literature review found that the authors observed high standard deviations amongst editors regarding task 42 of "rewriting sections of text to improve style" (Kruger and Bevan-Dye, 2013, p. 886). With regard to the meaning and content subcategories discussed in subsection 4.2.6.2 of the results chapter, such changes were deemed to be highly inappropriate by my participants which reflects Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, p. 887) research as exemplified in their content editing tasks 60, 61, 62, and 63 which neither the editors nor supervisors found to be acceptable. Similarly, the student participants in Cottier's (2017, p. 46) research also found the following interventions not to be the role of an editor:

Additions, deletions, rewriting or extensive editing of, sentences, paragraphs, ideas, views or opinions, analysis, meaning, introductions and conclusions and discipline-specific language.

Interventions regarding checking for plagiarism were not specifically addressed in Cottier's research although changes in areas of ideas and views or opinions were deemed problematic. Although Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2009) research did not measure changes to meaning using the same descriptors as Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 168) content editing tasks (i.e., 60, 61, 62, and 63), many of the proofreaders in their study also found content level changes to be unacceptable as discussed in section 2.1.7 of the literature review. Furthermore, Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 168) content editing task 63 regarding "checking for plagiarism and alerting the author" was actually covered by Eve in Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2010, p. 60) research in that she only alerts a student to possibly plagiarised text but does not make any editions as also noted in subsection 2.1.7. Alhojailan's (2019, p. 174)

research also revealed that his two proofreaders would only make minor changes if they did not interfere with meaning as again discussed in subsection 2.1.7. However, it would be interesting to further investigate the extent to which proofreaders/editors feel they can intervene in areas of meaning and content when sharing a similar discipline. For instance, Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2009) research mentioned in subsection 2.1.7 of the literature review discussed how Eve's lack of expertise in a particular field would allow her to intervene in areas of content. Further, Harwood's (2018 and 2019) research discussed in subsection 2.1.5 in regard to a proofreader sharing the same field as a student writer highlighted that changes could be made according to Ana's viewpoints, whereas Eleanor was concerned that providing ideas could be rather problematic.

From the above account and the findings presented in section 4.2 of the results chapter, there appears to be a consensus amongst the student, proofreader, and two senior lecturers concerning what proofreaders can and cannot do. This is evident in the fact that all three parties found acceptable forms of interventions to lie in areas of minor addition and advice to add more information, substitution, meaning and content regarding judgemental text, and recombining. Furthermore, the participants were in general agreement as to the problematic nature of interventions in areas of deletion, reordering, structural editing, APA referencing, meso and major addition, and correcting words used incorrectly in terms of meaning, as well as the unacceptability of changes made when adjusting the order of research questions, rewriting, and meaning and content in regard to 1) writing additional material at paragraph level; 2) rewriting sections; 3) deleting irrelevant content at paragraph level and; 4) checking for plagiarism. The aforementioned agreement between participants as to acceptable and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention could be used to inform university proofreading guidelines i.e., a proofreading policy could display forms of appropriate intervention along with inappropriate changes for the reader to have examples of what does and does not constitute ethically acceptable proofreading support. Indeed, such guidelines that display ethically appropriate and inappropriate forms of proofreading intervention will be discussed more in section 6.1 of the conclusion when I present a draft proofreading policy.

Although participants generally agreed as to the appropriacy of differing forms of proofreading intervention, noteworthy differences of opinion arose in areas of: 1) meaning and content in regard to advising the student that the text appeared to be judgemental as Emily thought that this was more an issue for the marker whereas Michael believed it was the type of problem that students need to be made aware of albeit in comment form; 2) the deletion of non-content words in transcripts which the lecturers found to be problematic as a student may have been advised to include everything mentioned by an interviewee but my student and proofreader raised issues of needing help with the word count; 3) structural editing when moving a sentence to another chapter in which the lecturers thought that the comments could have been more formative and was possibly more the role of a supervisor, whereas the student found the proofreader's advice to be beneficial as she appreciated knowing how the text appeared to a reader; 4) APA referencing adjustments which the lecturers found to be problematic insofar as intervening in forms of assessment when verifying that students can adhere to academic conventions whilst the student and proofreader recognised the necessity of adhering to said referencing format; and 5) rewriting in that the lecturers and student found this to be problematic whereas the proofreader focused on how she may have provided a better choice of words albeit in comment form. The implications of the lack of consensus amongst the participants for the aforementioned categories means that a proofreading policy would need to emphasise it being a form of *general* guidance for stakeholders and that a student should ultimately check with their department whether the proofreader changes are appropriate for their type of work and assessment.

5.2.1 In-Text Changes Versus Comments

From the findings displayed in the results chapter and the discussion above, it would appear that participants find comments to be more appropriate than in-text changes which is similar to the editors and supervisors in Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2013, pp. 886-887) research who found copyediting task 30, stylistic editing task 43, structural editing task 41, and content editing task 66 to be acceptable as problems were highlighted but not corrected. In addition, as noted in section 2.3. of the literature review, the student participants in Conrad's (2021) research differentiated between third parties who made in-text interventions as opposed to those who left suggestions and importantly highlighted that feedback

should be educational, and text should be edited in the student's own words. As such, Conrad highlighted that if a third party were to make an in-text or direct intervention, this would deny students the opportunity to learn from their written errors. Regarding the learning aspect of Conrad's (2021) findings, Harwood's (2018, p. 485) research mentioned in subsection 2.1.5 revealed that some of the proofreading comments served a pedagogic purpose which could improve current and future texts through educative remarks such as advising the student to add a page number for a quote. Indeed, from an educational perspective, such comments are particularly useful for a student like Sarah who observed that guidance in terms of reordering sentences is beneficial due to the fact that doctoral students can at times feel isolated and unable to access peers to have them read and comment on their work; such views are supported by one of the proofreaders (Anita) in Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2012, p. 574) research who found that her assistance alleviates the writer's sense of isolation or lack of support. Another important point which Sarah highlighted is that she is ultimately responsible for the changes as detailed in subsection 4.2.6.1 of the results chapter in regard to rewriting which further underscores the importance of comments.

Finally, in regard to both in-text and comment interventions, much depends on how the student views their proofreader's interventions. Indeed, my student sent me Microsoft Word documents of her proofread work which featured Track changes. As such, I am presuming that this is how she viewed the interventions and may not have noticed for instance that certain words had been added even with the Track changes function. For instance, when viewing proofreader interventions in Track changes of the Microsoft Word document, I had to hover over a word for a small grey box to appear that would indicate a word had been inserted but it did not appear in the right-hand margin of the document. However, I discovered that proofreader changes were far clearer when viewing one of my student's chapters in Google docs; I observed that the previously mentioned addition intervention was highlighted in pink within the text, and it also appeared in the right-hand margin of the document as an option for the student to either accept or reject through tick/cross symbols. This means that proofreading guidelines could stipulate the most effective method for a student to view their proofread work in order to see all changes and have the option to accept or reject them. If the student were to view the proofreader changes

in Google docs, consideration should be given as to whether the proofreader refrains from making interventions and informs the student that their work in a specific paragraph needs work through the comments option, or whether it would be acceptable for the student to view the document in Google docs and clearly see where the text had been adjusted to then make the decision of accepting or rejecting changes.

5.2.2 Perspectives on Non-Intervention

From Emily's account of the proofreader's non-interventions mentioned in subsection 4.2.8 of the results chapter, a number of points were highlighted in regard to: 1) the non-interventions being minor in nature and many being linked to formatting issues; 2) proofreaders not being infallible whilst still needing to be consistent; and 3) students taking responsibility for their work. The first point concerning the fact that interventions were not made in certain formatting areas was unsurprising as I had gathered from the student that such changes would be made for the final version of her thesis. Furthermore, as Jane is a professionally trained proofreader, it is unsurprising that most of the non-interventions were of a minor nature in accordance with how she understood the nature of her role. The second point highlights the difficulty of proofreading large texts such as a thesis and is a view supported by Jane which was discussed in subsection 4.3.2 of the results chapter where she highlighted the importance of having someone check a proofreader's work. Finally, the third point concerning students taking responsibility for their work is in accordance with the views of Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 163) and Harwood (2019, p. 19) regarding students simply accepting all interventions through the Track changes function which denies important learning opportunities. Indeed, this final important point will be reflected as a form of documented agreement between stakeholders in my draft proofreading policy detailed in section 6.1 of the conclusion.

5.3 Proofreading Practices

Having discussed participant views concerning ethically appropriate and inappropriate forms of proofreading intervention, the following will address: 1) students consulting a professional or non-

professional proofreader; 2) in-house and external proofreading services; and 3) the frequency of consulting a proofreader.

5.3.1 Students Consulting a Professional or Non-Professional Proofreader

With regard to the use of professional proofreading services presented in subsection 4.3.1 of the results chapter, Michael's concerns are understandable when considering arguments against consulting paid proofreaders as noted in subsection 1.2.1 of the literature review; for instance Baty (2006) cites Alan Smithers of Buckingham University who criticised Bradford University's provision of proofreaders and emphasised that having access to a proofreader is a reflection of a student being able to afford such a service rather than an indication of their academic capabilities. Such views are echoed by Turner (2018, p. 95), McKie (2019) and De Oliveira (2020, pp. 249-250), who highlight the unfairness of students obtaining better grades due to their ability to afford paid proofreaders (also see subsection 1.2.1 of the literature review). Regarding Michael's opinion of proofreaders making changes without the student's input, Scurr (2006) shares similar concerns and notes that paid proofreaders mask rather than confront literacy issues as again noted in subsection 1.2.1 of the literature review. Furthermore, Michael's remarks reflect observations made by Lines (2016, p. 373) concerning some editing agencies offering to substantially edit student texts which is a view supported by Harwood (2018, p. 502) who also emphasised that some proofreaders even introduce errors to a text.

Michael and Emily's seeming endorsement of non-professional proofreading services also mentioned in subsection 4.3.1 of the results chapter ties in with Conrad's (2021) important point regarding an educator who would feel comfortable permitting proofreading help from an informal contact but not from a professional source in which payment has to be made. However, Conrad importantly highlights potential dilemmas in that some students may not be able to rely upon family or friendship networks to help with their writing. Regardless of whether a student is permitted to engage with a professional or non-professional proofreader, an important point concerns students taking an active role in their writing which speaks to Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 163) and Harwood's (2019, p. 19) assertions that students should consider the proofreader changes made to their text as mentioned in subsection 5.2.2.

As such, it would be highly advisable for a student, proofreader, and lecturer to meet in order to establish from the outset the exact role of the proofreader. This is especially important when considering Michael's advice that there should be some form of discussion instead of receiving 'a nice shiny essay that you get a better mark for'. Indeed, some of the proofreaders in Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2012) research viewed themselves to be a cleaner who "dust around and clean up...leaving a nice shiny essay" (p. 575) as mentioned in subsection 2.1.7 of the literature review. Furthermore, Harwood, Austin, and Macaulay (2012) highlight the formative aspect of post-proofreading meetings in that students can clarify proofreading interventions and view problematic areas together. However, one of proofreaders (Anna) also chose not to meet students as she believed that this would be ethically questionable and beyond the support already provided in her proofreading interventions (p. 579) which reflects the views of Emily who prefers to keep a seemingly professional distance. In addition, it could be rather challenging for a student, proofreader, and lecturer to arrange and find time to meet so a form of documented agreement that was touched upon at the end of subsection 5.2.2 could be made between the three parties to show that each is aware of the types of interventions that can and cannot be made.

5.3.2 In-House and External Proofreading Services

With further regard to a professional proofreading service, aspects of possible in-house and external operations were seen as problematic for the participants in my research. Regarding in-house services, Jane highlighted that the University would need to appoint someone to run a proofreading service who is a professional proofreader with the skills and background to oversee the operation and check other proofreaders' documents as mentioned in subsection 4.3.2 of the results chapter. In addition, the University may have little experience in providing a proofreading service when considering its current Writing Centre and Study Skills Services' ethos of not being a proofreading provider nor endorsing external proofreaders respectively. Therefore, there would be an initial cost to train employees in proofreading which may mean the employment of new members of staff should current teachers be reluctant to undertake such a role and this course of action would come at a cost as clearly expressed by Jane and acknowledged by Michael. Indeed, Jane's observations concerning the difficulty of setting up an in-house proofreading service speak to Salter-Dvorak's (2019) comments regarding the amount

of organisation that would need to be undertaken to establish such an operation. As such, Salter-Dvorak (2019) underscores that setting up an in-house proofreading service is rather complex as there would need to be communication between various stakeholders throughout the university from the student through to EAP tutors, proofreaders, faculty members and upper echelons of management. As such, Salter-Dvorak (2019) highlights that this would also involve a number of important steps that could prove complex in regard to: 1) securing additional EAP staff to presumably act as in-house proofreaders which could have consequences for resources; 2) supervisors receiving standardisation training when providing feedback on written drafts in which it may be challenging to secure their willingness to cooperate; and 3) the university having to select and train proofreaders as well as ensuring a high standard of proofreading service, and to produce guidelines for all stakeholders (p. 129). In a similar vein, Michael also questioned whether the university would want to take on such a venture and highlighted the cost element which further reflects the views expressed by Salter-Dvorak (2019). Therefore, there could be an argument for Jane's suggestion of outsourcing proofreading via Student Services to already trained proofreaders who adhere to university policies. Indeed, ensuring that universities do in fact have a clear proofreading policy and ensure that external proofreaders follow university proofreading guidelines is very important when considering that: 1) guidelines are not always available at a university as highlighted by the participants in Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2010, p. 62) research; and 2) outsourcing gives rise to issues mentioned by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 164) regarding conflicting views between how editors perceive their role and university expectations of such third parties. Finally, Jane's assertion that it would be more advisable to outsource proofreading to a professional company such as the one she works for as it is a large organisation which could offer very good rates would alleviate costs involved in establishing and organising an in-house proofreading service.

5.3.3 The Frequency of Consulting a Proofreader

Regarding the extent to which students should be allowed to consult a proofreader, Sarah's views expressed in subsection 4.3.3 of the results chapter regarding the use of a proofreader when being assessed on language speak to concerns expressed by Jude Carroll of Oxford Brookes University (Baty,

2006; Shaw, 2014). Baty (2006) reported that Carroll equates proofreading to plagiarism by stating that when marks are awarded for English language competency, a student who uses the services of a proofreader is actually submitting work of another. Thus, Carroll clearly questions the authorship of a proofread text. In a later article, Shaw (2014) also makes reference to Carroll, who stated that a student should be transparent when submitting work for assessment and if a proofread text is held up as a reflection of a student's ability to produce a grammatically perfect text, it would result in a misrepresentation of such abilities. However, Carroll argues that proofreading could prove useful if a student is seeking credit for content in terms of the arguments presented, original work, and research skills. Nevertheless, this would mean that a student seeking credit for content, their writing abilities, and the authorship of a text could be held to account if a proofreader is consulted. In addition, Michael's views of the seemingly disingenuous nature of allowing PhD but not undergraduate or master's students to have proofreading help seemingly align with those expressed in an online forum of *The Guardian* (Shaw, 2014) and as noted in subsection 1.2.2 of the literature review in which a reader questioned whether anyone would submit work that had not had some form of proofreading, whilst emphasising the apparent disadvantage that international students have insofar as accessing a native speaker within their field of study.

Furthermore, Michael and Emily's caution regarding the recommendation of proofreaders aligns with those expressed by Alkhatib (2019) as mentioned in section 2.2 of the literature review in which 83 percent of her lecturer participants refrained from suggesting the use of a proofreader. In addition, the lecturers in Alkhatib's research held similar views to those expressed by Emily in claiming that proofreading is an essential part of the writing process that ideally needs to be self-taught whilst acknowledging that the situation is not always clear cut. Indeed, Turner (2011, p. 430) underscores the difficulty of a student proofreading their own work and emphasises the challenge in finding one's own mistakes. Furthermore, a proofreader could be beneficial if one were to follow Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, pp. 154-155) process-based approach to third-party interventions whereby the proofreader would contribute to the students' learning progress rather than focusing solely on one text. Importantly, the student, proofreader, and lecturer would determine the amount of involvement that can be provided

from the outset to establish the precise role of third-party help and boundaries that must be adhered to. However, two issues could arise with the regular use of a proofreader in that students could become frustrated by the cycle of writing, rewriting, and proofreading as highlighted by Turner (2011, p. 430) (see section 2.3 of the literature review), and some students may wish to keep sending more and more drafts to the proofreader. Therefore, it would be important to establish and regulate the number of times that a proofreader could be consulted.

5.4 Communication Amongst Stakeholders

Sarah's reasons for having a proofreader as mentioned in section 4.4 of the results chapter are in accordance with Conrad's (2020, p. 6) findings in that a quarter of the participants in her research used proofreading for issues of "typos" and "grammatical mistakes" as mentioned in section 2.3 of the literature review. In addition, Sarah's motivation for having a proofreader to ensure that her work is of a publishable standard appears to reflect the stance expressed by Kim (2019, p. 9) concerning L2 scholars wishing to publish being allowed to consult editors but restricting the use of proofreaders for L2 students writing for assessment. Regarding the rapport between Sarah and Jane discussed in section 4.4 of the results chapter, their friendship highlights the importance of establishing effective communication. Indeed, whilst Jane and Sarah's friendship naturally resulted in far greater communication, the former still has an initial phone call and exchanges one or two emails post-proofreading with private clients. With further regard to communication amongst stakeholders, Jane's decision to not advise lecturers that she proofreads students' work as well as Michael and Emily not having been advised of students consulting a proofreading service underscores the necessity of improved communication amongst stakeholders which can be obtained through clear, widely disseminated guidelines as highlighted by Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009), Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010), Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2012), McNally and Kooyman (2017), Harwood (2018), Kim and LaBianca (2018) Alhojailan (2019), Harwood (2019), and Kim (2019) and noted in section 2.4 of the literature review. In addition, whilst it may be a rather unusual request that proofreaders contact a supervisor to advise them of students using their service, all parties could at least be encouraged to take responsibility by students completing the previously mentioned stakeholder

agreement document that will be presented in section 6.1 of my conclusion when proposing a draft proofreading policy.

5.5 University Proofreading Guidelines and Stakeholder Advice for the University

To conclude the discussion chapter, the following subsections will discuss the findings mentioned in section 4.5 of the results chapter regarding university proofreading guidelines and stakeholder advice for the university.

5.5.1 University Proofreading Guidelines

Sarah's experience of trying to procure a set of University proofreading guidelines as mentioned in subsection 4.5.1 of the results chapter reflects the findings of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010, p. 62) mentioned in subsection 5.3.2 regarding guidelines not always being available at a university. Sarah's account also highlights the ambiguity surrounding the type of third-party help that can be sought as detailed by Kim and LaBianca (2018) in which the authors emphasise the lack of clear-cut definitions of proofreading and a failure to acknowledge the type of guidance which a student can receive when producing written work at their university. Turning to Jane's account of University proofreading guidelines, two interesting points concerning the University's approach to proofreading and the issue of plagiarism come to the fore. Regarding the first point, the University seems to have adopted what Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010, p. 65) term a "laissez-faire" approach to proofreading. This is highlighted in regard to the University having a link to brief proofreading guidelines on their Study Skills webpage which was also only ever devised for one faculty i.e., ScHARR. Whilst guidelines devised for said faculty could in theory have been applicable to a university wide context, it is questionable as to whether all faculties will have been consulted in the production of such guidance. In regard to the second point, the fact that proofreading guidelines displayed in the weblink were found via guidance on plagiarism/unfair means policies seemingly highlights that the University possibly takes a prohibitive stance to third-party intervention. Finally, Michael and Emily's experiences of proofreading practices at the University are very similar to those previously expressed by Sarah and further reflect the views of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2010, p. 62) mentioned in subsection 5.3.2

as noted above. Furthermore, Michael and Emily's experience of not having received any proofreading guideline instruction also reflects Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2010, p. 65) "laissez-faire" stance.

5.5.2 Stakeholder Advice for the University

The accounts from the participants mentioned in subsection 4.5.2 of the results chapter echo the views expressed by Kim and LaBianca (2018, p. 40) regarding the need to define forms of 'best practice' when students consult a third party for help with written work. The stakeholders' views also underscored the points raised in section 2.4 of the literature review concerning numerous authors' claims that along with better communication amongst all stakeholders, widely available proofreading guidelines are crucial for improved proofreading practices (Harwood, Austin and Macaulay 2009; Harwood, Austin and Macaulay 2010; Harwood, Austin and Macaulay, 2012; McNally and Kooyman, 2017; Harwood, 2018; Kim and LaBianca, 2018; Alhojailan, 2019; Harwood, 2019; Kim, 2019). In addition, Emily's comment that proofreading policies would also need to be extended to proofreaders who operate on a freelance basis emphasises the need for the dissemination of documentation similar to that provided by SENSE (2016, p. 6) (see section 6.1 of the conclusion) so as to be applicable to all types of proofreader whether they are professional or non-professional and in-house or external.

Having presented the results and discussion of my quantitative and qualitative analysis, consideration now needs to be given to the implications of my findings, particularly in regard to university proofreading policies which will be one of the areas that I focus on in the final chapter of the thesis.

Chapter 6 Conclusion

Leading on from the discussion of my results, section 6.1 firstly presents a draft proofreading policy and guidelines that incorporate my findings. Following this, section 6.2 explains the origins of said policy which lie in Bretag *et al.*'s (2011, pp. 5-6) academic integrity principles that have been adapted to inform my proofreading guidelines. Next, section 6.3 considers the general enhancement of proofreading policies with reference to nurturing a culture of academic integrity and establishing training to inform participants of ethically appropriate forms of proofreading. The chapter concludes by discussing the limitations to my study (section 6.4) followed by areas for possible further research (section 6.5).

6.1 Draft Proofreading Policy and Guidelines

Figure 14 below is a draft proofreading policy proposal that incorporates my acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading interventions which were listed in subsections 4.2.1 to 4.2.6 of the results chapter with accompanying commentary. Before commencing, I wish to advise the reader that I have not included the meaning and content category in regard to judgemental text which was deemed ethically appropriate as it is very unique and students may understand that it is acceptable for proofreaders to make changes in areas of meaning and content when it is clearly a contentious area. Furthermore, I would like to underscore that my guidelines are not only based on my own study but incorporate important articles/research by Baty (2006), Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), Bretag *et al.* (2011), Shaw (2014), SENSE (2016), Harwood (2018), and Conrad (2021); the aforementioned authors are cited where relevant in Figure 14 and noted in a bibliography at the end of the guidelines. In addition, the policy has been informed by the research of Bretag and Mahmud (2016) particularly when discussing the importance of educating and training stakeholders as well as reviewing the policy; as such, Bretag and Mahmud (2016) have also been listed in the previously mentioned bibliography. Finally, the tables which display the student's original text and the proofreader's intervention contain text which has been submitted to Turnitin as part of Sarah's (my EdD student participant) thesis which was mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Figure 14 Proofreading University Policy and Guidelines Concerning Student Texts For Assessment

Contents (page numbers to be added for an eventual policy)

1. Glossary of terms
2. University Proofreading Policy and Guidelines Overview
3. Purpose of the Policy
4. Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading
5. Educating and Training Stakeholders
6. Review of the Proofreading Policy

Glossary of Terms

Intervention(s) – An intervention refers to any involvement from the proofreader in a student’s text.

The intervention can mean that the proofreader has:

1. made an in-text change to the student’s text without leaving a comment;
 2. made an in-text change to the student’s text and left a comment via the Track changes function;
- or
3. not made an in-text change to the student’s text but advised them to make a change via the Track changes/comments function.

Proofreader – A proofreader refers to any individual other than the writer, i.e., a third party who has proofread the student’s text. The term proofreader includes:

1. a professional who is either employed by a company or who works on a freelance basis and usually accepts payment for their work;
2. a non-professional such as a classmate/peer, friend or family member who either does or does not accept payment for their work;
3. a writing centre or study skills services tutor; or
4. an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teacher.

Please note that a proofreader does not include the student’s *own* supervisor.

University Proofreading Policy and Guidelines Overview

The purpose of this policy is to foster an academically honest culture regarding proofreading in which all stakeholders such as students, proofreaders, academics, EAP teachers, writing centre tutors, and university policy makers share responsibility in upholding high standards of academic integrity at all degree levels. However, whilst not wishing to advocate the use of overzealous proofreading practices in which proofreaders excessively intervene in a student's text for assessment, the policy is not intended to serve as a type of directive with little scope for flexibility. Instead, the policy serves an educational purpose that advises and supports all parties as to ethically appropriate forms of proofreading. Before presenting the policy, it is important to define the terms proofreading and academic integrity in regard to proofreading practices. Hence, regarding proofreading, this policy adheres to Harwood, Austin and Macaulay's (2009, p. 167) definition as:

Types of help (whether voluntary or paid) that entail some level of written alteration to a "work in progress" (i.e. work that will contribute towards an undergraduate or postgraduate degree, or which may be published).

With regard to academic integrity, Bretag *et. al* (2011, p. 4) provide a definition from the University of Tasmania (2010) as follows:

Academic integrity is about mastering the art of scholarship. Scholarship involves researching, understanding and building upon the work of others and requires that you give credit where it is due and acknowledge the contributions of others to your own intellectual efforts. At the core, academic integrity requires honesty. This involves being responsible for ethical scholarship and for knowing what academic dishonesty is and how to avoid it.

Concerning proofreading, academic integrity means acknowledging through the enclosed Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading document that a proofreader has assisted a student in the writing of work for assessment and ethically acceptable forms of intervention have been adhered to.

Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of the policy is to provide stakeholders with information about ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of intervention as detailed below. However, please note the following:

- the interventions below show the student's original text and the proofreader's intervention which are either in-text adjustments i.e., a direct change to the student's text or comments made through the track-changes function;
- comments are preferred over in-text interventions as they serve an educational purpose in which a student writer can learn from a proofreader's feedback and consider the suggestion in greater depth;
- the proofreader should ensure that a student is able to view *all* changes made to their proofread work through the Track changes function of a Microsoft Word document;
- it is advisable that students open their Microsoft Word proofread work in Google docs as it clearly highlights in-text changes in pink with an accompanying note in the right-hand margin of the document for the student to either accept or reject through tick/cross symbols. Likewise, proofreader comments also appear in the right-hand margin of a Google doc and allow the student to decide whether to accept or reject the suggestions; and
- the interventions below are provided as a *general* form of guidance. Therefore, students should check with their supervisor whether the interventions are appropriate for their type of work and assessment. As such, a yes/no tick box has been provided below each intervention for the supervisor to note whether they agree or not with the change, and a possible explanation can be provided.

Ethically Acceptable Interventions

The four types of proofreader intervention below have been deemed ethically appropriate as they do not adversely affect the meaning and content or organisation of a text.

1. Minor Addition – N.B. The minor descriptor is adapted from Harwood (2018, p. 519)

Minor addition involves the proofreader adding one to five words to a student’s text.

1. Adding the words ‘flexible environment’ in the first example is acceptable as it had already been referred to earlier by the student.
2. Adding ‘providing/strengthening’ in the second is even more appropriate as it is a suggestion rather than a direct change by the proofreader.

Both interventions are acceptable as the meaning is not altered and the text flow or cohesion is improved.

¹The student’s original text	The proofreader’s intervention
1. Thus, while the first FL principle may be closely linked to social constructivism, the second FL principle could be connected with a broader understanding of constructivism.	1. Thus, while the first FL principle, flexible environment , may be closely linked to social constructivism, the second FL principle could be connected with a broader understanding of constructivism. (in-text)
2. Ridley (2012) further explains how this also influences the formulation of RQ as well as the justification for researching this topic.	2. The proofreader suggested ‘as well as providing/strengthening the justification for researching a chosen topic’?’ (comment)

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making minor addition interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

¹ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

2. Advice to Add More Information

Advice to add more information is when the proofreader advises the student:

1. that more information is needed to support a text or provide greater clarity; or
2. to add information to support a claim.

Both of the above interventions are acceptable; however, the proofreader should refrain from making a specific suggestion(s) as to what the added information should consist of because the content should be the student's own words and not those of the proofreader.

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader giving advice to add more information interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

3. Substitution – N.B. Numbers 1, 4, and 5 are from Harwood (2018, p. 517)

Substitution involves the proofreader replacing one word for another; note that this means the replacement of **one word only** and not multiple words. Substitution includes the categories listed below:

1. verb tense e.g., *design* → *designed*
 2. form e.g., *creative* → *creation*
 3. preposition e.g., *at* → *in*
 4. number errors, such as the replacement of nouns erroneously thought by the writer to be countable with the correct uncountable equivalent e.g., *feedbacks* → *feedback*
 5. agreement e.g., *both group received* → *both groups received*
 6. the replacement of an informal form e.g., *get* → *obtain*; *did a task* → *completed a task*
 7. a new word(s) entirely e.g., *that* → *on*
 8. American English to British English spelling e.g., *analyze* → *analyse*
- For other forms of substitution which may occur, the student should check with their supervisor if they are acceptable.

- Substitution does not include interventions that involve the proofreader changing words which have been used incorrectly in terms of meaning (this descriptor is task 5 of Kruger and Bevan-Dye's (2010, p. 167) editing tasks. E.g., incorrectly writing 'I *learnt* the students English' instead of the correct version 'I *taught* the students English'). Such interventions concern meaning and content and should not be made.

The three substitution examples below are ethically appropriate, especially those written in comment form.

1. The first is acceptable as it makes the text sound more natural.
2. The second is appropriate as it is a better word choice for the context.
3. The third is also acceptable as it advises a student of appropriate academic conventions and ensures consistency throughout the text.

² The student's original text	The proofreader's intervention
1. ...which requires exploring the explicit relationships among ideas expressed;	1. ...which requires exploration of the explicit relationships among ideas expressed; (in-text 'form')
2. If done successfully, students would be able to actively engage as they would have already slid through Bloom's inverted taxonomy	2. The proofreader suggested that 'slid' be replaced with ' worked ' (comment 'new word')
3. 'The two participants (6.7%) who agreed or strongly agreed with the most critical perceptions of FL were both over 40 and teaching in the 10-week pre-sessional course.'	3. Course durations are inconsistently presented. Previously, you have written 'ten weeks'. I would argue this version, '10-week', is more accurate. You could use Find and Replace to change all instances to be consistent with this format. (comment 'agreement')

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making substitution interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

² N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah's EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

4. Recombining – N.B. The definition and example intervention are from Harwood (2018, p. 518)

Recombining concerns:

1. the combining of one or more sentences; or
2. the division of one sentence into two or more sentences.

Example

The student's original text: *equal results, that is to say*

Proofread text: *equal results. Thus,*

- The above intervention is ethically appropriate as it does not change the meaning, and dividing lengthy sentences makes the text easier to read. In addition, a suggestion is better than an in-text change.

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making recombining interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

Ethically Questionable Interventions

The five types of intervention below are ethically questionable and reasons have been provided in each case.

1. Meso and Major Addition – N.B. The meso and major descriptors are from Harwood (2018, p. 519)

Meso and major addition involves the proofreader adding six to nine (meso) or ten plus (major) words to a student's text.

- Comments are far more advisable than in-text changes as a student would be able to consider whether the added words are appropriate.
- In addition, the proofreader should only add words when making already existing content more readable as opposed to introducing new ideas or concepts to which the student has not already made reference.

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making meso and major addition interventions?

Yes No

Reason: _____

2. Deletion – N.B. The minor descriptor is from Harwood (2018, p. 519)

- Minor deletion in which one to five words have been deleted either in-text or via the comments section are acceptable but it is ethically unacceptable to remove words that carry content as this affects the meaning of the student’s text.
- Furthermore, the deletion of more than five words from a text is problematic as this could result in rewriting and mask possible issues of the student needing to be more concise in their writing style.
- In the example below it would be more developmental for a proofreader to advise the student to review their work and find instances of repetition whilst considering the impact on the reader.

³ The student’s original text	The proofreader’s intervention
‘It has also been acknowledged that insightful reflections have not been included due to the shift in focus of the research imposed by the constraints of this format. Nevertheless, these exciting findings will be further explored and disseminated in future papers.’	This has been repeated too often, and I think it is starting to detract from the importance of the things that are within the constraints of the paper. It is also the focus of your ‘conclusion thoughts’. Could you delete it here? (comment)

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader deleting 1 to 5 words?

Yes No

Reason: _____

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader deleting more than 5 words?

Yes No

Reason: _____

³ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

3. Reordering

This intervention involves the reordering of words, phrases, or sentences within a paragraph.

1. The first intervention below is more appropriate than the second as the student needs to consider the sentence itself and make a decision as to whether it is appropriately placed.
2. However, for the second intervention, even though it is in comment form, a suggestion has been provided which makes it less appropriate as the student does not have to reflect on how their text should be reordered.

⁴The student's original text	The proofreader's intervention
1. 'The rationale behind adapting FL from an institutional point of view (RQ1), with a particular focus on underpinning pedagogies.' 2. 'Although participants acknowledged the importance of the IC, as the quote below illustrates, it can be seen, not only from Omar's quote above (Omar Pos 48) that not all participants felt completing the IC necessarily prepared them to better participate in the sessions.' 	1. Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence. (comment) 2. There are a lot of parenthetical ideas in this sentence. How about moving this phrase to a separate sentence at the end, e.g. 'This sentiment is echoed in Omar's quote above...' (comment)

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making reordering interventions?

Yes No

Reason: _____

4. Structural Editing – N.B. Descriptors 1 to 4 below are adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 168) editing tasks 46 to 49

Structural editing interventions involve the proofreader:

1. reordering/repositioning an entire paragraph to ensure that the argument is logically structured;
2. reordering/repositioning sections or larger units to ensure that the argument is logically structured ('sections or larger units' refers to text which is in excess of a single paragraph);
3. inserting or changing paragraph breaks in order to create a more logical structure;

⁴ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah's EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

4. inserting/creating textual ‘guideposts’ to help the reader orientate themselves in the text; or
5. moving text to another chapter.

The above changes are problematic as they concern the organisation of a text and could affect its argument. Regarding the examples below:

1. The first is problematic as even though it is in suggestion form, it would be relatively straightforward for the student to simply move the text without reflection. Instead, it would be more appropriate for the proofreader to highlight the text in question and advise the student to think about the ordering in this particular area.
2. The second is less problematic as the student still has to incorporate the sentence into the most relevant part of the next chapter, as they see fit. However, it would be more advisable for such a noteworthy change of organisation to be verified with a supervisor.

5The student’s original text	The proofreader’s intervention
<p>1. ‘This section presents the quantitative and qualitative findings obtained to address RQ3. Quantitative findings are presented first, and quotes from the semi-structured interviews are used to further explore the data obtained. It can be challenging to present both quantitative and qualitative findings cohesively (citation); this dissertation follows this approach as it can not only effectively allow the quantitative data to be better understood and contextualised but it is also fairly common in published articles (citations) reporting on MMR.’</p>	<p>1. Up to here, this paragraph sounds like general information on your approach to the findings, so I wonder if it is in the right place here. Would it be better with the introductory information above? (comment)</p>
<p>2. ‘Interestingly, only 10% of the participants felt that students could not see the rationale behind completing the IC.’</p>	<p>2. This sounds like discussion to me. Could you leave it for the next chapter? (comment)</p>

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making structural editing interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

⁵ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

5. Mechanical Alterations

Mechanical alterations do not concern the language and content of a student’s text; those that concern, for instance, punctuation, spelling, and capitalisation are ethically acceptable. However, interventions concerning referencing style are problematic as detailed below:

1. The first example would have been better in comment form advising the student that the highlighted word is not a key term and should be in standard font in accordance with APA referencing. Instead, the proofreader changed the highlighted word to its standard font and added inverted commas to show that the student wished to emphasise the word in question. This is problematic because the student may be assessed on their ability to follow appropriate academic conventions.
2. The second also concerns APA referencing style and is problematic because the proofreader made all the changes. Instead, it would have been more appropriate for the proofreader to comment that ‘and’ needs to be replaced with ‘&’ in all bracketed citations and advise the student to check this issue throughout the document.

‘The student’s original text	The proofreader’s intervention
1. As Licht (2014) explains, this may result in students working independently in their groups and actively taking ownership of their project which may look <i>chaotic</i> , but it allows students to actively take ownership of their knowledge construction and learning process.	1. As Licht (2014) explains, this may result in students working independently in their groups and actively taking ownership of their project which may look ‘ <i>chaotic</i> ’, but it allows students to actively take ownership of their knowledge construction and learning process. (in-text change)
2. (This was in reference to the word ‘and’ being replaced by an ‘ampersand’)	2. I’ve replaced ‘and’ with ‘&’ in all bracketed citations in line with APA. (comment)

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making mechanical alterations interventions that do not affect referencing style?

Yes No

Reason: _____

⁶ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah’s EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making mechanical alterations interventions that affect referencing style? This can also include in-text citations and the reference list/bibliography.

Yes No

Reason: _____

Ethically Unacceptable Interventions

The three interventions below are unacceptable as they concern the argument of a student's text which would result in the work no longer being that of the writer and could potentially severely affect the assessment of a piece of work to the student's advantage.

1. Restructuring Research Questions

The proofreader's advice to change the order of research questions cannot be made as it concerns the student's presentation of their data and how the research questions are framed which could affect the structure of the entire research. Therefore, if the proofreader has any concerns in this area, they should simply advise the student that the order seems problematic and to check with their supervisor.

⁷The student's original text	The proofreader's intervention
'Therefore, this chapter presents the results obtained in this mixed-methods study informed by the proposed RQs. Firstly, it explores findings related to RQ3 , student participants.'	Just a thought...As RQ3 seems to have turned into the key RQ, could you re-number them and make this RQ1? It would make it easier to follow. (comment)

These guidelines recommend that restructuring research question interventions are NOT permitted. Notwithstanding our recommendation, does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making restructuring research question interventions?

Yes No

Reason: _____

2. Rewriting – N.B. the definition and example interventions are from Harwood (2018, p. 518)

⁷ N.B. The table extracts are from Sarah's EdD thesis which was submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Rewriting concerns:

- 1) the replacement of 6 or more consecutive words in the writer's text; or
- 2) the replacement of the writer's text by 6 or more new consecutive words by the proofreader.

Examples

The student's original text: *It is easily to see that*

Proofread text: *As we might expect*

[=replacement of 6 consecutive words of the student's original text]

The student's original text: *a positive effect on students' rewrite*

Proofread text: *a positive effect on the quality of the revised piece*

[=replacement of the student's original text by 6 consecutive words by the proofreader]

Such interventions cannot be made in-text and if the proofreader notices that a part of the text is problematic, they should limit themselves to advising the student that changes need to be made through the Track changes/comments function without providing suggestions.

These guidelines recommend that rewriting interventions are NOT permitted. Notwithstanding our recommendation, does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making rewriting interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

3. Meaning and Content – N.B. The example interventions are adapted from Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 168) editing tasks 60-62

Interventions cannot be made in regard to meaning and content which include:

1. writing additional or supplementary material at paragraph level;
2. rewriting sections to improve content; and
3. deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content at paragraph level.

The interventions listed above are ethically unacceptable as they affect the argument of a writer's text and result in the student producing work which is no longer expressed in their own words; this is a serious issue as it amounts to collusion and could result in a student's mark being affected. For problematic parts of a text, the proofreader should instead highlight any issues and leave a comment that advises the student to review a particular issue.

These guidelines recommend that meaning and content interventions are NOT permitted.

Notwithstanding our recommendation, does the supervisor approve of the proofreader making meaning and content interventions?

Yes

No

Reason: _____

The next part of the guidelines will present the Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading form which the student, proofreader, and academic/supervisor would need to read and sign.

Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading

<p>1. The type of proofreader that the student consults. Please tick the option that applies and note that a proofreader does not include the student's <i>own</i> supervisor.</p>	<p>1. A professional proofreader who is either employed by a company or who works on a freelance basis and usually accepts payment for their work.</p> <p>2. A non-professional such as a classmate/peer, friend or family member who either does or does not accept payment for their work.</p> <p>3. A writing centre or study skills services tutor.</p> <p>4. An English for Academic Purposes teacher.</p> <p>5. Other – please specify: _____</p>
<p>2. Reason for consulting a proofreader</p>	
<p>3. Title of text to be submitted for proofreading</p> <p>4. Nature of document</p> <p>5. Number of words</p> <p>6. Number of figures and tables</p>	
<p>7. Name/type of study course or internship</p> <p>8. Degree/diploma level of course</p> <p>9. University/college/institute (for an external proofreader)</p>	
<p>10. Delivery date to proofreader</p> <p>11. Return date to student (in full/in instalments)</p>	
<p>12. Estimated cost of proofreading</p> <p>13. Terms of payment (interval between submitting invoice and payment)</p> <p>14. Name and email address of person responsible for paying the invoice if different from the student contact details in point 18 below.</p>	
<p>15. Are corrections to be written by hand on hard copy or as Track changes in an electronic document?</p>	
<p>16. What house style should be used?</p> <p>17. Should UK or US English be used?</p>	
<p>18. Student, proofreader, and academic/supervisor names and signatures with the date attesting that the enclosed proofreading policy has been read and understood. Please also provide a contact email address.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student's name, signature, email address, and date ▪ Proofreader's name, signature, email address, and date ▪ Academic/Supervisor's name, signature, email address, and date
<p>19. The student understands that they have the final responsibility to check a proofreader's work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student's name, signature, and date

Adapted from SENSE's (2016, p. 6) form to confirm proofreading service for a student thesis/paper

Educating and Training Stakeholders

An integral part of a proofreading policy concerns steps that can be taken to educate and train stakeholders in acceptable proofreading practices through workshops for educators and university policy makers, and as part of a module for students. For instance, students could receive instruction on ethically appropriate forms of proofreading during a lecture and have a subsequent quiz that is part of their mark to encourage student engagement with issues of academic integrity in regard to proofreading. A possible lesson plan adapted from (Conrad, 2021) that academics could use in lectures to educate students as to appropriate forms of proofreading practice has been provided below.

1. Assign the students an asynchronous task of reading a text(s) that argues in favour and against proofreading practices such as the following articles from the Times Higher Education (Baty, 2006) and the Guardian (Shaw, 2014):

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/fluency-can-be-all-yours-for-a-small-fee/202365.article>.

<https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/apr/09/international-students-proofreading-academic-writing-support>

2. Provide students with a number of questions concerning the text(s) and discuss corresponding ethical issues which in turn highlight that issues of proofreading are not clear cut and that debates may arise concerning acceptable and unacceptable forms of practice.
3. Students then read the institution's academic integrity policy on proofreading and discuss the extent to which said policy addresses the issues of proofreading mentioned in the text that they consulted for the first stage.
4. Next, students consult a code of conduct concerning the consequences of academic dishonesty; this exercise should not be designed to frighten students, rather to highlight the importance of distinguishing appropriate and inappropriate behaviour so as to avoid negative consequences.
5. Finally, students are given a number of scenarios in which they apply the aforementioned policy. Such scenarios could concern who is consulted e.g., a professional or non-professional proofreader as well as the type of help that is given such as the minor addition of one to five words or the major addition of ten plus words.

Review of the Proofreading Policy

Once the proofreading policy has been established and training organised, records of evaluation and forms of review need to be set up to ensure that the policy is periodically updated to reflect current proofreading practices and identify areas in need of improvement.

Bibliography

Baty, P. (2006) 'Fluency can be all yours...for a small fee', *Times Higher Education*, 7 April.

Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/fluency-can-be-all-yours-for-a-small-fee/202365.article> (Accessed: 31 August 2019).

Bretag, T. and Mahmud, S. (2016) 'A Conceptual Framework for Implementing Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy in Australian Higher Education', in Bretag, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Singapore: Springer Reference, pp. 463-480.

Bretag, T. *et al.* (2011) 'Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(2), pp. 3-12.

Conrad, N. (2021) 'Addressing Literacy Brokering in the EAP Classroom', in Macdiarmid, C. and MacDonald, J.J. (eds.) *Pedagogies in English for Academic Purposes: Teaching and Learning in International Contexts*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, [pre-print version].

Harwood, N. (2018) 'What do proofreaders of student writing do to a master's essay? Differing interventions, worrying findings', *Written Communication*, 35(4), pp. 474-530.

Harwood, N., Austin, L. and Macaulay, R. (2009) 'Proofreading in a UK university: Proofreaders' beliefs, practices, and experiences', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, pp. 166-190.

Kruger, H. and 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(2), pp. 153-169.

SENSE (2016) *Guidelines for Proofreading Student Texts*. Available at: <https://www.sense-online.nl/files/esense/esense-public-files/759-sense-guidelines-for-proofreading-student-texts/file> (Accessed: 20 August 2019).

Shaw, C. (2014) 'International students are turning to proofreading agencies to get support', *The Guardian*, 9 April. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/apr/09/international-students-proofreading-academic-writing-support> (Accessed: 19 September 2019).

6.2 Using Bretag *et al.*'s (2011, pp. 5-6) Academic Integrity Principles to Inform Proofreading Guidelines

As noted in section 6.0, the following explains the origins of my above proofreading policy which lie in Bretag *et al.*'s (2011, pp. 5-6) academic integrity principles. As a brief introduction, Bretag *et al.* (2011) analysed the academic integrity policies of 39 universities in Australia. The researchers' investigations led them to devise 22 categories, as listed below, to determine the effectiveness of academic integrity policies. Although the authors' research had a specific focus on plagiarism, many of the categories have been applied to my own draft proofreading policy provided in section 6.1 as detailed below. I would like to advise the reader that the information below cited from Bretag *et al.* (2011) is noted in italics and the adaption for my proofreading policy is written in standard font.

1. Title of the policy

The title has been noted at the start of my policy i.e., 'Proofreading University Policy and Guidelines Concerning Student Texts For Assessment'

2. Key terms

University policy makers could be advised that the proofreading guidelines should be made readily available and easy to locate through the university's intranet service using key search terms such as 'proofreading policies', 'proofreading guidelines', 'proofreading practices', 'ethically acceptable proofreading', 'proofreading help', or by simply searching 'proofreading'.

3. Definition of academic integrity: Whether academic integrity or academic honesty are defined in the policy

A definition of academic integrity has been included in my policy as part of the overview.

4. Related embedded documents

My policy includes a Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading document.

5. Purpose: Clear statement of the purpose of the policy

The purpose of my policy has been noted and concerns ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention.

6. Responsibility: Clear statement of responsibility for each stakeholder in the policy

The overview clearly states that all stakeholders have a responsibility to uphold ethical proofreading practices. In addition, the supervisor is asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree with each form of intervention in the purpose of the policy section. Furthermore, the Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading document asks for the signatures of the student, proofreader, and academic/supervisor.

7. Breach ID: Identification of what constitutes a breach of the policy

The purpose of the policy section details examples of acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading interventions with accompanying commentary.

8. *Whether the policy uses the terms intent/intention/motivation/knowingly to determine breach behaviour*

Although intent in terms of unfair means includes knowingly or accidentally plagiarising which very often both have serious consequences, it is also of importance in regard to proofreading insofar as students acknowledging the use of a proofreader rather than submitting work without any credit given to a third party. As such, the Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading document includes a list of options in which students note the type of proofreader consulted and their reason for procuring a proofreading service which would serve a useful purpose for universities when making decisions regarding the level of support that they wish to provide.

9. *Tool used to detect plagiarism (e.g., manual process, detection software)*

In regard to proofreading practices, policies could outline the responsibility of the proofreader to flag instances of suspected plagiarism when proofreading the student's work. The policy could determine whether the proofreader alerts the student to possible instances of plagiarism or if it should be brought to the immediate attention of a staff member. However, it is highly unlikely that a student would engage the services of a proofreader if they were aware that a member of staff could be contacted for such issues. Therefore, for the purposes of my policy, as I wish to focus on academic integrity in regard to proofreading rather than plagiarism, this issue would need to be discussed with an ethics review board.

10. *Levels: Classification of a breach according to levels/tiers/major or minor*

The purpose of the policy section establishes ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading with commentary.

11. *Approach: The spirit of the policy, whether to punish, educate, minimise risk, or develop integrity*

The spirit of the proofreading policy is predominantly educational with a focus on developing integrity whilst clearly outlining unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention and the subsequent penalties. Indeed, Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 7) highlight that for policies to be effective, adequate support must be given over extended periods of time. With regard to such support, students could undertake courses that

educate and develop their academic integrity skills as proposed by Liu and Harwood (2022, pp. 33-34) in their research concerning the role of one-to-one writing tutors at a UK university; Liu and Harwood's research revealed that students expected tutors to provide extensive support with proofreading which was contrary to the university's writing centre ethos and accordingly advocate extending a writing centre's activity to encompass the entire university whereby students undertake credit-bearing modules with an emphasis on writing processes. In turn, Liu and Harwood (2022) refer to Deane and Ganobcsik-Williams' (2012, p. 194) initiative of training academic staff to help students improve their writing through formative types of assessment in which learners are given support and feedback that can be utilised when undertaking summative assessments. As such, training and credit bearing modules that educate students regarding ethically acceptable forms of proofreading could be an effective form of developing academic integrity. The aforementioned has been noted in my policy under educating and training stakeholders as well as the purpose of the proofreading policy that details ethically acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention.

12. *Penalty: Outcomes of the policy breach are stated*

As mentioned in category 11, whilst the spirit of the policy is to educate, proofreading policies would need to clearly stipulate unethical forms of proofreading practice and the consequences of such breaches. Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 7) state that policies should be sufficiently detailed in specifying various types of breaches and the consequences. Importantly, the authors also advise the use of straightforward flow charts that clearly show the user how a policy is implemented. In order to determine whether breaches have been made such as unacceptable forms of proofreading intervention, a supervisor could request that a student send a pre-proofread and proofread draft of their work to compare the student's original work with their proofread version. However, this could result in students not acknowledging the use of a proofreader and could mean much more work for a marker who would have to compare the pre-proofread and proofread work along with the document submitted for assessment. As such, this point has not been included in my policy. Furthermore, it may be more challenging to determine academic breaches such as a student having received too much help from a proofreader when compared to issues of plagiarism which are possibly easier to detect through software such as Turnitin. Therefore,

this could be a strong argument for either having an in-house proofreading service in which internal proofreaders are trained in ethically appropriate forms of proofreading according to a university's standards or an external agency that liaises closely with the university to ensure adherence to said institution's proofreading policies.

13. *Mention of the term 'collusion' used in policy or assisting breach*

Collusion has been mentioned in the purpose of the policy section with regard to the meaning and content category that is an unacceptable form of proofreading intervention.

14. *Whether the policy applies to higher degree by research (HDR) students*

Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 4) underscore the importance of ensuring that academic policies and forms of penalty are consistently applied to all faculties across a university and that opportunities to educate students are not overlooked. As such, proofreading policies and the forms of support mentioned in category 11 would be applicable to all levels of study to nurture and foster ethically acceptable forms of proofreading from undergraduate through to higher level degrees. My policy states in the overview that it applies to all degree levels. However, Harwood (under review) observed that applying a university wide policy could be difficult as numerous departments and individual academics may require more leeway when determining if a student can consult a proofreader for work that is to be assessed. Harwood highlighted this issue as he noted that the importance of accurate language can vary for the numerous types of written assignment and accompanying assessment criteria. Indeed, Harwood's view is supported by Conrad (2021) who noted that ethically appropriate and inappropriate practices are very much dependent on the context and that the university course environment as well as its objectives need to be taken into consideration. As such, this initiative may need to start on a small scale by focusing initially on one department or even a number of academics who trial proofreading policies for different forms of work and assessment criteria. The findings of such trials could eventually be used to extend proofreading policies to other departments and the wider university environment. Clearly a campus wide initiative would require a certain if not considerable amount of time but the steps

taken would at least begin to address issues regarding the consultation of proofreaders and nurture a greater sense of academic integrity amongst students.

15. *Whether the policy mentions retrospective application*

Students could undertake a form of diagnostic writing test which lecturers use as a benchmark to compare against submitted work that had been proofread; lecturers would be privy to which students have had work proofread if a form of student, proofreader, and lecturer agreement were used as provided in section 6.1 (see the Stakeholder Agreement Permitting Proofreading document). The lecturer would then be in a position to compare the standard of writing that a student was capable of producing without the benefit of a proofreader's intervention with the work which was submitted. However, as mentioned in category 12, this could result in students not acknowledging the use of a proofreader and could mean much more work for a marker who would have to compare the pre-proofread and proofread work along with the document submitted for assessment. As such, this point has not been included in my policy.

16. *Reporting: Who notifies of a breach of policy?*

Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 7) advise that whilst procedures concerning reporting a breach of policy need to be clearly specified, the policy does not need to be overly detailed. As such, the proofreading policy could specify the measures to be undertaken by each stakeholder should any concerns arise. As mentioned in category 12, issues of academic breaches have not been noted in my policy.

17. *Recording: Where is a breach of policy recorded?*

Similarly to point 16, Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 7) also advise that the recording of policy breaches needs to be clearly delineated but not excessive. In regard to proofreading, the policy would need to specify where breaches are recorded for future reference by those privy to such information. As mentioned in categories 12 and 16, issues of academic breaches have not been noted in my policy.

18. *Confidentiality: Whether the record of breaches is kept confidential and what is the level of access*

As with categories 16 and 17 regarding the reporting and recording of a breach of policy, Bretag *et al.*

(2011, p. 7) advise that sufficient details need to be provided in regard to confidentiality but that it does not need to be excessive. As mentioned in categories 12, 16, and 17, issues of academic breaches have not been noted in my policy.

19. Ease of access: Ability to find the policy on the university's website using the search function and any of the following terms: academic integrity policy, plagiarism policy, academic honesty policy

As highlighted in points 1 and 2, the proofreading policy would need to be easy to locate which could be ensured by having a straightforward title with corresponding key terms. The policy would then be made available in “a central web area on the institutional website” as recommended by Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 8). This has not been stated in my policy but the university would be advised that it should be easily accessed, for instance, through an institution’s intranet service as mentioned in category 2.

20. Timing: When the policy was last reviewed or approved

In regard to review and approval, Bretag *et al.* (2011, p. 10) outline the importance of continued support for all stakeholders to ensure that policies reflect what happens in practice. As such, proofreading policies would require regular review in order to measure the success of support services provided in regard to ethically acceptable forms of proofreading and stakeholders’ perspectives concerning the effectiveness of proofreading policies. This has been included in my policy under the review of the proofreading policy section.

21. Circumstances: Context, mitigating circumstances, factors to consider regarding breach

As with the reporting, recording, and confidentiality categories, circumstances could also be clearly but not overly detailed in regard to proofreading practices. As mentioned in categories 12, 16, 17, and 18, issues of academic breaches have not been noted in my policy.

22. Enabling implementation: Procedures, resources, modules, training, seminars, and professional development activities to facilitate staff and student awareness and understanding of policy

As mentioned in category 11, the spirit of the proofreading policy would be primarily to educate whilst ensuring that ethically acceptable forms of proofreading practice are upheld. As such, the forms of implementation mentioned in this category would also be suitable types of support regarding raising awareness of ethical and unethical forms of proofreading practices. Activities that could be undertaken to educate students as to ethically appropriate forms of third-party support have been proposed by Conrad (2021) who describes a genre-based lesson for those attending a first-year writing course in an American university which was adapted for the purposes of my research (see section 6.1).

6.3 General Enhancement of Proofreading Policies

Having presented a draft proofreading policy and explained its origins from Bretag *et al.*'s (2011, pp. 5-6) academic integrity principles, the following will discuss additional measures that can be undertaken regarding proofreading, underlining the importance of educating and training stakeholders.

Bretag and Mahmud (2016, pp. 467-468) established that a robust academic policy is of the utmost importance as this provides the necessary support to align policy with practice. Furthermore, rather than focusing on negative aspects regarding practices which should be avoided, greater emphasis should be placed on educating and promoting values that institutions wish to nurture. Therefore, in the case of my research, more emphasis should be given to the implementation of guidelines that educate all parties concerning ethically appropriate forms of proofreading and establishing stakeholder training as noted in my draft guidelines in section 6.1 under the purpose of the policy and educating and training stakeholders sections. With further regard to educating and promoting ethically acceptable forms of proofreading, Bretag and Mahmud (2016) propose academic integrity champions who can be internal as well as external participants that instigate and bring about change within an organisation. Academic integrity champions could clearly be applied in regard to proofreading with representatives from student, proofreader, academic (i.e., lecturers, senior lectures etc.), and university policy maker cohorts. If proofreading was an accepted form of practice and kept in-house, for instance through a university's writing centre, employees such as EAP lecturers could also become academic champions. Alternatively,

if proofreading were accepted but outsourced, external proofreading/editing agencies could have a representative to fulfil the academic champion role.

With specific regard to training, Bretag and Mahmud (2016, pp. 468-469) emphasise the importance of educating staff and students regarding academic integrity, and the importance of curriculum and assessment design as well as teaching practices that encourage good practice. Furthermore, the authors reported that when creating academic integrity education strategies, it is important to acknowledge the different types of universities, subjects, staff, and students. With regard to proofreading, small-scale trials could initially be undertaken as mentioned in section 6.2 category 14 to firstly determine the feasibility of establishing proofreading policies for different forms of work and assessment practice. Once established, proofreading policies could later be expanded to encompass the entire university in regard to educating stakeholders as to ethically appropriate forms of proofreading and accordingly standardise proofreading practices to encourage good practice. Regarding proofreading, students could be provided with examples of writing that has undergone acceptable, questionable, and unacceptable forms of third-party support. This could be followed up by students having meetings with a dedicated member of staff who clarifies doubts regarding appropriate and inappropriate forms of intervention and also answers queries concerning a proofreading policy.

Finally, in order to ensure the effectiveness of the academic integrity policy, regular review is needed. Bretag and Mahmud (2016, p. 472) note that such review concerns a university's dedication to upholding academic integrity and referring to data gathered from breaches. Revision should also be based on feedback from decision-makers who are involved in breaches of academic integrity as well as those involved in appeal. This strategy could clearly be applied to proofreading when reviewing and updating the policy.

6.4 Limitations of the Study

A number of issues arose in regard to the limitations of my study which are detailed below with possible solutions that could be pursued in future research. In sum, the limitations concern: 1) my participants;

2) determining what types of intervention participants would be content with for in-text changes and comments; 3) the method used to determine lecturer views of the overall number of interventions made to the student's text; and 4) the problematic nature of classifying a proofreader's degree of intervention by counting words to fit minor, meso, and major categories.

The first limitation to my study concerned my participants and a number of issues arose. The main concern was highlighted in section 3.2 of the methodology in that I was unable to retain some of the master's students I had initially recruited due to the effects of COVID-19, which meant that I only had two students for the pilot study and one (Sarah) for my main data collection. Another issue concerned the fact that Sarah and Jane (the proofreader) were friends which meant that interview responses could have been influenced by their friendship. For instance, a student writer who is not a friend of the proofreader may be more forthcoming when highlighting ethically questionable or unacceptable forms of intervention. In addition, Sarah was not a typical L2 student writer as mentioned in section 5.1 of the discussion chapter in that Jane proofread work that was of an exceptionally high standard. Moreover, Sarah also teaches EAP which is a clear reflection of her writing competency. In order to overcome the three aforementioned issues, for a future study, I could contact organisations such as the Society of English language professionals in the Netherlands (SENSE) to enquire as to whether their bank of proofreaders and editors would be willing to participate in my research along with their student writer; I would request that the writer not be a friend of the proofreader, and ask that the student have a typical IELTS score of 6 rather than the high level of writing competency displayed by Sarah. Further, I would be able to access a network such as SENSE from having presented my interview findings to one of their special interest groups of translators and editors that I was not aware of at the start of my research journey. However, I acknowledge that members of SENSE or other editing agencies would be elite informants as defined by Marshall and Rossman (2011, p. 155) (see section 3.2) not typical of many freelance proofreaders who work with student writers. Therefore, another option could be pursued through my planned career in a university environment in which I would hopefully have greater access to proofreaders who may be known to colleagues or advertise their proofreading services on campus; indeed, Harwood (2018, p. 486) was able to secure the proofreaders in his study through this method. I

realise that I could have contacted proofreaders who advertise their services on campus from the outset of my project but as a novice researcher, I preferred to start my recruitment process with students who studied at my home institution.

The second limitation of my study is that I needed to have determined far more systematically if student, proofreader, and lecturer participants would be happy with in-text changes for mechanical interventions of punctuation, spelling, capitalisation, abbreviations/acronyms/ ampersands, headings, and correlating parts in a text or whether they would still expect comments for such interventions; the participants in my research took little issue with such forms of intervention but for a future study, I would need to probe in more depth if it would be suitable to simply make in-text changes or whether they would still expect comments. Leaving proofreading comments for every type of punctuation would clearly be an arduous task but two options could be to: 1) highlight a part of the text and advise the student that the punctuation needs work, and follow this up in a post-proofreading meeting if the student encountered difficulties; and/or 2) ask the student to view their proofread work in Google docs (see section 5.2.1 of the discussion) which automatically highlights where changes have been made.

The third limitation to my study concerns the method by which I determined lecturer perspectives on the overall interventions made to a student's text. I explored this question to some extent during the pilot lecturer interviews where I was able to show the two participants the entire text as it was a master's assignment of nine pages. However, this arrangement was not ideal as the first pilot lecturer understandably wanted to read through the entire text before passing comment which took eleven minutes. As I had stipulated in my ethics application and information sheets to academics that the interview would be approximately one hour, I was concerned that viewing the text in its entirety would take up too much time and not only cause interviewee fatigue but also potentially discourage participants from conducting further interviews. Therefore, for the second pilot lecturer interview, I asked the participant to consider only the first three pages but gave the option of viewing the entire text should they wish. As only the first three pages were viewed, it took the lecturer just over a minute to complete the task and naturally allowed me sufficient time to cover all other aspects of the interview.

Therefore, for future interviews, I decided to continue in this vein by only showing the first three pages of a text but still gave the option of viewing it in its entirety. This decision was especially pertinent for the interviews I conducted regarding Sarah's EdD work due to the naturally lengthy nature of each chapter. However, Michael understandably commented that from not having viewed the texts in their entirety, he would not wish to pass judgement without going through each intervention. Unfortunately, this would have been too time consuming a process as even Sarah's conclusion of only five pages long still had 119 Track changes interventions. To overcome said issues in future research, I would ideally conduct interviews face-to-face rather than online. This would allow me to show participants a paper copy in which they could take time to view the interventions and leaf through each page themselves rather than managing the awkward online situation of constantly having to ask me to scroll down the text on the screen. Alternatively, if the interview were online, I could email the materials to the participant beforehand so that they could view the document at their convenience, and during the interview both the lecturer and I would have the advantage of being able to scroll through the document together. Indeed, this arrangement could be undertaken for face-to face as well as online formats as it would save time during the interview because the lecturer would have had sufficient time to peruse the text and consider the proofreader's comments. However, the potential drawback of this set up, especially for online interviews, would be if the participant failed to view the document beforehand. As such, I could conduct interviews in which the sole purpose of the study would be to explore lecturers' perspectives regarding overall interventions made to a student text (with the student's permission) which would hopefully highlight the necessity of viewing the document prior to interview.

Finally, the fourth limitation concerns the fact that my participants problematised the heuristic of minor, meso, and major level changes as noted in subsection 4.2.5.1 of the results chapter. The participants understandably highlighted that it could be viewed as methodologically unsatisfactory to classify the degree of intervention by counting words and that it is more a question of *what* is changed rather than the amount. However, counting words is clearly a reliable practical method albeit it a rather blunt instrument. As such, researchers could respond to these arguments and counter-arguments when designing future studies.

6.5 Recommendations for Further Research

To conclude my thesis, I will now present the recommendations for further research which concern: 1) my taxonomy; and 2) determining the extent to which students feel that feedback from proofreaders improves their writing skills at each stage of the proofreading process and as a whole.

With regard to my taxonomy, even though no interventions were made in the area of addition major, it helped me to highlight that most changes were indeed minor. As such, in a future study, I could streamline the category of addition by having one subcategory for minor interventions and combine meso and major level forms of change. This could also be extended to the deletion category which saw low results for both the meso and major forms of intervention. With further regard to deletion, the issue of making meso and major level interventions in the area of deletion was also problematic for the participants. Therefore, in a future study, I would need to clearly specify if making such changes involved “removing redundancies” which was stylistic editing task 34 of Kruger and Bevan-Dye’s (2013, p. 886) taxonomy and/or content that would be classified as Kruger and Bevan-Dye’s far more problematic content editing task 62 of “deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content” (p. 887) which both editors and supervisors agreed was unacceptable. By clarifying the distinction between removing redundancies and/or content, I would also be able to more accurately verify if Sarah’s questioning noted in subsection 4.2.2.1 of the results chapter concerning the ethical appropriacy of such interventions corresponds to the views of the student participants in Cottier’s (2017, p. 46) research in which deletion was found to be problematic. Concerning the substitution category of informal to formal forms, I would most likely need to consider an international student’s English level before retaining such a category as my participant was a proficient user of the language and taught EAP, making this subcategory redundant for such a competent speaker. Regarding the structural editing tasks of reordering/repositioning sections or larger units and inserting/creating textual guideposts, I may consider avoiding such interventions for a future taxonomy as none were made in my pilot study nor my examination of the student’s EdD thesis. This was to be expected as both interventions concern editing more than proofreading. In regard to the mechanical alteration interventions of widows and orphans, running heads, and page numbers, I would verify whether the proofreader was professionally trained and as such, most likely to be knowledgeable

about such finely grained copy-editing tasks as defined by Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010, p. 167). Furthermore, I could also request a sample of the student's work to see the extent to which help was needed in such detailed areas. For the meaning and content categories, I would again need to take into consideration the student's English level in regard to correcting words that had been incorrectly used in terms of meaning. In addition, I would avoid the subcategory concerning plagiarism as this may be beyond the role of a proofreader who may not be privy to software that allows them to detect instances of unfair means. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the meaning and content category could be limited to simply indicating parts of the text where the student needs to communicate their message more clearly. Finally, whilst very few interventions were made regarding phatic forms of communication and web links, I found this to be a unique feature of my analysis and would still retain both categories for a future study as they allow for a valuable insight into the rapport between the student and proofreader.

Finally, for a future study, I would assess the extent to which students feel that feedback from proofreaders improves their writing skills at each stage of the proofreading process and as a whole. I had initially begun to investigate this area during my interviews but became aware that a very different type of study would be needed in order to properly explore whether or not proofreading leads to acquisition and improvement in writing abilities. This became especially clear when I asked Sarah whether she thought having a proofreader helped improve her writing skills; Sarah replied that she was unsure and neither agreed nor disagreed with my question. Furthermore, when I asked Jane if she felt that Sarah's writing had improved, I realised that the answer concerned perceptions rather than clear evidence. As such, for a future study, I would employ a different type of research design to convincingly investigate the effects of proofreading and whether it has a pedagogical benefit. Said study could be undertaken with proofreaders and part-time master's students studying over a two-year period or undergraduates attending a three/four-year course to investigate writing over a longer period of time. In addition, I would focus on one particular type of text such as an essay as this is the type of work that students tend to frequently produce and it would be useful in helping me chart their progress. Furthermore, having essays of a similar structure and manageable length would also help me to better make comparisons between different students' work. By investigating the extent to which a proofreader

could develop a student's writing skills, I would also draw upon research undertaken in areas of writing centres and tutor practice insofar as the extent to which a writing centre tutor's role is that of a proofreader or whether it serves a primarily pedagogic function, the effectiveness of error correction on L2 student writing and whether a proofreader's interventions serve a formative purpose as well as student reactions to written feedback, and the extent to which comments made by a proofreader can develop a student as a writer.

References

Alhojailan, A.I. (2019) 'Changes Beyond Limits: Proofreading in an American University', *International Journal of Linguistics*, 11(5), pp. 169-180.

Alkhatib, N. I. (2019) 'Academic Staff Perceptions of the Need for Proofreading for UK Postgraduate Students', *Social Sciences & Humanities*, 27(4), pp. 2299-2312.

Altrichter, H. and Holly, M. L. (2005) 'Research Diaries', in Somekh, B. and Lewin, C. (eds.) *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 24-32.

Baty, P. (2006) 'Fluency can be all yours...for a small fee', *Times Higher Education*, 7 April. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/fluency-can-be-all-yours-for-a-small-fee/202365.article> (Accessed: 31 August 2019).

Behm, R. (1989) 'Ethical Issues in Peer Tutoring: A Defense of Collaborative Learning', *The Writing Centre Journal*, 10(1), pp. 3-12.

Bretag, T. and Mahmud, S. (2016) 'A Conceptual Framework for Implementing Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy in Australian Higher Education', in Bretag, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Singapore: Springer Reference, pp. 463-480.

Bretag, T. *et al.* (2011) 'Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(2), pp. 3-12.

Budenz, J. (2007) 'OK for some to pay', *Times Higher Education*, 5 January. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/comment/letters/ok-for-some-to-pay/207363.article> (Accessed: 6 December 2020).

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2003) 'Shapers of published NNS research articles', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, pp. 223-243.

Connors, R.J. (2000) 'The Erasure of the Sentence', *College Composition and Communication*, 52(1), pp. 96-128.

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(1), pp. 172-183.

Conrad, N.L. (2020) 'Proofreading revisited: Interrogating assumptions about postsecondary student users of proofreading', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 46, pp. 1-12.

Conrad, N. (2021) 'Addressing Literacy Brokering in the EAP Classroom', in Macdiarmid, C. and MacDonald, J.J. (eds.) *Pedagogies in English for Academic Purposes: Teaching and Learning in International Contexts*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, [pre-print version].

Cottier, C. (2017) 'Thesis editing guidelines: Do they meet students' expectations and reflect current practice?', *Proceedings of the 8th IPEd National Editors Conference: Advancing Our Profession*. Brisbane, Australia, 13-15 September. Brisbane: Institute of Professional Editors, pp. 36-64.

De Oliveira, B. (2020) 'The Ethics of Writing Services for Graduate Students', *Teaching Ethics*, 19(2), pp. 245-254.

Deane, M. and Ganobcsik-Williams, L. (2012) 'Providing a hub for writing development: A profile of the centre for academic writing (CAW), Coventry University, England', in Thaiss, C. *et al.* (eds.) *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places*. Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse, pp. 189-201.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1970) *The Research Act In Sociology: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. London: Butterworth and CO. LTD.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faigley, L. and Witte, S. (1981) 'Analyzing Revision', *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), pp. 400-414.

Flower, L. *et al.* (1986) 'Detection, Diagnosis, and the Strategies of Revision', *College Composition and Communication*, 37(1), pp. 16-55.

Flowerdew, J. and Wang, S. H. (2016) 'Author's editor revisions to manuscripts published in international journals', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, pp. 39-52.

Haggis, T. (2006) 'Pedagogies for diversity: retaining critical challenge amidst fears of 'dumbing down'', *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), pp. 521-535.

Harwood, N. (2018) 'What do proofreaders of student writing do to a master's essay? Differing interventions, worrying findings', *Written Communication*, 35(4), pp. 474-530.

Harwood, N. (2019) "'I Have to Hold Myself Back from Getting into All That': Investigating Ethical Issues Associated with the Proofreading of Student Writing', *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17, pp. 17-49.

Harwood, N. (under review). Lecturer, language tutor, and student perspectives on the ethics of the proofreading of student writing.

Harwood, N., Austin, L. and Macaulay, R. (2009) 'Proofreading in a UK university: Proofreaders' beliefs, practices, and experiences', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, pp. 166–190.

Harwood, N., Austin, L. and Macaulay, R. (2010) 'Ethics and integrity in proofreading: Findings from an interview-based study', *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, pp. 54-67.

Harwood, N., Austin, L. and Macaulay, R. (2012) 'Cleaner, helper, teacher? The role of proofreaders of student writing', *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(5), pp. 569-584.

Herriot, R. E. and Firestone, W. A. (1983) 'Multisite Qualitative Policy Research: Optimizing Description and Generalizability', *Educational Research*, 12(2), pp. 14-19.

IELTS (2020) *Test format*. Available at: <https://www.ielts.org/about-the-test/test-format> (Accessed: 18 March 2020).

IPed (2013) *Australian standards for editing practice*. Available at: <https://www.iped-editors.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ASEP-Flat-Onscreen-Version.pdf> (Accessed: 2 May 2022).

Kim, Eun-Young, J. (2019) 'Korean Scholars' Use of For-Pay Editors and Perceptions of Ethicality', *Publications*, 7(21) pp. 1-12.

Kim, Eun-Young J. and LaBianca, A. S. (2018) 'Ethics in Academic Writing Help for International Students in Higher Education: Perceptions of Faculty and Students', *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 16, pp. 39-59.

Koulouriotis, J. (2011) 'Ethical Considerations in Conducting Research with Non-native Speakers of English', *TESL Canada Journal*, 5, pp. 1-15.

Kruger, H. and 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(2), pp. 153-169.

Kruger, H. and Bevan-Dye, A. (2013) 'The language editor's role in postgraduate research: A survey of supervisors' perceptions', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 27(4), pp. 875-899.

Kvale, S. (1996) *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage Publications.

Leavy, P. (2014) *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lines, L. (2016) 'Substantive editing as a form of plagiarism among postgraduate students in Australia', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(3), pp. 368-383.

Liu, C. and Harwood, N. (2022) 'Understandings of the Role of the One-to-One Writing Tutor in a U.K. University Writing Centre: Multiple Perspectives', *Written Communication*, 00(0), pp. 1-48.

Luo, N. and Hyland, K. (2016) 'Chinese academics writing for publication: English teachers as text mediators', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 33, pp. 43-55.

Luo, N. and Hyland, K. (2017) 'Intervention and Revision: Expertise and Interaction in Text Mediation', *Written Communication*, 34(4), pp. 414-440.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B. (2011) *Designing Qualitative Research*. 5th edn. London: SAGE Publications.

McKie, A. (2019) 'When does proofreading become plagiarism?', *Times Higher Education*, 12 June. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/when-does-proofreading-become-plagiarism> (Accessed: 21 August 2019).

McNally, D. and Kooyman, B. (2017) 'Drawing the line: Views from academic staff and skills advisors on acceptable proofreading with low proficiency writers', *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 11(1), pp. A145- A158.

Multon, K. D. and Coleman, J. S. M. (2018) 'Inter-Rater Reliability', in Frey, B.B. (ed.) *The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation*, London: SAGE Publications, pp. 863-866.

Myers, S.A. (2003) 'Reassessing the "Proofreading Trap": ESL Tutoring and Writing Instruction', *The Writing Centre Journal*, 24(1), pp. 51-70.

Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive (2020) ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. Available at: <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan> (Downloaded: 22 September 2020).

Patton, M.Q. (1999) 'Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis', *Health Services Research*, 34(5), pp. 1189-1208.

Rebuck, M. (2014) 'Feedback on Feedback: An Analysis of L2 Writers' Evaluations of Proofreaders', *NU Ideas*, 3, pp. 1-22.

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of an L2 student, proofreader, and lecturers

Salter-Dvorak, H. (2019) 'Proofreading: How de facto language policies create social inequality for L2 master's students in UK universities', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 39, pp. 119-131.

Scott, D. (2007) 'Resolving the quantitative-qualitative dilemma: a critical realist approach', *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 30(1), pp. 3-17.

Scurr, R. (2006) 'It is not enough to read an essay and mark it; one must also guess if a student has purchased professional help', *Times Higher Education*, 15 December. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ruth-scurr/207185.article> (Accessed: 21 August 2019).

SENSE (2016) *Guidelines for Proofreading Student Texts*. Available at: <https://www.sense-online.nl/files/esense/esense-public-files/759-sense-guidelines-for-proofreading-student-texts/file> (Accessed: 20 August 2019).

Shaw, C. (2014) 'International students are turning to proofreading agencies to get support', *The Guardian*, 9 April. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/apr/09/international-students-proofreading-academic-writing-support> (Accessed: 19 September 2019).

Smagorinsky, P. (2008) 'The Method Section as Conceptual Epicenter in Constructing Social Science Research Reports', *Written Communication*, 25(3), pp. 389-411.

The University of Sheffield (2020) *Proofreading*. Available at: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/ssid/301/study-skills/writing/proofreading> (Accessed: 9 January 2020).

The University of Sheffield (2021) *Writing Advisory Service (WAS)*. Available at: <https://students.sheffield.ac.uk/eltc/was> (Accessed 23 October 2021).

Turner, J. (2011) 'Rewriting writing in higher education: the contested spaces of proofreading', *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), pp. 427-440.

Turner, J. (2012) 'Academic Literacies: Providing a space for the socio-political dynamics of EAP', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, pp. 17-25.

Turner, J. (2018) 'Getting the Writing Right: Writing/Language Centres and Issues of Pedagogy, Responsibility, Ethics, and International English in Graduate Student Research Writing', in Lawrence, S. and Zawacki, T.M. (eds.) *Re/Writing the Centre: Approaches to Supporting Graduate Students in the Writing Center*. Colorado: Utah State University Press, pp. 86-104.

Willey, I. and Tanimoto, K. (2012) "'Convenience Editing" in action: Comparing English teachers' and medical professionals' revisions of a medical abstract', *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, pp. 249-260.

Willey, I. and Tanimoto, K. (2015) "'We're drifting into strange territory here": What think-aloud protocols reveal about convenience editing', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, pp. 63-83.

Yin, R. K. (2018) *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. London: SAGE.

Appendices

Appendix A Quantitative Inter-Rater Reliability Tests and Codebook

Table 1 Results of the Second Round of Quantitative Coding (10th September 2021)

For the reader's information, the first column details the coding number, the second and third show my code and the code description respectively, the fourth and fifth show my supervisor's code and the code description respectively, the sixth shows whether we agreed or disagreed, and the seventh displays the new rate of agreement based on our collaborative coding.

N.B. The table below contains excerpts from Sarah's (the EdD student participant) thesis with Jane's proofreading interventions which were submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Coding Number	Researcher's Coding Number	Researcher's Coding Description	Supervisor's Coding	Supervisor's Coding Description	Agree/Disagree	Collaborative Coding New Rate of Agreement
1.	7.10.1 comment	Commented: & (The proofreader suggested that the student to change 'and' in the quote to '&')	7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references Comment intervention	Proofreader uses comment box to suggest 'Batchelor and Di Napoli, 2006' becomes 'Batchelor & Di Napoli, 2006'	Agree	
2.	1.1 comment	Commented: 'which take' (The proofreader suggested that the student add 'which' and substitute a verb form i.e., 'taking' changed to 'take')	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but agreed that a word had been added. However, at this point we noted that my supervisor had not coded this intervention as it had been classified as part of code 3 below. As such, I realised that my substitution subcategory descriptors were confusing as I

						noted that each one concerned the substitution of 1 to 5 consecutive words. Therefore, my supervisor would have included the word 'which' as part of code 3 below. Consequently, I decided to remove the 1 to 5 consecutive words element for each of the substitution subcategory descriptors which meant that they now only concerned one specific word that was substituted.
3.	3.1 comment	Commented: 'which take' (The proofreader suggested that the student add 'which' and substitute a verb form i.e. 'taking' changed to 'take')	3.2 Substitution – form Comment intervention	Proofreader uses comment box to suggest 'taking a less prominent position' becomes 'which take a less prominent position'	Disagree	Agree My supervisor agreed that it was a change of verb tense and not form. As such, no changes needed to the codebook.
4.	3.7 comment	Commented: 'by'? (The proofreader suggested that the student substitute 'by' with 'while')	3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely Comment intervention	Proofreader uses comment box to suggest 'while offering an insight' becomes 'by offering an insight'	Agree	
5.	3.7 comment	Commented: 'those of students, they...' (The proofreader suggested that the student substitute 'the' with 'those of')	I struggled between choosing 3.7 or 3.9: 3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely [or 3.9 Substitution – miscellaneous] 'those of' are two new words to replace 'the students' ones'; so I	Proofreader uses comment box to suggest 'are eclipsed by the students' ones; they still enlighten' becomes 'those of students, they still enlighten'	Agree	

			opted for 3.7 here. 'students' without the apostrophe is a mechanical alteration; I was unsure whether to count that as a separate intervention, but thought I shouldn't, so haven't. Comment intervention			
6.	2.1 comment	Commented: 'those of students, they...' (The proofreader suggested that the student delete 'ones')	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but agreed that a word had been deleted.
7.	7.1 comment	Commented: 'those of students, they...' (The proofreader suggested that the student replace the semicolon with a comma)	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation Comment intervention	Proofreader uses comment box to suggest 'are eclipsed by the students' ones; they still enlighten' becomes 'those of students, they still enlighten' [suggesting change of semicolon to comma]	Agree	
8.	4.6 comment	Commented: I wonder if this sentence is for the Discussion chapter (or even the Conclusion). Although it was only master's level, Diana Ridley drilled into me that the findings should be present in this chapter, but not discussed until the next (to avoid repetition	4.6 Structural editing – moving sections Comment intervention	Proofreader asks a question to raise the possibility of whether a sentence may be better relocated in a different chapter of the thesis: "I wonder if this sentence is for the Discussion chapter (or even the Conclusion). Although it was only master's level,	Agree	

		and reduce word count). Would the same apply to doctorate level?		Diana Ridley drilled into me that the findings should be present in this chapter, but not discussed until the next (to avoid repetition and reduce word count). Would the same apply to doctorate level?"		
9.	4.1 comment	Commented: Dude, you need to review the structure of this paragraph from the third sentence onwards. 'Secondly' is used twice, and I got lost in your explanation re. RQs1 and 2.	5 Rewriting Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests part of a paragraph may need rewriting to enhance the clarity of the writer's message: "Dude, you need to review the structure of this paragraph from the third sentence onwards. 'Secondly' is used twice, and I got lost in your explanation re. RQs1 and 2." [NH: The use of 'Dude' here made me cackle*&!?. I presume you're not double-coding this also as 10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction]	Disagree	Agree I agreed with my supervisor that it is rewriting based on secondly being used twice and the fact that the proofreader got lost in RQs. As such, the text would warrant a rewrite rather than a reordering or change of words, phrase, or sentence structure. Furthermore, we decided that I would not double code it as phatic communication because the comment is about a specific point regarding rewriting the text.
10.	3.5 in-text change	'mixed-method' substituted by 'mixed-methods'	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Disagree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded. Whilst I initially considered this to be a

						form of agreement my supervisor advised me that ‘mixed-method’ is an acceptable phrase and that this should instead be classified as category 3.9 of substitution miscellaneous. Therefore, I made changes to my codebook and removed the reference to singular and plural forms as I realised that it was causing confusion and not strictly speaking part of agreement.
11.	7.3 comment	Commented: Just a thought...As RQ3 seems to have turned into the key RQ, could you re-number them and make this RQ1? It would make it easier to follow.	3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests writer may consider reordering her research questions, changing ‘RQ1’ into ‘RQ3’: “Just a thought...As RQ3 seems to have turned into the key RQ, could you re-number them and make this RQ1? It would make it easier to follow.”	Disagree	Agree My supervisor agreed that I was correct for this code as he had not seen this category in the codebook.
12.	3.5 in-text change	‘Students participants’ substituted by ‘student participants’	3.5 Substitution – agreement In-text change	Proofreader changes ‘students participants’ to “student participants”	Agree	
13.	3.7 comment	Commented: So as not to repeat ‘follow’, could you use ‘in line with’ here?	3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests replacing ‘follow’ with ‘in line with’: “So as not to repeat ‘follow’, could you use ‘in line with’ here?”	Agree	
14.	1.4 comment	Commented: This seems ambiguous. What reasons, and where ‘above’?	5 Rewriting Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests the writer’s ‘due to the reasons explored above’ is ambiguous:	Disagree	Agree My supervisor agreed that my code was more applicable.

				<p>“This seems ambiguous. What reasons, and where ‘above’?”</p> <p>The [indirect] suggestion from the proofreader is for the writer to rewrite this part of the text, or to expand it to achieve clarity.</p>		
15.	7.7.1 in-text change	Double space removed after the full stop and before ‘the’	7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout In-text change	Proofreader changes ‘the rationale’ to ‘The rationale’. There are 2 changes: capitalization of ‘t’ and changing the two spaces after full stop to one.	Agree	
16.	7.4 in-text change	Lower case letter ‘t’ in ‘ the rationale’ became upper case as it followed a full stop.	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreader changes ‘the rationale’ to ‘The rationale’. There are 2 changes: capitalization of ‘t’ and changing the two spaces after full stop to one.	Disagree	Agree My supervisor agreed with my coding but to distinguish between codes 7.1 and 7.4, I need to make it clear that code 7.4 does not refer to a proofreader change in punctuation which would result in the following word beginning with a lower/upper-case letter.
17.	4.1 comment	Commented: Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence. (The proofreader suggested that a sentence needed to be reordered in the paragraph and	4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases, or sentences [This takes care of the proofreader’s questioning whether the sentence ‘is in the right place’ in the text.] Comment intervention	Proofreader comments on the following sentence by the writer: ‘The rationale behind adapting FL from an institutional point of view (RQ1), with a particular focus on underpinning pedagogies.’	Agree	

		more information needed to be added.)		<p>“Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence.”</p> <p>The proofreader comments on two levels:</p> <p>i) She questions whether the sentence ‘is in the right place’ in the text;</p> <p>ii) She points out the sentence is incomplete.</p>		
18.	1.4 comment	<p>Commented: Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence.</p> <p>(The proofreader suggested that a sentence needed to be reordered in the paragraph and more information needed to be added.)</p>	<p>1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification</p> <p>Comment intervention [This takes care of the proofreader’s pointing out the sentence is incomplete.]</p>	<p>Proofreader comments on the following sentence by the writer:</p> <p>‘The rationale behind adapting FL from an institutional point of view (RQ1), with a particular focus on underpinning pedagogies.’</p> <p>“Please review this sentence. Is it in the right place? It is also not a complete sentence.”</p> <p>The proofreader comments on two levels:</p> <p>i) She questions whether the sentence ‘is in the right place’ in the text;</p> <p>ii) She points out the sentence is incomplete.</p>	Agree	
19.	2.1 in-text change	‘some’ deleted before ‘final’	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but

						agreed that a word had been deleted.
20.	1.1 in-text change	'a' added before 'reflective'	1.1 Addition minor In-text change	Proofreader changes 'of reflective nature' to 'of a reflective nature'.	Agree	
21.	3.5 in-text change	'Student's Voices' substituted by 'Students' Voices'	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreaer changes 'Student's Voices' to 'Students' Voices'	Disagree	Agree I agreed that this intervention should have been coded as Mechanical Alteration as it concerns a change to punctuation and not agreement. As such, I removed the following from subcategory 3.5 'This subcategory also includes changes to punctuation to ensure agreement e.g. teacher's voices teachers' voices', and the following from category 7.1 'Interventions regarding punctuation to ensure agreement are coded under subcategory 3.5 e.g. teacher's voices teachers' voices'.
22.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after 'first'	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreader has added a comma after 'presented first,'	Agree	
23.	1.4 comment	Commented: It's not obvious what 'this approach' refers to. Perhaps you could restructure the sentence to something like ' ; however, this dissertation does just that as it...'	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree I agreed with my supervisor that this did not need to be coded as the intervention is actually in regard to code 24 below.

24.	1.1 comment	<p>Commented: It's not obvious what 'this approach' refers to. Perhaps you could restructure the sentence to something like ' ; however, this dissertation does just that as it... ('however' inserted at the start of the clause. The comma is also inserted but this is a result of the word 'however' being added and not due to an error on the student's part)</p>	<p>1.1 Addition minor Comment intervention [This takes care of proofreader's suggestion to add 'However']</p>	<p>Proofreader responds to writer's text, which reads: "this dissertation follows this approach" 'It's not obvious what 'this approach' refers to. Perhaps you could restructure the sentence to something like ' ; however, this dissertation does just that as it...' Proofreader says it's unclear what 'this approach' refers to. Proofreader suggests a rewrite.</p>	Agree	
25.	3.7 comment	<p>Commented: It's not obvious what 'this approach' refers to. Perhaps you could restructure the sentence to something like ' ; however, this dissertation does just that as it...' ('follows this approach' substituted by 'does just that')</p>	<p>1.1 Addition minor Comment intervention [Proofreader suggests addition of 5 words: 'does just that as it']</p>	<p>Proofreader responds to writer's text, which reads: "this dissertation follows this approach" 'It's not obvious what 'this approach' refers to. Perhaps you could restructure the sentence to something like ' ; however, this dissertation does just that as it...' Proofreader says it's unclear what 'this approach' refers to. Proofreader suggests a rewrite.</p>	Disagree	<p>Agree My supervisor agreed that this was a form of substitution as 'does just that' was replaced with 'follows this approach'. However, as I have now changed the substitution category to apply to one word only as opposed to one to five words, this would need to be coded as three separate codes for each word.</p>

26.	2.1 comment	Commented: Delete 'fairly' (in the interests of being concise).	2.1 Deletion minor Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests deletion of a word and gives a reason for her suggestion: "Delete 'fairly' (in the interests of being concise)."	Agree	
27.	4.2 comment	Commented: Up to here, this paragraph sounds like general information on your approach to the findings, so I wonder if it is in the right place here. Would it be better with the introductory information above?	4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences Comment intervention [Although the proofreader mentions moving the 'paragraph', she doesn't in fact mean the whole paragraph; she's only referring to the first half of the paragraph. So although I initially thought this should be coded as 4.2, I concluded that category 4.1 is the right one.]	Proofreader suggests repositioning of text: "Up to here, this paragraph sounds like general information on your approach to the findings, so I wonder if it is in the right place here. Would it be better with the introductory information above?"	Disagree	Agree I agreed with my supervisor in that this intervention concerned the reordering of part of the paragraph rather than moving the paragraph to another part of the text.
28.	3.8 in-text change	'conceptualize' substituted by 'conceptualise'	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but agreed that an American spelling was substituted by its British form.
29.	7.4 comment	Commented: APA 7 th ed. prefers lower case for such terms. (This was in reference to 'interactive content')	7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation Comment intervention	"referred to as Interactive Content (IC)" Proofreader questions writer's initial capitals:	Agree	

				“APA 7 th ed. prefers lower case for such terms.”		
30.	Not coded	Not coded	7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation Comment intervention [Should this be coded twice as the proofreader suggests capitalizing two different words?]	“referred to as Interactive Content (IC)” Proofreader questions writer’s initial capitals: “APA 7 th ed. prefers lower case for such terms.”	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that I had not coded but agreed that it referred to Mechanical Alteration - capitalisation
31.	3.7 in-text change	‘It’ substituted by ‘This’	3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely In-text change	Proofreader changes ‘It is followed’ to ‘This is followed’.	Agree	
32.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after ‘sessions’	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but he agreed that it referred to Mechanical Alteration – punctuation.
33.	3.7 in-text change	‘it’ substituted by ‘the section’	3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely In-text change	Proofreader changes “it concludes with’ to ‘the section concludes with’.	Agree	
34.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after ‘findings’	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreader inserts comma: ‘Before presenting the findings,’	Agree	
35.	3.5 comment	Commented: ‘week’? (The student had written ‘six weeks courses’ and the proofreader suggested ‘six week course’)	3.5 Substitution – agreement Comment intervention	Proofreader suggests ‘weeks’ becomes ‘week’: ‘six weeks courses’ “‘week’?”	Agree	

36.	7.6 comment	Commented: Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7 th ed. (This was in reference to the number '2,000')	7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size Comment intervention	Proofreader tells writer not to use italics, and includes a weblink to APA advice on this point: '2,000' "Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7 th ed."	Agree	
37.	7.6 in-text change	Commented: Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7 th ed. (This was in reference to the number '2,000')	7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size In-text change	Proofreader tells writer not to use italics, and includes a weblink to APA advice on this point: '2,000' "Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7 th ed."	Agree	
38.	11 comment	Commented: Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7th ed. (This was in reference to the number '2,000')	11 Web links to additional sources of instruction Comment intervention	Proofreader tells writer not to use italics, and includes a weblink to APA advice on this point: '2,000' "Don't use italics here. Click here for more info on italics in APA 7 th ed."	Agree	
39.	7.7.1 in-text change	Double space removed between the full stop and 'Unfortunately'	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but he agreed that it referred to Mechanical Alteration – Text Layout.
40.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after 'form'	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreader inserts comma: 'the consent form, so their'	Agree	

41.	7.1 in-text change	Comma replaced by a semicolon after '90 students'	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	'90 students,' Proofreader makes two changes: Changes comma to semicolon Deletes a double space to make a single space	Agree	
42.	2.1 in-text change	'out' removed before 'of'	Not coded	Not coded	Disagree	Agree This was an intervention that my supervisor had not coded but agreed that it referred to Deletion.
43.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after 'respondents'	7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation In-text change	Proofreader inserts a comma: 'out of those respondents'	Agree	Agree
44.	Not coded	Not coded	7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout In-text change	'90 students,' Proofreader makes two changes: Changes comma to semicolon Deletes a double space to make a single space	Agree	Agree This was an intervention that I had not coded but agreed that it referred to Mechanical Alteration – text layout

Table 2 Results of the Third Round of Quantitative Coding (14th and 16th September 2021)

N.B. The table below contains excerpts from Sarah’s (the EdD student participant) thesis with Jane’s proofreading interventions which were submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Coding Number	Description for In-Text Changes and Comments	Researcher’s Coding	Supervisor’s Coding	Agree/Disagree
1.	<p>To distinguish between in-text changes and comments, for each intervention below I have noted either:</p> <p>1) <i>in-text change</i> at the top of the box; or</p> <p>2) the student’s text plus the proofreader’s comment.</p> <p>Some of the proofreader comments have more than one form of intervention. Such instances have been duplicated and the relevant part of text to be coded has been highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci’s (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p> <p>Advise Nigel that even though this is only one comment, it is counted as six forms of intervention as it makes reference to six</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>NH notes: In-text change or comment? If both in-text change AND comment, code it twice—1 for in-text change, 1 for comment. Change from ‘google scholar’ to Google Scholar would be coded twice—once for removal of quote marks, another time for capitalization (although two cases of capitalization here would be coded twice).</p> <p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn’t explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is ‘just an observation’.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree

	initialisms/acronyms that the student could potentially change; as such, it has been duplicated five times below.			
2.	<p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn't explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is 'just an observation'.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree
3.	<p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn't explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is 'just an observation'.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree
4.	<p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn't explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is 'just an observation'.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree

5.	<p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn't explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is 'just an observation'.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree
6.	<p>The student wrote: This MMR study explores the perceptions of FL in an EAP OL course with a particular focus on students and their engagement with the IC through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>The proofreader commented: Just an observation – this sentence has 6 initialisms/acronyms. (lines 3 to 5)</p>	7.5.2 comment	<p>Proofreader comment.</p> <p>Proofreader doesn't explicitly advise writer to reduce number of acronyms, but points out how many there are in a single sentence, saying this is 'just an observation'.</p> <p>7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms</p>	Agree
7.	<p>The student wrote: ...through the lenses of Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT.</p> <p>In regard to 'lenses', the proofreader commented: Is plural right here? (line 5)</p>	3.4 comment	<p>Proofreader comment</p> <p>Proofreader questions the writer's choice of plural form.</p> <p>3.5 Substitution – agreement</p>	Disagree Advise Nigel that I agree with him and that this was a mistake on my part.
8.	<p><i>In-text change</i></p> <p>'chapter' rewritten as 'Chapter' (line 5)</p>	7.4 in-text change	<p>Proofreader in-text change</p> <p>7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation</p>	Agree
9.	<p><i>In-text change</i></p> <p>'difference' rewritten as 'different' (line 6)</p>	3.2 in-text change	<p>Proofreader in-text change</p> <p>3.2 Substitution – form</p>	Agree

10.	<i>In -text change</i> Comma removed after 'teachers' (line 7)	7.1 in-text change	In-text change Proofreader removes Oxford comma 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Agree
11.	The student wrote: The complexity and richness of the data obtained reinforces the conception of the impossibility of having a single reality but rather a choral composition of intricated realities, as perceived and reported by the participants The proofreader commented: I love this explanation! (lines 8 to 10)	10.1 comment	Proofreader comment 10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	Agree
12.	<i>In -text change</i> 'chapters' rewritten as 'Chapters' (line 12)	7.4 in-text change	Proofreader in-text change 7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	Agree
13.	<i>In -text change</i> 'four' rewritten as '4' This was in reference to chapter numbers. (line 12)	7.3 in-text change	Proofreader in-text change 7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	Agree
14.	<i>In -text change</i> 'six' rewritten as '6' This was in reference to chapter numbers. (line 12)	7.3 in-text change	Proofreader in-text change 7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	Agree
15.	The student wrote: to then explore The proofreader commented: 'and then explores'? (line 13)	3.7 comment	Proofreader comment 3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	Agree

16.	<p>The student wrote: to then explore</p> <p>The proofreader commented: 'and then explores'? (line 13)</p>	3.1 comment	<p>Proofreader comment</p> <p>3.5 Substitution – agreement</p> <p>However, the fact the proofreader changes the writer's 'to' to 'and' would mean the form of 'explore' would HAVE to change. I write this because see what you do elsewhere when the proofreader changes a comma to a full stop; you do NOT count the resulting need to change the initial letter of the next word to a capital letter as an additional intervention. Is the same thing happening here but you ARE counting it as an intervention?</p>	<p>Disagree – Advise Nigel with that I agree with his point and that I should not count explore/explores as an intervention.</p>
17.	<p><i>In-text change</i></p> <p>'Thirdly' rewritten as 'Third' (line 13)</p>	3.2 in-text change	<p>Proofreader in-text change</p> <p>3.9 Substitution – miscellaneous It could be 3.9. This is my choice.</p> <p>However, it could be that 'third' is seen as more formal—in which case it could be coded 3.6 Substitution – informal to formal It can't be 3.2 Substitution – form as 'third' and 'thirdly' are both adverbs.</p>	<p>Disagree Advise Nigel that I made a mistake here and thought of third as an adjective. I agree that it should be 3.9 miscellaneous.</p>
18.	<p><i>In-text change</i></p> <p>'are' deleted after 'proposed' (line 15)</p>	2.1 in-text change	<p>Proofreader in-text change</p> <p>2.1 Deletion minor</p>	<p>Agree</p>
19.	<p>The student wrote: RQ</p> <p>The proofreader commented: RQs? (line 15)</p>	3.9 comment but possibly 3.5 comment for agreement	<p>Proofreader comment</p> <p>3.5 Substitution – agreement Wasn't sure about this one, but closest category I could find...</p>	<p>Agree Advise Nigel that I was not sure but agree that it is 3.5</p>

20.	The student wrote: This chapter concludes with a key summary of the analysis presented. The proofreader commented: Delete 'key'? (line 17)	2.1 comment	Proofreader comment 2.1 Deletion minor	Agree
21.	The student wrote: <u>7.1. What does Flipped Learning Mean?</u> In regard to second full stop of 7.1. the proofreader commented: In previous sections, you haven't used a full stop here, but in this section you do. When you come to format, ensure consistency throughout the document with whichever style you like best. (line 19)	7.8 comment	Proofreader comment 7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	Agree
22.	<i>In -text change</i> 'RQ' rewritten as 'RQs' (line 20)	3.9 in-text change	In-text change 3.5 Substitution – agreement	Disagree Advise Nigel that I agree with him; RQs should agree with the series of numbers that follow in the student's text.
23.	<i>In -text change</i> Space inserted: 1,1b rewritten as 1, 1b (line 20)	7.7.1 in-text change	In-text change 7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	Agree
24.	<i>In -text change</i> Comma removed after 'implementation' (line 23)	7.1 in-text change	In-text change 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Agree
25.	<i>In -text change</i> Comma removed after 'method' (line 23)	7.1 in-text change	In-text change 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Agree
26.	The student wrote: This can be reflected on...	3.1 comment	Proofreader comment 3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	Disagree Advise Nigel that I agree with him; I classified this as a verb

	The proofreader commented: 'This is reflected in...?' (line 204)			change but I realise that it was a mistake as it is actually a new word entirely.
27.	The student wrote: This can be reflected on ... The proofreader commented: 'This is reflected in ...?' (line 24)	3.7 comment	Proofreader comment 3.3 Substitution – preposition	Disagree Advise Nigel that I agree with him; I made a mistake here as I realise it is a change of preposition
28.	<i>In -text change</i> Participants perceptions rewritten as participants' perceptions. (line 24)	7.1 in-text change	In-text change 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Agree
29.	The student wrote: Relle (Pos. 23) reports a different practical application of FL... In regard to 'Relle', the proofreader commented: Do you need to specify that these are teachers? You have only said participants, and the reader (like me!) may have forgotten which names relate to which participants. (line 25)	1.1 comment	Proofreader comment 1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	Disagree Advise Nigel that I initially thought 1.4 as the word count is not specific; I put 1.1 because I thought the student would only need to mention that the participants are teacher. However, I realise my error.
30.	The student wrote: Relle (Pos. 23) reports a different practical application of FL... In regard to '(Pos. 23)', the proofreader commented: In this chapter, you've used a full stop instead of a comma here for almost all citations, so I'm wondering if this is the format you've decided to go with? I won't change them here for that reason, but note that in previous chapters, you mostly used a comma and I changed them all	7.10.1 comment (if a citation) or 7.1 comment (if punctuation)	Proofreader comment I wasn't sure what was meant by 'Pos.', but I could see the writer was <i>quoting respondents from her data</i> . So she's saying 'My teacher interviewee said...'. So presumably, rather than 7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references ...this should be 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Agree

	<p>to consistently use a comma. You'll need to review this. Use Find and Replace as necessary. (line 25)</p> <p>Advise Nigel that I was not sure if '(Pos. 23)' should be counted as a citation (as the proofreader states) or as punctuation for my coding because it is not a citation in the usual sense i.e., referring to a published text. However, for intervention 32 below, the proofreader makes reference to APA style guide so could it be coded a citation?</p>			
31.	<p><i>In -text change</i></p> <p>'Cedric (143)' rewritten as 'Cedric (Pos. 143)' (Line 27)</p> <p>Advise Nigel that as with intervention 30 above, I am not sure if the addition of 'Pos.' is counted as a citation or addition.</p>	<p>7.10.1 comment (if a citation) or 1.1 comment (if addition)</p>	<p>In-text change</p> <p>1.1 Addition minor</p>	Agree
32.	<p>The student wrote: Marcia (Pos. 10; 34)</p> <p>In regard to the semicolon, the proofreader commented: Comma? APA uses a comma for discontinuous page numbers in citations, so would it be appropriate here? See the style blog here. (line 29)</p> <p>Advise Nigel that as with interventions 30 and 31 I am not sure if this is to be counted as a citation or punctuation.</p>	<p>7.10.1 comment (if a citation) or 7.1 comment (if punctuation)</p>	<p>Proofreader comment</p> <p>NH: I think the problem is that this ISN'T a citation, <i>but here and earlier, the proofreader is treating them as if they were citations. Tricky...</i></p> <p>So I think it SHOULD be 7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation ...but proofreader isn't treating it this way.</p>	Agree
33.	<p>The student wrote: Marcia (Pos. 10; 34)</p>	<p>11 comment</p>	<p>Proofreader comment</p>	Agree

	<p>In regard to the semicolon, the proofreader commented: Comma? APA uses a comma for discontinuous page numbers in citations, so would it be appropriate here? See the style blog here. (line 29)</p>		11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	
34.	<p><i>In -text change</i> 'necessary' rewritten as 'necessarily' (line 31)</p>	3.2 in-text change	<p>In-text change 3.2 Substitution – form</p>	Agree
35.	<p><i>In -text change</i> 'students practicing' rewritten as 'students practising' (line 32)</p>	3.8 in-text change	<p>In-text change 7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling NH: Although the American English spelling would be 'practicing' for the verb, probably it's not about UK/US varieties, and just about spelling, in that many native speakers (as well as L2 speakers) simply don't realise the verb and noun are spelt differently?</p>	<p>Disagree Advise Nigel that I have noticed that the proofreader has made remarks to the student about American and British spelling so I was most likely influenced by this.</p>
36.	<p><i>In -text change</i> 'preseasonal' rewritten as 'pre-sessional' (line 34)</p>	7.1 in-text change	<p>In-text change NH: Again a tricky one, in that she's ostensibly changing the American way of writing this word to the British way of doing it. But have gone for 7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling</p>	<p>Disagree Advise Nigel that I agree with him; I did not know that this was the American form so marked it as introduced a dash.</p>

Table 3 Quantitative Codebook to Measure Proofreader Interventions (21st September 2021)

N.B. As this codebook was based primarily on the research of Harwood (2018), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and my own piloting with additional reference made to Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Rebuck (2014), and Cottier (2017), please see section 3.3.1, Figure 5 of the methodology which details the descriptors noted below and their source.

1. The descriptors in the codebook apply to **in-text actual changes** and **comment section remarks where no change is made**. I have endeavoured to make this clear by starting each code category/subcategory with ‘Interventions regarding...’; in that way it can encompass both in-text actual changes and comments section remarks where no change is made. Further details regarding the coding categories are listed as follows:
 - i. code categories 1 to 9 can be used when the proofreader makes an in-text correction but does not comment **and** when the proofreader only comments but does not correct. However, code subcategory 1.4 only applies to comments section remarks where no actual change is made and more details have been provided in the codebook;
 - ii. code category 10 is only for comment remarks where no change is made. Codes under category 10 serve as phatic forms of communication in which the proofreader interacts with the student but there is no actual proofreading or pedagogic purpose;
 - iii. code category 11 is only for comment remarks where no change is made but the proofreader provides web links to additional sources of information for the student which could serve an educational purpose; and
 - iv. code categories 13 and 14 are editing methods and methods of raising queries and comments. For each *entire* piece of text analysed, they only indicate the **method** in which the proofreader intervened and do not count as any form of intervention; they simply advise the reader what method was used by the proofreader to make changes or add comments. **Therefore, code categories 13 and 14 should not need to be used for the inter-rater reliability test when coding individual parts of a proofread text.**
2. Coding Guidance:
 - i. note the code number and if the intervention **was an in-text change** or a **comment** (see example interventions 1 and 2 in the table below);
 - ii. if the proofreader has made an in-text change and a comment for the same intervention, code it as two separate forms of intervention (see example interventions 3 and 4 in the table below); and
 - iii. if the proofreader has made interventions that affect more than one part of a piece of text e.g., ‘google scholar’ becomes Google Scholar, the quote mark removal and capitalisation are coded separately. Please note that the removal of quote marks counts as one intervention only but the capitalisation of Google and Scholar counts as two separate interventions (see example interventions 5 to 7 in the table below).

Intervention number	Intervention code and details of whether it was an in-text or comment intervention	Details regarding the proofreader intervention i.e. if it was an in-text change or proofreader comment)
1.	7.1 in-text change	Comma inserted after ‘chapter’
2.	3.7 comment	Proofreader comment: Is this the right word? Dissatisfaction? (The student had written ‘satisfaction’)
3.	7.4 comment	Proofreader comment: I’ve changed this to a small ‘m’ as ‘motivation’ is a generic term.
4.	7.4 in-text change	‘m’ in ‘motivation’ was changed from an upper to lower-case letter.

5.	7.1 in-text change	'google scholar' changed to Google Scholar The proofreader removed the quote marks
6.	7.4 in-text change	'google scholar' changed to Google Scholar The proofreader capitalised Google
7.	7.4 in-text change	'google scholar' changed to Google Scholar The proofreader capitalised Scholar

Name	Description
1.1 Addition minor	Interventions regarding minor level addition of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 5 words or fewer.
1.2 Addition meso	Interventions regarding meso level addition of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 6 to 9 words.
1.3 Addition major	Interventions regarding major level addition of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 10+ words.
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	Interventions regarding advice to add more information. This subcategory applies to comments only interventions , for instance when the proofreader has advised the student that more information needs to be added but the number of words is unknown. Examples include but are not limited to instances where the proofreader has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. advised the student that a sentence is incomplete; ii. noted that a citation needs to be added to support a claim; and/or iii. indicated that more information is needed to provide greater clarity, e.g., through the use of a question mark or advising the student that the text is ambiguous/unclear. <i>N.B. If the proofreader also provides a suggested piece of text, the word count would be apparent. Therefore, such an intervention would be coded under 1.1, 1.2 or 1.3 depending on how many words are suggested.</i>
2.1 Deletion minor	Interventions regarding minor level subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 5 words or fewer.
2.2 Deletion meso	Interventions regarding meso level subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 6 to 9 words.
2.3 Deletion major	Interventions regarding major level subtraction of words, phrases, or sentences i.e., 10+ words.
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a verb tense e.g., design ➔ designed.
3.2 Substitution – form	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a word form e.g., adjective to noun <i>creative</i> ➔ <i>creation</i>
3.3 Substitution – preposition	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a preposition e.g., <i>at</i> ➔ <i>in</i>
3.4 Substitution – number errors	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a noun erroneously thought by the writer to be countable e.g., <i>feedbacks</i> ➔ <i>feedback</i>
3.5 Substitution – agreement	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a word regarding agreement e.g., <i>both group received</i> ➔ <i>both groups received</i>
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of an informal to formal word e.g., <i>get</i> ➔ <i>obtain</i> ; <i>did a task</i> ➔ <i>completed a task</i>
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of a new word entirely e.g., <i>that</i> ➔ <i>on</i>
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	Interventions regarding the substitution/replacement of an American to British English word e.g., <i>analyze</i> ➔ <i>analyse</i>
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	Interventions regarding any other form of substitution/replacement of a word not already mentioned in substitution categories 3.1 to 3.8
4.1 Structural editing -	Interventions regarding the reordering of words, phrases, or sentences

Name	Description
reordering words, phrases, or sentences	<i>within</i> a paragraph.
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	Interventions regarding the reordering/repositioning of an <i>entire</i> paragraph within a text to ensure that the argument is logically structured. This differs from subcategory 4.1 as it means that an <i>entire</i> paragraph has been moved within a text rather than words, sentences, or phrases <i>within</i> a paragraph.
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	Interventions regarding the reordering/repositioning of sections or larger units to ensure that the argument is logically structured; sections or larger units refer to text which is in excess of a single paragraph.
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	Interventions regarding inserting or changing paragraph breaks in order to create a more logical structure.
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	Interventions regarding inserting/creating textual guideposts to help the reader orientate him-/herself in the text.
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	Interventions regarding moving text to another chapter.
5.1 Rewriting Meso	Interventions regarding the replacement of 6 to 9 consecutive words in the writer’s text OR the replacement of the writer’s text by 6 to 9 new consecutive words by the proofreader.
5.2 Rewriting Major	Interventions regarding the replacement of 10 or more consecutive words in the writer’s text OR the replacement of the writer’s text by 10 or more new consecutive words by the proofreader.
6 Recombining	Interventions regarding the combination of one or more sentences, or the division of one sentence into two or more sentences.
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	Interventions regarding punctuation. <i>N.B. If the proofreader replaces a full stop with a comma this is only coded as 7.1 mechanical alteration – punctuation. The fact that the following word would change from beginning with an upper to lower-case letter is not counted as an intervention because it is a natural consequence of the change in punctuation and not due to any error on the student writer’s part e.g., currency. Namely ➡ currency, namely The same applies to the opposite i.e., a comma being replaced by a full stop which would result in the following word beginning with an upper instead of a lower-case letter e.g., currency, namely ➡ currency. Namely If the proofreader adds in a word such as ‘however’ that naturally needs to be followed by a comma, this is coded as 1.1 addition only. The comma is not coded as this is a consequence of adding the word (however) and not due to any error on the student’s part.</i>
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	Interventions regarding spelling including typos. <i>N.B. This does not include changes to spelling in regard to American and British English; such changes are coded in subcategory 3.8</i>
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	Interventions regarding numbering. Examples include but are not limited to instances of: i. replacing one number with another. For instance, when the proofreader replaces a number e.g., 5 with another number e.g., 6 if the student has erroneously written the same number (5) twice in the same sentence; ii. numbers under ten being noted in word form and those above as numerals; iii. chapter numbers being written in number rather than word form i.e., <i>Chapter four</i> becomes <i>Chapter 4</i> iv. incorrect use of decimal points e.g., 55.% instead of 55.5%; and v. incorrect cross-referencing of numbering e.g., the student writer

Name	Description
	mentions the number seven but in another part of the text shows a calculation of three plus five thus making eight instead of seven.
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	Interventions regarding a lower-case letter being made an upper case/capital letter and vice versa. This subcategory also encompasses capitalisation in regard to referencing style guidelines e.g., APA <i>N.B. This subcategory does not apply to instances where the proofreader has changed a comma to a full stop or vice versa which would result in the following word beginning with an upper or lower-case letter; such a form of intervention is coded as punctuation only i.e., subcategory 7.1</i>
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	Interventions regarding abbreviations.
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	Interventions regarding acronyms.
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	Interventions regarding replacing an ampersand in the text with ‘and’
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	Interventions regarding font type and font size. This subcategory also encompasses font type/style in regard to referencing style guidelines e.g., APA
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	Interventions regarding ensuring consistency in terms of layout. This includes the removal of double spaces where necessary and formatting single spaces.
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	Interventions regarding document layout and design e.g., when the proofreader advises the student to separate information in a table.
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	Interventions regarding ensuring that there are no widows or orphans in the text.
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	Interventions regarding running heads where applicable.
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	Interventions regarding ensuring the consistency of headings in regard to numbering (including punctuation such as full stops after numbers) and style; this can also include proofreader suggestions to add a heading. <i>N.B. This category only includes mechanical alterations in regard to numbering and style. For interventions that do not concern numbering and style, please refer to the appropriate code e.g., if the proofreader advises the student to delete a word in the heading, this is coded as subcategory 2.1</i>
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	Interventions regarding ensuring consistency in terms of cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, and the table of contents.
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	Interventions regarding ensuring that page numbers are correct and consecutive.
7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references	Interventions regarding the referencing style for in-text references. This includes changing an ampersand to ‘and’ and vice versa. <i>N.B. This category does not include student writer reference to participants in their study. For instance, if the student quotes a participant by writing Relle (Pos. 23) and the proofreader advises that the full stop after ‘Pos’</i>

Name	Description
	<i>should be replaced by a comma, this would be classified as 7.1 punctuation. As such, in-text references for this subcategory only refer to those made to published sources.</i>
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and bibliography/reference list	Interventions regarding ensuring that all references in the text appear in the bibliography/reference list, and that all sources in the bibliography/reference list are referenced in the text.
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	Interventions regarding ensuring that the bibliography/reference list is in accordance with the prescribed house style.
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	Interventions regarding ensuring that bibliographical/reference list information is accurate.
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	This subcategory is for any other interventions regarding mechanical alteration that are not already mentioned in categories 7.1 to 7.10
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	Interventions regarding the correction of words that have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning.
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	Interventions regarding checking for plagiarism and alerting the author i.e., the student writer.
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	Interventions regarding alerting the author to text which could be judgemental.
9 Erroneous correction	Interventions regarding instances where the proofreader has modified the text incorrectly.
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	This subcategory applies to comments only interventions and are instances of phatic communication between the proofreader and the student where the proofreader has made positive comments that provide the student writer with encouragement. Such interventions do not involve any changes to the text.
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	This subcategory applies to comments only interventions and are instances of phatic communication where the proofreader interacts with the student without causing any changes to the text. For example, the proofreader makes a joke about a possible word that was expressed by a participant in the student writer’s study which was written as XXX. Such forms of communication serve no proofreading or pedagogic purpose but act as a type of ‘chat’ between the proofreader and student.
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	This category applies to comments only interventions and are instances where the proofreader provides the student with web links to additional sources of material that could serve an educational purpose.
12 Non-interventions	Instances where the proofreader appears to choose not to make changes to erroneous parts of a text.
13.1 Editing methods	Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function, and letting the author decide which suggested changes to accept/reject electronically.
13.2 Editing methods	Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, without tracking changes (i.e., returning a print-ready document back to the author of the dissertation/thesis).

Name	Description
13.3 Editing methods	Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function and providing the author with a hard-copy print format of the electronically edited document, and letting the author input the suggested changes him-/herself, without doing a proofread of the final document.
13.4 Editing methods	Editing electronically in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word, using the tracking function and providing the author with a hard-copy print format of the electronically edited document, letting the author input the suggested changes him-/herself and then doing a proofread of the final document.
13.5 Editing methods	Editing by hand on hard copy, and letting the author input corrections, without checking input corrections.
13.6 Editing methods	Editing by hand on hard copy, letting the author input corrections, and doing a proofread to check that the corrections have been input correctly.
13.7 Editing methods	Editing electronically in a word processing programming like Microsoft Word, using the change-tracking function, and returning two versions of the document to the student – one with the changes and comments showing (so the student can see the changes if desired) and one with the changes accepted (i.e., a print ready document).
14.1 Methods of raising queries and comments	Listing queries and comments in a separate document (either handwritten or electronically).
14.2 Methods of raising queries and comments	Using the comments function in a word-processing package like Microsoft Word to add queries and comments directly to the edited document.
14.3 Methods of raising queries and comments	Writing queries and comments on the hard-copy edited document or using stick-on notes to add queries and comments to the hard-copy edited document.
14.4 Methods of raising queries and comments	Typing queries and comments directly into the edited document but not using the comments function (e.g. typing in different-coloured text or highlighted text).

Appendix B – Qualitative Coding Results and Participant Codebooks

N.B. The figure below contains excerpts from Sarah’s (the EdD student participant) thesis with Jane’s proofreading interventions which were submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Figure 1 Noteworthy Lecturer Transcript Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Tester and Researcher

For the reader’s information each example below in Figures 1, 2, and 3 adhere to the following format:

- 1) the subheadings denote the reason why I chose to include the examples e.g., the interviewee’s responses need to be analysed in greater depth;
- 2) the code and definition that I refer to;
- 3) where relevant, the excerpt from the student writer’s text and the proofreader’s intervention have been included to help the reader determine the context of the coded transcript;
- 4) the coded transcript (N.B. As noted in section 4.2, for ease of reading, I have removed instances of repeated words, pauses, fillers such as ‘erm’ and ‘er’, words that carry no meaning in the context of the excerpt such as ‘oh right, yes I see’, and pieces of text that do not make sense or the grammar is unclear) ; and
- 5) the action that was taken as a result of the disagreement/discrepancy e.g., code definitions were better defined.

1) Subcategory: The interviewee’s responses need to be analysed in greater depth

Codes:

- **Deletion:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader deleting words (not highlighted in the coded transcript below).
- **Proofreader Role:**
The lecturer’s views of the role of a proofreader (highlighted in yellow in the coded transcript below).

Student Writer’s Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Student Writer’s Text 1 (shown in italics in the coded transcript below)

‘Well, my favorite thing is I can arrange my time freely. **Um, I don't have to. I don't have to. You know, I don't have to start to start for the whole day, in a classroom...**’

Proofreader Intervention 1 (shown in italics in the coded transcript below)

Commented: Phrases/sentences like this (those shown in bold above) that don’t add any content could be replaced with ellipses to reduce word count and make it easier for the reader to find the main idea.

Student Writer’s Text 2 (shown in bold in the coded transcript below)

‘It has also been acknowledged that insightful reflections have not been included due to the shift in focus of the research imposed by the constraints of this format. Nevertheless, these exciting findings will be further explored and disseminated in future papers.’

Proofreader Intervention 2 (shown in bold in the coded transcript below)

Commented: This has been repeated too often, and I think it is starting to detract from the importance of the things that are within the constraints of the paper. It is also the focus of your ‘conclusion thoughts’. Could you delete it here?

Coded transcript:

If you were trying to analyse discourse and sort of thought process or interactions you'd probably wanna leave them in, if you're trying to get to the point of somebody's opinion and this sort get in the way I'd probably be likely to recommend ellipsis again a bit depends on the context but it is a very hard call I think dealing with direct interview material but I reflected have not been included due to the shift in focus of the research again it's a suggestion and I think it's OK although again it depends on are you getting in the way of it being assessed so that's always hard. I would tend to say do you do something like you do realise you're repeating this a lot or something but I do worry about that if something is being assessed then are you are you kind of getting the way of the assessor's opinion of how the piece of work again these are pretty interesting lines of decision here I think I would make a comment about you said this before and just leave it to see what they think about it.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

The tester and I coded the transcript above as deletion as it concerned ellipsis. However, the tester also noted that part of the transcript (see highlighted areas) also concerned proofreader role as the interviewee mentioned how a proofreader could potentially affect work being assessed. For this example, the second coder was correct as I noted that it was one of a number of instances where I overly focused on the topic of the question i.e., deletion.

Action Taken

As a result of the above, I realised that I needed to analyse the interviewee's point of view far more closely and in greater depth.

2) Subcategory: Code definition needs to be more clearly defined

Example 1:

Codes:

- **Substitution:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader substituting words.
- **Mechanical Alteration:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

No examples of the student's utterance and the proofreader's intervention were shown during the lecturer interview for this example.

Coded transcript:

That's one you know I do intervene in and spell this in full yeah so again context dependent but with reservations about how far you go ah English I've just been talking doing a PhD where this is a problem so we've got stigmatisation where sometimes it's 'z' and sometimes it's 's' and the big one is 'practised' and 'practiced'.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

Both the tester and I coded the transcript above as substitution. However, the tester also wrote mechanical in brackets with a question mark. I explained why it was substitution as it concerns American and British English spelling but realised that I needed to provide examples in my coding system that clearly differentiate between the two categories of substitution and mechanical alterations.

Action Taken:

As noted above, I provided examples in my codebook to differentiate between substitution (verb tense, form, prepositions, number errors, agreement, the replacement of an informal form with its formal version, a new word(s) entirely, American English to British English spelling, and/or miscellaneous)

and mechanical alteration (punctuation, spelling including typos, capitalisation, abbreviations, acronyms, and ampersands, font size and font types, text layout and appearance, headings, correlating parts of the text, citations and references, and/or miscellaneous).

Example 2:

Codes:

- **Mechanical Alteration:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions.
- **Information:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader giving advice to add more information.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

No examples of the student's utterance and the proofreader's intervention were shown during the lecturer interview for this example.

Coded transcript:

I do comment on that quite often they'll have a big direct quote and then not give a page number, it seems to be falling out of fashion. I do say something about, just put something in, I put in the margin, page number question mark, but again there is a way in which that might be seen to be just bordering on the unethical in that the student might be being assessed on how well they understand the referencing system so it's a difficult one that but I usually do it because it seems it to me just and on another level it's just convention and they have to understand the conventions er citations and references yeah I will put a question mark if there's it looks to me it needs it needs to be have some source but I don't really go ahead and say much about it, I just say citation or does this need a citation or something and references and reference list or just in text referencing?

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

For the coded transcript above, I noted mechanical alteration as it discussed quotes, page numbers and citations and references, whereas the tester coded it as information with mechanical in brackets followed by a question mark. In our discussion, the tester remarked that the proofreader providing a page number and question mark is asking for more information, and that the other parts of the excerpt would be mechanical in regard to citations and references. When I explained my definition of mechanical alteration and information, the tester agreed that the excerpt was more concerned with the former.

Action Taken:

Even though the tester agreed with me that the transcript above was mechanical alteration, I decided to provide examples of mechanical alteration (punctuation spelling including typos, capitalisation, abbreviations, acronyms, and ampersands, font size and font types, text layout and appearance, headings, correlating parts of the text, citations and references, and/or miscellaneous) and information (the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader giving: advice to add more information; advice to add more information and a suggestion was provided; advice to add information to support a claim; and/or advice that more information is needed to provide greater clarity) to my coding system to clearly differentiate between the two. In addition, the tester also noted during the meeting that this excerpt could be proofreader role as the student is assessed on their referencing system skills, which again highlighted my need to focus more closely on the content of the participant's utterance and not be overly influenced by the question.

3) Subcategory: Code defined more clearly and coding definition changed

Codes:

- **Non-Intervention:**
The lecturer's views of parts of the text where the proofreader does not intervene.
- **Proofreader Role:**

The lecturer's views of the role of a proofreader.

- **Expectations:**

The expectations that students have of their proofreader according to the lecturer.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Not applicable as the above codes do not concern specific types of intervention that were made to the student's text.

Coded transcript:

When you're dealing with a huge text or even a five or six thousand words essay it's quite easy to miss things and I think it's to be expected that the student should go through and pick up things themselves and they need to proofread it themselves before they submit it so whilst you try your best to pick up small changes like that it's not always infallible so some things get missed particularly if you're struggling with meaning so I think that's understandable and allowable and it is up to the student to recheck **they have to take some responsibility, not just hand it in because some proofreader's looked at it** so two paragraphs and one quote was in grey but the other paragraphs and another quote was in black this part of the text was moved to page nine in the revised version but no changes were made so by moving it, did it make more sense, was that it?

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

Regarding the transcript above, I coded it as non-intervention for the entire paragraph based on its discussion of incorrect parts of a text being overlooked. However, the tester coded the excerpt as proofreader role (see the first highlighted part in yellow) and expectations (see the second highlighted part in green). Regarding the part highlighted in yellow, the tester explained that he did not put non-intervention because it concerns inevitable slip ups; the tester sees non-intervention as a deliberate choice whereas the transcript above highlights an example of the proofreader not noticing an error. Both the tester and myself are correct as non-intervention can encompass the proofreader not intervening either through choice or due to lack of acknowledgement.

In regard to the second code highlighted in green, the tester thought that it concerned the expectations of the lecturer; I explained that expectations concerns what a student expects of their proofreader which means that my coding would be correct in this instance but I clearly needed to better define this code. From our discussion, the tester decided that the part highlighted in green should be coded as proofreader role because it is not what the student thinks or expects (i.e., expectations) but is more concerned with the role of the proofreader which I presume is in reference to the student being encouraged to take responsibility.

Action Taken:

For the first category of non-intervention, I defined it more clearly i.e., the lecturer's views of parts of the text where the proofreader does not intervene. This encompasses: 1) the proofreader made a deliberate choice not to intervene; 2) the proofreader may not have intervened because a change/suggestion was not needed or it could be unethical for the proofreader to make a change/suggestion; and/or 3) the proofreader may not have noticed errors or issues.

Regarding the proofreader role and expectation codes, I decided to combine the two to be clear that it was the *lecturer's* perspective of the role of a proofreader and what a student expects. Therefore, I renamed the code as 'Lecturers and Proofreading Practices' and defined it as: The lecturer's views of the role of a proofreader insofar as what one would perceive or expect of a proofreader. This can include: 1) the proofreading help that could be provided to second language writers of English; and 2) the lecturer's opinion of the expectations that students have of their proofreader regarding the type of proofreading help and guidance that can ethically be provided; 3) students always consulting a proofreader; and/or 4) the ethical appropriacy of proofreading practices as a whole.

N.B. The figure below contains excerpts from Sarah's (the EdD student participant) thesis with Jane's proofreading interventions which were submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Figure 2 Noteworthy Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Researcher's First and Second Tests (Student)

1) Subcategory: The interviewee's responses need to be analysed in greater depth

Codes:

- **Feedback:**
Whether the student believes that the feedback provided by a proofreader is helpful at each stage of the writing process or only at the end.
- **Mechanical Alteration:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions.
- **Fluency:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Not applicable as feedback and fluency do not concern specific types of intervention that were made to the student's text. For mechanical alteration, I did not show the student any examples from their text as this had already been undertaken in the first interview.

Coded transcript:

I think it's quite nice to have it at each stage cos then you can think about the mistakes like you know the thing with the double spaces so I found that really helpful. I think as a researcher, I know what I want to say and in my head it's all super clear but when I put it on paper it's not all super clear cos you know I just I write based on the things that I know so maybe I don't explain the connections very clearly or or yeah explain how links to previous things or to current theory so to have someone to just read through it and say OK this makes sense, like the narrative makes sense is really really helpful.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

I initially coded the entire excerpt above as feedback based on the interviewer question. For the second coding, I still kept it as feedback but based on my experience with the lecturer transcript of focusing excessively on the question, I realised that other categories needed to be highlighted which were fluency, and error correction. As such, the part highlighted in yellow shows mechanical alteration in regard to double spaces and the fact that the student appreciated such interventions could imply that they are seen as ethically acceptable. The part highlighted in green shows an utterance that I coded as fluency because it discusses the proofreader helping ideas connect more effectively.

Action Taken:

As a result of the aforementioned, I firstly better-defined feedback as follows: 1) whether participants believe that the feedback provided by a proofreader is helpful at each stage of the writing process or only at the end; 2) whether participants believe that post-proofreading feedback in the form of a meeting is or is not helpful. Secondly, I defined my code for mechanical alteration more clearly so that double spaces would appear under text layout and appearance. Thirdly, I improved the coding definition of fluency to read: the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay in regard to: 1) the flow of the essay; and/or linking ideas more clearly.

2) Subcategory: Incorrect coding which resulted in the creation of a new coding category

Code:

- **Structural Editing:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader reordering paragraphs and/or sections or larger units, inserting or changing paragraph breaks, and inserting or creating textual guideposts

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Not applicable as I did not show the student any examples from their text because this had already been undertaken in the previous first interview.

Coded transcript:

I'm a bit confused about that bit to be honest and when I first thought about this in my head I thought it would make sense to have the findings and the analysis together because that way I can be as objective as I want to be and, I don't need to be careful about saying that my findings are interesting or whatever erm but I thought as well that if I combine those two chapters, it's gonna be really lengthy, really hard to structure so there's not going to be a clear difference between my data and how I'm interpreting my data and I don't think that's fair on the reader. I think the reader should be able to look at my data and then do their own interpretation and compare it to my interpretation.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

Regarding this example, I initially coded it as structural editing as it was the topic of the interviewee question. However, upon reflection, I realised on the second coding that it was more concerned with the readability and accessibility of the text as the interviewee highlighted issues with the data presentation and how the reader interprets it rather than structural editing concerns of reordering paragraphs and/or sections or larger units, inserting or changing paragraph breaks, and inserting or creating textual guideposts.

Action Taken:

As a consequence of the above, I created a new code of readability/accessibility concerning the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader ensuring that a text is appropriate for its target audience.

3) Subcategory: Defining a code in more depth

Code:

- **Writing Skills:**
Whether a proofreader can improve a student's writing skills

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Not applicable as writing skills do not concern specific types of intervention that were made to the student's text.

Coded transcript 1:

I think it is helpful and I am maybe a bit more mindful of the type of grammar issues that I will make but some of that it's hard because I know once they've pointed out to me like oh this is not right, I'm like yeah of course it's not right erm so I think a lot of the mistakes they're just slips and I'm not aware of them so it helps me be, can I write hand for those types of mistakes so when I'm proofreading my own work, I pay more attention to those things so maybe in a way it is helping my writing.

Coded Transcript 2:

I think yeah academic register, I am struggling with academic register because I don't agree so much with the academic conventions so you know sometimes you will point things that like oh this is a bit you know subjective or emotional whatever and I'm like yeah but it is subjective, emotional or whatever because I've made it.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

In regard to the first example, I had coded it as writing skills for both the first and second test. However, on the second test, I realised the student had stated that the help of a proofreader could also improve their *own* proofreading skills which meant that this code could be defined in more depth. Similarly, for the second example, when conducting the second test, I realised that the writing skills code could be better defined by referring to specific types of writing skills development especially as I had shown the student a prompt card detailing such forms of assistance.

Action Taken:

Based on the above examples, I added that the code of writing skills can include proofreaders helping students improve their own proofreader skills, and I included the following subcategories of writing skills to better define the code in more depth: 1) spelling; 2) punctuation; 3) vocabulary; 4) word structure or morphology (e.g., simple words such as 'work' and complex words such as 'worker'); 5) word order; 6) sentence structure; 7) paragraph structure; 8) organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs; 9) academic register (e.g., appropriateness of language, formality of language, active and passive forms, 1st and 3rd person) 10) content; 11) line of argumentation; 12) formatting and presentation of text; 13) referencing; and/or 14) other.

N.B. The figure below contains excerpts from Sarah's (the EdD student participant) thesis with Jane's proofreading interventions which were submitted to Turnitin as mentioned in section 3.5.1 of the methodology.

Figure 3 Noteworthy Qualitative Coding Discrepancies between the Researcher's First and Second Tests and (Proofreader)

1) Subcategory: The interviewee's responses need to be analysed in greater depth

Codes:

- **Reason:**
The reason for the proofreader's intervention.
- **Proofreading Role:**
The proofreader's perception of their role in regard to the interventions that they did or did not make.
- **Fluency:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Student Writer's Text 1 (shown in italics in the first transcript below)

This seems to support the flexible space principle of FL to foster **discussion among peers** of the content under the guidance of the tutor.

Proofreader Intervention 1 (shown in italics in the first transcript below)

This seems to support the flexible space principle of FL to foster **peer discussion** of the content under the guidance of the tutor.

Student Writer's Text 2 (shown in bold in the first transcript below)

Considering this finding within a FL course, it reinforces the idea that teachers do play **a key role essential** in promoting the necessary autonomy to complete the tasks before the sessions.

Proofreader Intervention 2 (shown in bold in the first transcript below)

The proofreader suggested 'an essential role'

Coded Transcript 1:

OK yeah so the first one is just in the interests of being concise you know one of the features of academic of good academic writing is to be concise so why use three words when you can use two, yeah so again 'key role' and 'essential' to me are synonyms so there was a bit of redundancy in this sentence we didn't need to have both of those words in there so again in the interests of being concise I made a suggestion that she use an 'essential role'.

Coded Transcript 2 (Example 41 below):

...one of my, when I proofread a piece of work it's you know it's not just about putting the commas in the right place, I want it to flow and sound as good as it can so that's what these two are about really the originals weren't wrong but it could just sound a little bit better.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

I initially coded transcript 2 as reason because I linked it to the context of the first coded transcript above regarding why the proofreader had reordered parts of the student's text. However, I realised on the second coding that it was more concerned with proofreader role insofar as ensuring a text flows well and not only adjusting commas. Additionally, I also realised on the second coding that the same utterance can be coded as because the interviewee mentioned that the text is not wrong but that they help by ensuring that it flows and sounds as good as possible.

Action Taken:

As with the lecturer and student coding, the aforementioned showed me once again the importance of concentrating more on the content of the interviewee's response rather than heavily focusing on the question.

2) Subcategory: The interviewee's responses need to be analysed in greater depth and better defined codes

Example 1:

Codes:

- **Reason:**
The reason for the proofreader's intervention.
- **Structural Editing:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader reordering paragraphs and/or sections or larger units, inserting or changing paragraph breaks, and inserting or creating textual guideposts

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Student Writer's Text 1

As Olusegun (2015) succinctly explains, the central idea grounding this theory is that learning is constructed, that is new knowledge is built upon previous knowledge, rather than as a result of the passive transmission of information relying on reception, rather than construction.

Proofreader Intervention 1

'You have talked about constructivism quite a lot already. Would it be better to move this definition to earlier in the section where you first begin discussing constructivism? Maybe in the previous paragraph where you mention King's ideas and constructivist approach?'

Student Writer's Text 2

Heading: 2.2.2.3. Intentional Content (FLN, 2014 The Four Pillars of F-L-I-P™)

Proofreader Intervention 2

Is this subsection the right place to introduce and discuss the revised taxonomy and focus on HOTS verbs? Would it be more appropriate in the previous section?'

Coded Transcript 1:

Yeah OK so again this is you know she's got all the content in that she needs but as a reader some of didn't feel like it was in a logical place.

Coded Transcript 2:

So this was about giving more of a logical order to the content that was down there.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

For the first coding, I coded both transcripts above as reason only. For the second coding, I also noted it as reason and structural editing as I realised that it discusses the order of the text and possibly moving it.

Action Taken:

In addition to having focused too much on the question, I decided to code structural editing more clearly. As such, I added the descriptors from my taxonomy of reordering paragraphs, reordering sections or larger units, inserting or changing paragraph breaks, inserting or creating textual guideposts, and/or moving text to another chapter) to the code of structural editing so that I could easily see the different forms when making reference to said area whilst coding.

Example 2:

Code:

- **Reason:**
The reason for the proofreader's intervention
- **Substitution:**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader substituting words
- **Fluency**
The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay.

Student Writer's Excerpt and Proofreader Intervention:

Student Writer's Text:

...which requires **exploring** the explicit relationships among ideas expressed;

Proofreader Intervention

...which requires **exploration** of the explicit relationships among ideas expressed;

Coded Transcript:

OK exploring the, which requires exploration. Yeah so this was just it sounded more natural to change the form, the part of speech here 'requires exploration of the explicit relationship' rather than 'require exploring', everyone understands what exploring means but I think a native speaker would probably write 'exploration of' instead.

Acceptance or Rejection of the Second Coder's Coding:

On my first coding, I had coded the transcript above as reason only in regard to why the proofreader substituted 'exploring' with 'exploration'. I kept it as reason for the second coding but realised that it could also appear under the substitution and fluency codes. Regarding substitution, the proofreader mentions 'exploring' and exploration which falls under the subcategory of verb tense. The fluency code was assigned on the second coding as I noted that the proofreader mentions the text sounding more natural.

Action Taken:

In addition to having focused too much on the question, I defined the substitution code to help me notice specific forms such as verb tense; the subcategories matched those of my taxonomy and are as follows: 1) verb tense; 2) form; 3) preposition; 4) number error; 5) agreement; 6) the replacement of an informal form with its formal version; 7) a new word(s) entirely; 8) American English to British English spelling; and/or 9) miscellaneous. I also added to the fluency code that it can include helping the writer make the text sound more natural.

Table 1 Second Round of Qualitative Coding Results (7th September 2021)

Coding Number	Researcher's Coding	Supervisor's Coding	Agree/Disagree
1.	Addition – Ethical	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Disagree
2.	Addition – Learning	Same code as above	Disagree
3.	Addition – Ethical	Addition – Ethical	Agree
4.	Addition – Ethical	Void	Disagree
5.	Addition – Learning	Addition – Learning	Agree
6.	Addition – Ethical	Addition – Ethical	Agree
7.	Addition – Ethical	Same code as number 6	Agree
8.	Addition – Ethical	Same code as number 6	Agree
9.	Addition – Ethical	Style of intervention	Disagree – (New code needed)
10.	Addition – Learning	Addition – Learning	Agree
11.	Addition – Ethical	Addition – Ethical	Agree
12.	Deletion – Ethical	Deletion – Ethical	Agree
13.	Deletion – Ethical	Same code as number 12	Agree
14.	Deletion – Ethical	Same code as number 12	Agree
15.	Deletion – Ethical	Deletion - Learning	Disagree
16.	Deletion – Ethical	Same code as number 14	Disagree
17.	Deletion – Ethical	Deletion – Learning	Disagree
18.	Deletion - Learning	Deletion – Ethical	Disagree
19.	Deletion - Learning	Same code as 17	Agree
20.	Deletion – Ethical	Same code as 17	Disagree
21.	Substitution – Learning	Substitution – Learning	Agree
22.	Substitution – Ethical	Substitution – Ethical	Agree
23.	Substitution – Ethical	Same code as number 22	Agree
24.	Void	Overall	Disagree
25.	Substitution – Learning	Same code as number 21	Agree
26.	Substitution – Learning	Same code as number 21	Agree
27.	Substitution – Ethical	Same code as number 22	Agree

28.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Void	Disagree
29.	Proofreader Endorsement 1	Proofreader Endorsement	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
30.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Void	Disagree
31.	Substitution – Ethical	Substitution – Ethical	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
32.	Substitution – Learning	Substitution Learning	Agree
33.	Substitution – Ethical	Same as code number 31	Agree
34.	Reordering – Ethical	Reordering – Ethical	Agree
35.	Reordering – Ethical	Reordering – Ethical	Agree
36.	Reordering – Learning	Void	Disagree
37.	Structural Editing 1 – Ethical	Structural Editing – Ethical	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
38.	Structural Editing – Learning	Structural Editing - Learning	Agree
39.	Structural Editing 5 – Ethical	Structural Editing – Ethical	Agree
40.	Rewriting – Ethical	Rewriting – Ethical	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
41.	Rewriting - Learning	Void	Disagree
42.	Mechanical Alteration 10 – Ethical	Mechanical Alteration – Ethical	Agree
43.	Mechanical Alteration 6 – Ethical	Same code as number 42	Agree
44.	Mechanical Alteration 6 – Ethical	Mechanical Alteration - Learning	Disagree
45.	Mechanical Alteration - Learning	Same code as number 44	Agree
46.	Mechanical Alteration 10 – Ethical	Mechanical Alteration – Ethical	Agree
47.	Mechanical Alteration 9 – Ethical	Mechanical Alteration – Ethical	Agree
48.	Mechanical Alteration 1 – Ethical	Same code as number 47	Agree
49.	Mechanical Alteration 2 – Ethical	Same code as number 47	Agree
50.	Mechanical Alteration 3 – Ethical	Same code as number 47	Agree
51.	Proofreader Endorsement 1	Void	Disagree
52.	Mechanical Alteration 9 – Ethical	Same code as number 47	Agree
53.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading	Void	Disagree
54.	Mechanical Alteration 9 – Ethical	Same code as number 47	Agree
55.	Information 1 – Ethical	Information – Ethical	Agree

56.	Information 2 – Ethical	Same code as number 55	Agree
57.	Information 2 - Learning	Information – Learning	Agree
58.	Information 4 – Ethical	Same code as number 55	Agree
59.	Overall	Void	Disagree
60.	Overall	Overall	Agree
61.	Overall	Same code as number 60	Agree
62.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Correction vs comments issue	Disagree
63.	Overall	Same code as number 60	Agree
64.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Void	Disagree
65.	Non-Intervention	Non-Intervention	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
66.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
67.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
68.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
69.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
70.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
71.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
72.	Non-Intervention	Same code as number 65	Agree
73.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Agree
74.	Lecturers' Views of Proofreading Practices	Same code as number 73	Agree
75.	Proofreader Training	Proofreader Training	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)
76.	University Proofreading Guidelines and Practices - Lecturers	University Proofreading Guidelines and Practices - Lecturers	Agree (My supervisor applied this code to a longer stretch of the transcript)

Table 2 Student, Proofreader, and Lecturer Qualitative Codebooks (7th October 2021)

Student Qualitative Interview Codebook

N.B. The intervention descriptors below make reference to my own piloting, Harwood (2018), and Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) with additional reference made to Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Rebuck (2014), and Cottier (2017). As such, please see subsection 3.3.1, Figure 5 of the methodology which details each intervention descriptor and its source.

Furthermore, other descriptors noted below were based on my interview questions in which reference was made to the research of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009 and 2012), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and Harwood (2018). Therefore, please see subsections 3.3.3.1 to 3.3.3.3 of the methodology which details interview questions adapted from the aforementioned sources.

Name	Description
Accept/Decline Interventions	The student's decision to accept or decline proofreader interventions
Experience	The student's experience of consulting a proofreader in regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the rapport between the student and the proofreader; 2) the student's opinion of the proofreader's help; and 3) useful techniques that the proofreader suggested.
Proofreader Profile	The profile of the student's proofreader in regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) being a professional or non-professional proofreader; 2) how the student and proofreader met; and 3) why the student chose the proofreader.
Readability/Accessibility	The student's views regarding the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader ensuring that a text is appropriate for its target audience.
Students and Proofreading Practices	Students views on proofreading practices in regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) how students view the role of a proofreader and what they expect. This can include but is not limited to the student's views regarding the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader providing error correction such as grammar issues in general and mistakes, help with the flow of a text, and linking ideas more clearly; 2) whether students should always be allowed to consult a proofreader; and 3) the ethical appropriacy of proofreading practices as a whole.
University Proofreading Guidelines and Practices	Whether the student was aware of information from the university concerning proofreading guidelines/practices, and if the university had provided any information concerning proofreading guidelines/practices.
Proofreading Advice	Advice that the participant could provide the university in regard to proofreading practices. This also includes thoughts and suggestions regarding in-house and external proofreading services.

Name	Description
Writing Skills	<p>Whether a proofreader can improve a student’s writing skills. This includes areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) helping a student improve their own proofreading skills; 2) spelling; 3) punctuation; 4) vocabulary; 5) word structure or morphology; 6) word order; 7) sentence structure; 8) paragraph structure; 9) organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs; 10) academic register; 11) content; 12) line of argumentation; 13) formatting and presentation of text; 14) referencing; and/or 15) other.
Addition – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader adding words. This refers to words, phrases or sentences being added that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words). <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Deletion – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader deleting words. This refers to words, phrases, or sentences being deleted that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words). <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Substitution – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader substituting words. This refers to the replacement of 1 to 5 consecutive words OR the replacement of the writer’s text by 1 to 5 new consecutive words by the proofreader and encompasses interventions in the areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) verb tense; 2) form; 3) preposition; 4) number error; 5) agreement; 6) the replacement of an informal form with its formal version; 7) a new word(s) entirely; 8) American English to British English spelling; and/or

Name	Description
	<p>9) miscellaneous. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Reordering – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader reordering a sentence. This includes repositioning words, phrases, or sentences. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Structural Editing – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) reordering paragraphs; 2) reordering sections or larger units; 3) inserting or changing paragraph breaks; 4) inserting or creating textual guideposts; and/or 5) moving text to another chapter. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Rewriting – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader rewriting the text by replacing 6 or more consecutive words of the text with new words OR replacing words from the text with 6 or more consecutive new words and such interventions can be meso (6 to 9 words) or major (10 plus words). <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Recombining – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader combining one or more sentences, or dividing one sentence into two or more sentences. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Mechanical Alteration – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions. This encompasses interventions in areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) punctuation; 2) spelling including typos; 3) capitalisation; 4) abbreviations, acronyms, and ampersands; 5) font size and font types; 6) text layout and appearance (this includes the removal of double spaces and the formatting of single spaces); 7) headings; 8) correlating parts of the text; 9) citations and references; and/or 10) miscellaneous. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Meaning and Content – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making interventions with the meaning and content. This refers to the proofreader:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) correcting words that have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning; 2) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary;

Name	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) rewriting sections to improve content; 4) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content; 5) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author; and/or 6) alerting the author to text which could be judgemental. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Information – Ethical	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader giving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) advice to add more information (n.b. this differs from that of ‘addition – ethical’ as it means to add more information in general rather than specific words. This means that the word count would be unknown in the case of information); 2) advice to add more information and a suggestion was provided; 3) advice to add information to support a claim; and/or 4) advice that more information is needed to provide greater clarity. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to comment section only remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Feedback	<p>Feedback in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) whether the student believes that the feedback provided by a proofreader is helpful at each stage of the writing process or only at the end; and/or 2) whether the student does/does not have a meeting with the proofreader post-proofreading feedback, and if this is/could be helpful.
Fluency	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay in regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the flow of the essay; and/or 2) linking ideas more clearly.

Proofreader Qualitative Interview Codebook

N.B. The intervention descriptors below make reference to my own piloting, Harwood (2018) and Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) with additional reference made to Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Rebuck (2014), and Cottier (2017). As such, please see subsection 3.3.1, Figure 5 of the methodology which details each intervention descriptor and its source.

Furthermore, other descriptors noted below were based on my interview questions in which reference was made to the research of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009 and 2012), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and Harwood (2018). Therefore, please see subsections 3.3.3.1 to 3.3.3.3 of the methodology which details interview questions adapted from the aforementioned sources.

Name	Description
Lecturer Communication	The communication that the proofreader has with their student's lecturer.
Proofreader Profile	The proofreader's background. This encompasses: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) how they see their role; 2) the number of texts they read per month; 3) the reasons for proofreading a text; and 4) the types of text that the proofreader reads.
Proofreader Role	The proofreader's perception of their role in regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the interventions that they did or did not make, and/or 2) what the proofreader perceives or expects to undertake as part of proofreading.
Proofreader's Company	This refers to a proofreading company that the proofreader works for in regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) why they chose the company; 2) whether training is provided and if so, what does it entail; 3) whether proofreading guidelines are provided when proofreading university student texts; and 4) whether the information provided distinguishes between proofreading for a native and non-native English speaker.
Student Communication	The communication that the proofreader has with their student.
Student Requests	The requests that the proofreader receives from students.
University Proofreading Guidelines and Practices	Whether the proofreader was aware of information from the university concerning proofreading practices.
Proofreading Advice	Advice that the participant could provide the university in regard to proofreading practices. This also includes thoughts and suggestions regarding in-house and external proofreading services.
Writing Skills	Whether a proofreader can improve a student's writing skills. This includes areas of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) helping a student improve their own proofreading skills; 2) spelling;

Name	Description
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) punctuation; 4) vocabulary; 5) word structure or morphology; 6) word order; 7) sentence structure; 8) paragraph structure; 9) organisation of ideas between sentences and paragraphs; 10) academic register; 11) content; 12) line of argumentation; 13) formatting and presentation of text; 14) referencing; and/or 15) other.
Addition – Reason/Ethical	<p>The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of addition, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader adding words. This refers to words, phrases or sentences being added that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words). This also includes the proofreader improving the fluency of the essay in regard to text flow and cohesion.</p> <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Deletion – Reason/Ethical	<p>The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of deletion, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader deleting words. This refers to words, phrases or sentences being deleted that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words).</p> <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Substitution – Reason/Ethical	<p>The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of substitution, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader substituting words. This refers to the replacement of 1 to 5 consecutive words OR the replacement of the writer’s text by 1 to 5 new consecutive words by the proofreader and encompasses interventions in the areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) verb tense; 2) form; 3) preposition; 4) number error; 5) agreement; 6) the replacement of an informal form with its formal version; 7) a new word(s) entirely;

Name	Description
	8) American English to British English spelling; and/or 9) miscellaneous. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Reordering – Reason/Ethical	The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of reordering, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader reordering a sentence. This includes repositioning words, phrases, or sentences. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Structural Editing – Reason/Ethical	The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of structural editing, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader: 1) reordering paragraphs; 2) reordering sections or larger units; 3) inserting or changing paragraph breaks; 4) inserting or creating textual guideposts; and/or 5) moving text to another chapter. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Rewriting – Reason/Ethical	The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of rewriting, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader rewriting the text by replacing 6 or more consecutive words of the text with new words OR replacing words from the text with 6 or more consecutive new words and such interventions can be meso (6 to 9 words) or major (10 plus words). <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Recombining – Reason/Ethical	The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of recombining, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader combining one or more sentences, or dividing one sentence into two or more sentences. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Mechanical Alteration – Reason/Ethical	The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of mechanical alteration, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions. This encompasses interventions in areas of: 1) punctuation; 2) spelling including typos; 3) capitalisation; 4) abbreviations, acronyms, and ampersands; 5) font size and font types; 6) text layout and appearance (this includes the removal of double spaces and the formatting of single spaces) 7) headings

Name	Description
Meaning and Content – Reason/Ethical	<p>8) correlating parts of the text; 9) citations and references; and/or 10) miscellaneous.</p> <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p> <p>The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of meaning and content, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making interventions with the meaning and content. This refers to the proofreader:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) correcting words that have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning; 2) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary; 3) rewriting sections to improve content; 4) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content; 5) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author; and/or 6) alerting the author to text which could be judgemental. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Information – Reason/Ethical	<p>The reason for the proofreader’s intervention if a change was made in the area of information, and the ethical appropriacy of the proofreader giving:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) advice to add more information (n.b. this differs from that of ‘addition – ethical’ as it means to add more information in general rather than specific words. This means that the word count would be unknown in the case of information); 2) advice to add more information and a suggestion was provided; 3) advice to add information to support a claim; and/or 4) advice that more information is needed to provide greater clarity. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to comment section only remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Feedback	<p>Feedback in regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) whether the proofreader believes that the feedback is helpful at each stage of the writing process or only at the end; and/or 2) whether the proofreader does/does not have a meeting with the student post-proofreading feedback, and if this is/could be helpful.
Fluency	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay in regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the flow of the essay; and/or 2) linking ideas more clearly.

Lecturer Qualitative Interview Codebook

Please note that this table includes codes of 1) the ethical appropriacy of specific forms of intervention e.g. ‘Addition – Ethical;’ and 2) whether a specific form of intervention helps a student learn e.g. ‘Addition – Learning’. If the lecturer refers to the ethical appropriacy of proofreading **in general**, please refer to the code concerning ‘Benefits of Proofreading’. Similarly, if the lecturer refers to proofreading helping the student learn **in general**, please refer to the code concerning ‘Lecturers’ Views of Proofreading Practices’.

N.B. The intervention descriptors below make reference to my own piloting, Harwood (2018) and Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010) with additional reference made to Willey and Tanimoto (2012), Rebuck (2014), and Cottier (2017). As such, please see subsection 3.3.1, Figure 5 of the methodology which details each intervention descriptor and its source.

Furthermore, other descriptors noted below were based on my interview questions in which reference was made to the research of Harwood, Austin and Macaulay (2009 and 2012), Kruger and Bevan-Dye (2010), and Harwood (2018). Therefore, please see subsections 3.3.3.1 to 3.3.3.3 of the methodology which details interview questions adapted from the aforementioned sources.

Name	Description
Lecturers’ Views of Proofreading Practices	The lecturer’s views regarding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the ethical appropriacy of proofreading practices in general. N.B. If the lecturer refers to the ethical appropriacy of specific forms of intervention please refer to the relevant code e.g. if the lecturer comments on the ethical appropriacy of addition, this would be classified as Addition – Ethical. 2) students consultation of professional or non-professional proofreading services; 3) whether students should always be allowed to consult a proofreader; and/or 4) whether the lecturer advises their students to have their work proofread.
Fairness	The lecturer’s view concerning the fairness of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) some students being able to afford a proofreader whereas others not having such opportunities; and/or 2) some students having friends, family members, acquaintances who are able to offer proofreading help.
Proofreader Role	The lecturer’s view of a proofreader’s role insofar as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) what the lecturer perceives or expects a proofreader should or should not to do to a student’s work; and/or 2) the proofreading help that <i>could</i> be provided to second language writers of English.
Benefits of Proofreading	The benefits of proofreading insofar as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) whether the lecturer believes that the feedback provided by a proofreader is helpful at each stage of the writing process or only at the end; 2) the extent to which the lecturer believes that students benefit from having meetings with their proofreader either during the writing process or post-proofreading; and/or 3) the extent to which student can learn in general. N.B. Please refer to the appropriate code for specific

Name	Description
	instances of learning e.g. if the lecturer comments on addition in regard to the proofreader's intervention helping the student learn, this would be classified as Addition – Learning.
Number and Frequency of Interventions.	The ethical appropriacy of: 1) the number of proofreader interventions made to either a number of pages of the text or the entire piece of work; and/or 2) the frequency in which the proofreader corrects or comments on the same type of error.
Non-Intervention	The lecturer's views of parts of the text where the proofreader does not intervene. This can include: 1) the proofreader made a deliberate choice not to intervene; 2) the proofreader may not have intervened because a change/suggestion was not needed or it could be unethical for the proofreader to make an in-text change/comment; and/or 3) the proofreader may not have noticed errors or issues.
Proofreader Communication	Whether the lecturer communicates with a student's proofreader.
Proofreading Training	Whether the university had provided the lecturer with training or directives regarding proofreading practices.
University Proofreading Guidelines and Practices	Whether the lecturer was aware of information from the university concerning proofreading guidelines/practices.
Proofreading Advice	Advice that the lecturer could provide the university in regard to proofreading practices. This also includes thoughts and suggestions regarding in-house and external proofreading services.
Addition – Ethical Addition – Learning	The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader adding words. This refers to words, phrases or sentences being added that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words). This code also includes: 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader's interventions in regard to addition; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to addition. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>
Deletion – Ethical Deletion – Learning	The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader deleting words. This refers to words, phrases or sentences being deleted that can be minor (1 to 5 words), meso (6 to 9 words), or major (10 plus words). This code also includes: 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader's interventions in regard to deletion; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to deletion. <i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i>

Name	Description
Substitution – Ethical Substitution – Learning	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader substituting words. This refers to the replacement of 1 to 5 consecutive words OR the replacement of the writer’s text by 1 to 5 new consecutive words by the proofreader and encompasses interventions in the areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) verb tense; 2) form; 3) preposition; 4) number error; 5) agreement; 6) the replacement of an informal form with its formal version; 7) a new word(s) entirely; 8) American English to British English spelling; and/or 9) miscellaneous. <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to substitution; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to substitution. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Reordering – Ethical Reordering – Learning	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader reordering a sentence. This includes repositioning words, phrases, or sentences.</p> <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to reordering; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to reordering. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
Structural Editing – Ethical Structural Editing – Learning	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) reordering paragraphs; 2) reordering sections or larger units; 3) inserting or changing paragraph breaks; 4) inserting or creating textual guideposts; and/or 5) moving text to another chapter.

Name	Description
	<p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to structural editing; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to structural editing. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
<p>Rewriting – Ethical Rewriting – Learning</p>	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader rewriting the text by replacing 6 or more consecutive words of the text with new words OR replacing words from the text with 6 or more consecutive new words and such interventions can be meso (6 to 9 words) or major (10 plus words).</p> <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to rewriting; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to rewriting. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
<p>Recombining – Ethical Recombining – Learning</p>	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader combining one or more sentences, or dividing one sentence into two or more sentences.</p> <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to recombining; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to recombining. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
<p>Mechanical Alteration – Ethical Mechanical Alteration – Learning</p>	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making mechanical alteration interventions. This encompasses interventions in areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) punctuation; 2) spelling including typos; 3) capitalisation; 4) abbreviations, acronyms, and ampersands; 5) font size and font types; 6) text layout and appearance (this includes the removal of double spaces and the formatting of single spaces) 7) headings 8) correlating parts of the text;

Name	Description
	<p>9) citations and references; and/or 10) miscellaneous.</p> <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to mechanical alteration; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to mechanical alteration. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
<p>Meaning and Content – Ethical Meaning and Content – Learning</p>	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader making interventions with the meaning and content. This refers to the proofreader:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) correcting words that have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning; 2) writing additional or supplementary material if necessary; 3) rewriting sections to improve content; 4) deleting irrelevant or unnecessary content; 5) checking for plagiarism and alerting the author; and/or 6) alerting the author to text which could be judgemental. <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to meaning and content; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to meaning and content. <p><i>N.B. This code applies to in-text actual changes and comment section remarks where no change is made.</i></p>
<p>Information – Ethical Information – Learning</p>	<p>The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader giving:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) advice to add more information (N.B. this differs from that of ‘addition – ethical’ as it means to add more information in general rather than specific words. This means that the word count would be unknown in the case of information); 2) advice to add more information and a suggestion was provided; 3) advice to add information to support a claim; and/or 4) advice that more information is needed to provide greater clarity. <p>This code also includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the extent to which the lecturer believes that a proofreader can help a student improve their writing skills and/or learn from the proofreader’s interventions in regard to information; and 2) the distinction between a proofreader leaving comments and making in-text corrections in regard to

Name	Description
Fluency	information. <i>N.B. This code applies to comment section only remarks where no change is made.</i> The ethical appropriacy of the proofreader improving the fluency of an essay in regard to: 1) the flow of the essay; and/or 2) linking ideas more clearly.

Appendix C – Research Ethics Documentation

Figure 1 Research Ethics Board Approval Letter



Downloaded: 03/07/2020
Approved: 03/02/2020

Fiona Richards
Registration number: 190221973
School of English
Programme: Standard PhD in Department of English Language and Linguistics

Dear Fiona

PROJECT TITLE: An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders and lecturers
APPLICATION: Reference Number 031959

On behalf of the University ethics reviewers who reviewed your project, I am pleased to inform you that on 03/02/2020 the above-named project was **approved** on ethics grounds, on the basis that you will adhere to the following documentation that you submitted for ethics review:

- University research ethics application form 031959 (form submission date: 02/02/2020); (expected project end date: 01/10/2023).
- Participant information sheet 1073343 version 5 (02/02/2020).
- Participant information sheet 1073344 version 5 (02/02/2020).
- Participant information sheet 1073345 version 5 (02/02/2020).
- Participant consent form 1073346 version 6 (02/02/2020).
- Participant consent form 1073347 version 6 (02/02/2020).
- Participant consent form 1073348 version 6 (02/02/2020).

If during the course of the project you need to [deviate significantly from the above-approved documentation](#) please inform me since written approval will be required.

Your responsibilities in delivering this research project are set out at the end of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Emma Bradley
Ethics Administrator
School of English

Please note the following responsibilities of the researcher in delivering the research project:

- The project must abide by the University's Research Ethics Policy: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/rs/ethicsandintegrity/ethicspolicy/approval-procedure>
- The project must abide by the University's Good Research & Innovation Practices Policy: https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.671066!/file/GRIPPolicy.pdf
- The researcher must inform their supervisor (in the case of a student) or Ethics Administrator (in the case of a member of staff) of any significant changes to the project or the approved documentation.
- The researcher must comply with the requirements of the law and relevant guidelines relating to security and confidentiality of personal data.
- The researcher is responsible for effectively managing the data collected both during and after the end of the project in line with best practice, and any relevant legislative, regulatory or contractual requirements.

Figure 2 Student Participant Information Sheet

1. Research Project Title:

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

2. Invitation

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide whether or not to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask myself, Fiona Richards, the principal investigator, or my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood, if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

3. What is the project's purpose?

I am completing this research as part of my PhD in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). The purpose of my project is to assess the ethical perspectives of students who speak English as a second language, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. My study will determine how students, proofreaders and lecturers interpret ethical issues surrounding proofreading practices. At present, many British universities do not have proofreading guidelines and those that do provide little information for students, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to what is and is not ethically appropriate in terms of proofreading intervention (changes). Therefore, my findings will be used to: 1) investigate the ethical reasoning behind proofreading practices from the perspective of students, proofreaders and lecturers through semi-structured interviews; 2) raise student, proofreader and lecturer awareness at the University of Sheffield of proofreading practices by examining the types and amount of interventions that proofreaders make to student texts as well as conducting semi-structured interviews with all stakeholders that assess their perspectives of ethically appropriate interventions; 3) develop recommendations for university proofreading guidelines that consider the perspectives of each stakeholder, these guidelines being informed through stakeholders' responses in semi-structured interviews; and 4) determine how universities can better address the pedagogical needs of future students who speak English as a second language, achieved through semi-structured interviews at each stage of the writing process to assess the extent to which students and lecturers feel that writing skills have improved.

4. Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are a student who speaks English as a second language and who consults a proofreader about your work. Your proofreader can be known to you in an informal or formal capacity. As such, the proofreader can be a friend, family member, peer, or professional proofreader. Please note that employees of the University of Sheffield's XXX (University's Writing Centre) (WAS) cannot be included in my research as the WAS stipulates on its webpage <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/eltc/languagesupport/writingadvisory/index> that they are not a proofreading service. Before participating in my research, please try to obtain your proofreader's consent to send me your proofread work; your proofreader will remain anonymous throughout the research and lecturer participants or those involved in the marking process will not be made aware of your proofreader's identity. Furthermore, please could you ask your proofreader if they would like to be involved in my research as I will analyse my data using a case study approach in which each case is formed of the student and proofreader. For your information, approximately eleven other students will be involved in my research as well as twelve proofreaders and lecturers. I would also like to advise you that the term 'lecturer' also encompasses those involved in a supervisory role as will be the case for doctoral students involved in my research. Indeed, 'lecturer' is a broad term that I have chosen to include academics of all levels i.e. lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, and professor.

5. Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep (and be asked to sign a consent form) and you can still withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. You do not have to give a reason and this will not impact your grades. If you wish to withdraw from the research, please contact me or Professor Nigel Harwood. Please note that once the data has been anonymised, pseudonymised and included within my dataset, whilst you can withdraw from any on-going or future data collection, your data cannot be removed from the research project beyond (.....) *Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.*

6. What will happen to me if I take part? What do I have to do?

I will conduct my pilot and data collection process with you from November 2020 to the end of September 2021. However, participants are invited to join my research at any stage between the aforementioned dates and as such this information sheet is applicable to all students regardless of when they choose to commence participation in my study.

In order to conduct my research, I will need to analyse the pre and post proofread writing drafts of your work for assessment. I will then email you a pre-interview task and later conduct a semi-structured interview with you. As such, I will need you to provide me with your pre and post proofread work at each stage of the proofreading process so that I can undertake my textual analysis. The textual analysis involves looking at the interventions that your proofreader does or does not make to the written work you produce at each stage of the writing process from your first initial draft through to the work you submit for assessment.

After each analysis of your text, I will email you a short pre-interview task which is divided into parts A and B. For part A, I will ask you five short questions about your proofreader. For part B, I will select a number of changes that were made to your proofread text and ask you to comment on whether you think the changes are ethically appropriate or not and why. There will be approximately ten categories in total for part B and the answers do not need to be lengthy as you will only be asked to comment on whether you think the changes made to your text are ethically appropriate or not and why. You will then be asked to return your answers via email so that I can analyse them before conducting a recorded, semi-structured interview with you.

In the semi-structured interviews, I will firstly ask you questions about your proofreader, which are additional to those of the pre-interview task, and whether you feel their feedback helps improve your writing skills. Secondly, I will ask you to discuss the ethical appropriacy of changes that the proofreader did and did not make to your text based on the pre-interview task. For the third part of the interview, I will ask you about proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. The questions will be mainly open and in depth in style but could also include closed questions that are briefer in nature. After each interview, I will record interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data. This will be logged in the form of diary or memo entries which will be for my use only but form an important part of my research. The number of textual analyses, pre-interview tasks and semi-structured interviews will depend on how frequently you submit work to your proofreader throughout the writing process.

As well as conducting interviews with you, I will also interview your proofreader and a *different* lecturer. This means that your lecturer will not see your pre or post proofread work at any time. Instead a different lecturer will be shown the changes made to your text during their interview. This has been done to protect your identity as well as that of your proofreader. Furthermore, any work that is presented to the different lecturer will not show your name nor that of your proofreader.

Additional to the above, I will also request that you forward me email communications between you and your proofreader throughout the entire writing and proofreading process so that I can see what types of proofreading requests you make and those which are accepted or rejected by your proofreader. All

such forms of correspondence will remain completely anonymous in my findings and will not be forwarded or communicated in any shape or form to a third party. However, forwarding the researcher email communication is optional and if you do not agree to this part of the study, it will have no adverse effects on your participation. Furthermore, if you initially agree to participate in this part of the study, you are free to opt out at any time and this will also have no negative impact on your participation.

Please note that the semi-structured interviews will be conducted via Google Meet and I will request your permission to record the interview either by video or audio only. Each interview will last approximately one hour. All interviews will be conducted in a professional manner and there are no foreseeable lifestyle restrictions that will occur as a result of participating in my research. All of the interviews will be transcribed using transcription software and you will be allowed to view your own transcripts upon request. Your interview transcripts will not be made available to any of the other participants. Furthermore, if you have any concerns that arise post interview or indeed at any other stage of the process, please email me and we will arrange to speak via Google Meet. In order to distinguish between the students, proofreaders and lecturers when presenting the findings of my research, pseudonyms will be used. If you wish to choose the pseudonym, please advise me once you have agreed to participate in the research.

7. What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

As previously stated, the purpose of my research is to investigate ethical perspectives from stakeholders into proofreading practices. This is due to the fact that very little research has been undertaken on the interventions that proofreaders make to students' work for assessment. Therefore, the main focus of my research is on *proofreading interventions* in order to determine how universities can help students improve their academic writing skills through ethically acceptable forms of proofreading help. **However, I must advise you that if I suspect or detect plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader writes the entire text for the student), I am morally bound to report such behaviour.** Notwithstanding the aforementioned, I would like to reiterate that the focus of my research is *proofreading* and I do not anticipate that the students or proofreaders in my research would engage in plagiarism or ghostwriting. Any other unexpected discomforts, disadvantages and risks which may arise during the research will be brought immediately to your attention.

8. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for those people participating in the project, it is hoped that this work will develop university awareness and policies that uphold academic integrity, inform proofreading guidelines to reflect students', proofreaders' and lecturers' perspectives and further uphold academic integrity, and further develop students' academic writing skills through ethically appropriate forms of proofreading intervention.

9. Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?

All the information that we collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential and will only be accessible to members of the research team. You will not be able to be identified in any reports or publications unless you have given your explicit consent for this. If you agree to us sharing the information you provide with other researchers (e.g. by making it available in a data archive) then your personal details will not be included unless you explicitly request this. Furthermore, in order to retain participants' anonymity, every effort will be made to recruit both students and proofreaders from large classes.

10. What is the legal basis for processing my personal data?

According to data protection legislation, we are required to inform you that the legal basis we are applying in order to process your personal data is that 'processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest' (Article 6(1)(e)). Further information can be found in the University's Privacy Notice <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general>.

11. What will happen to the data collected, and the results of the research project?

The data collected will be stored on my University of Sheffield's UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. My supervisor and I will have access to the data throughout the research project. When reporting my data in my research, all data will be anonymised or pseudonymised. I will not collaborate with any other researchers or partner organisation, however, I will use ELAN software to assist in transcribing the semi-structured interviews. ELAN is an annotation tool for audio and video recordings which has been chosen for its sophistication in allowing me to differentiate and segment the voice recordings of each speaker in the semi-structured interviews. This will allow me to transcribe each speaker effectively and efficiently. In regard to protecting your identity, ELAN is available through the University of Sheffield's IT services <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/it-services/desktop/applications> and from communication with the university's IT department, I have been advised that the software will have undergone testing before being added to the available applications list. Furthermore, ELAN is not an internet-based tool so your data will initially only be stored on my computer. Further information about ELAN can be found through its webpage <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan> Once I have transcribed the interview recording using ELAN, I will save all related files and data, using your pseudonym, to my University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. As soon as the data has been saved on the aforementioned devices, it will be deleted from my computer.

Any identifiable personal data such as the key which links you to the data you provided will be destroyed as soon as possible and once it is clear that this will not affect my research purposes. This will be determined by the end of September 2021 when I will have collected all my data. As I plan to publish my research, all other forms of anonymised and pseudonymised data will be destroyed three years after publication and I will advise you where you can obtain a copy of the published results in due course. You will not be identified in any report or publication. Due to the nature of this research it is very likely that other researchers may find the data collected to be useful in answering future research questions. We will ask for your explicit consent for your data to be shared in this way.

12. Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being self-funded by myself, Fiona Richards, as a PhD student at the University of Sheffield.

13. Who is the Data Controller?

The University of Sheffield will act as the Data Controller for this study. This means that the University is responsible for looking after your information and using it properly.

14. Who has ethically reviewed the project?

This project has been ethically approved via the University of Sheffield's Ethics Review Procedure, as administered by the Department of English Language and Linguistics.

15. What if something goes wrong and I wish to complain about the research?

If you have any complaints during the research process, please contact my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood. Should you feel that your complaint has not been handled to your satisfaction by me or Professor Nigel Harwood, please contact Dr Kook-Hee Gil who is the PhD Director for the Department of English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature. Dr. Kook-Hee Gil will then escalate the complaint through the appropriate channels. If the complaint relates to how your personal data has been handled, information about how to raise a complaint can be found in the University's Privacy Notice: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general> ; the Data Protection Officer is Anne Cutler. When making your complaint please specify if it is regarding your treatment by myself, Fiona Richards, or if it is something serious that occurs during or following your participation in the project.

16. Will I be recorded, and how will the recorded media be used?

The audio recordings (not the video recordings) and transcripts of the semi-structured interviews made during this research will be used only for analysis and for illustration in conference presentations and lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

17. Contact for further information

Should you wish to obtain further information about the project, please contact:

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood – Primary Supervisor
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Please note that you will be given a copy of the information sheet and an accompanying signed consent form to keep.

Thank you very much for taking part in my project

Figure 3 Proofreader Participant Information Sheet

1. Research Project Title:

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

2. Invitation

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide whether or not to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask myself, Fiona Richards, the principal investigator, or my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood, if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

3. What is the project's purpose?

I am completing this research as part of my PhD in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). The purpose of my project is to assess the ethical perspectives of students who speak English as a second language, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. My study will determine how students, proofreaders and lecturers interpret ethical issues surrounding proofreading practices. At present, many British universities do not have proofreading guidelines and those that do provide little information for students, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to what is and is not ethically appropriate in terms of proofreading intervention (changes). Therefore, my findings will be used to: 1) investigate the ethical reasoning behind proofreading practices from the perspective of students, proofreaders and lecturers through semi-structured interviews; 2) raise student, proofreader and lecturer awareness at the University of Sheffield of proofreading practices by examining the types and amount of interventions that proofreaders make to student texts as well as conducting semi-structured interviews with all stakeholders that assess their perspectives of ethically appropriate interventions; 3) develop recommendations for university proofreading guidelines that consider the perspectives of each stakeholder, these guidelines being informed through stakeholders' responses in semi-structured interviews; and 4) determine how universities can better address the pedagogical needs of future students who speak English as a second language, achieved through semi-structured interviews at each stage of the writing process to assess the extent to which students and lecturers feel that writing skills have improved.

4. Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are a proofreader for a student who speaks English as a second language. Proofreaders can be known to the student in an informal or formal capacity. As such, the proofreader can be a friend, family member, peer, or professional proofreader. Please note that employees of the University of Sheffield's XXX (University's Writing Centre) (WAS) cannot be included in my research as the WAS stipulates on its webpage <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/eltc/languagesupport/writingadvisory/index> that they are not a proofreading service. Before participating in my research, please try to obtain your student's consent to send me your proofread work; your student will remain anonymous throughout the research and lecturer participants or those involved in the marking process will not be made aware of your student's identity. Furthermore, please could you ask your student if they would like to be involved in my research as I will analyse my data using a case study approach in which each case is formed of the student and proofreader. For your information, approximately eleven other proofreaders will be involved in my research as well as twelve students and lecturers. I would also like to advise you that the term 'lecturer' also encompasses those involved in a supervisory role as will be the case for doctoral students involved in my research. Indeed, 'lecturer' is a broad term that I have chosen to include academics of all levels i.e., lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, and professor.

5. Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep (and be asked to sign a consent form) and you can still withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. You do not have to give a reason and this will not impact you in any way. If you wish to withdraw from the research, please contact me or Professor Nigel Harwood. Please note that once the data has been anonymised, pseudonymised and included within my dataset, whilst you can withdraw from any on-going or future data collection, your data cannot be removed from the research project beyond (.....) *Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.*

6. What will happen to me if I take part? What do I have to do?

I will conduct my pilot and data collection process from November 2020 to the end of September 2021. However, participants are invited to join my research at any stage between the aforementioned dates and as such this information sheet is applicable to all proofreaders regardless of when they choose to commence participation in my study.

In order to conduct my research, I will need you to provide me with the student's pre and post proofread work for assessment at each stage of the proofreading process so that I can begin my textual analysis. The textual analysis involves looking at the interventions that you do or do not make to the student's written work which is produced at each stage of the writing process from the student's first initial draft through to the work submitted for assessment. Once I have completed my textual analysis, I will then conduct recorded semi-structured interviews with you.

In the semi-structured interviews, I will firstly ask you questions regarding your proofreading background. Secondly, I will ask you about specific changes that you did or did not make to the student's text as well as other possible changes that could be made. Thirdly, I will ask you questions about the type of proofreading requests that your current and previous students have asked you to make. Fourthly, I will ask you to discuss your communication with the student's lecturer or supervisor. Finally, I will ask you questions regarding proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. The questions will be mainly open and in depth in style but could also include closed questions that are briefer in nature. After each semi-structured interview, I will record interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data recorded. This will be logged in the form of diary or memo entries which will be for my use only but form an important part of my research. The number of textual analyses and semi-structured interviews will depend on how frequently your student submits work to you throughout the writing process.

As well as conducting interviews with you, I will also interview your student and a *different* lecturer. This means that the student's lecturer will not see the work that you proofread at any time. Instead, a different lecturer will be shown the changes made to the student's text during their interview. This has been done to protect your identity as well as that of your student. Furthermore, any work that is presented to the different lecturer will not show your name nor that of your student.

Additional to the above, I will also request that you forward me email communications between you and your student throughout the entire writing and proofreading process so that I can see what types of proofreading requests the student makes and those which you accept or reject. All such forms of correspondence will remain completely anonymous in my findings and will not be forwarded or communicated in any shape or form to a third party. However, forwarding the researcher email communication is optional and if you do not agree to this part of the study, it will have no adverse effects on your participation. Furthermore, if you initially agree to participate in this part of the study, you are free to opt out at any time and this will also have no negative impact on your participation.

Please note that the semi-structured interviews will be conducted via Google Meet and I will request your permission to record the interview either by video or audio only. Each interview will last approximately one hour. All interviews will be conducted in a professional manner and there are no

foreseeable lifestyle restrictions that will occur as a result of participating in my research. As mentioned above, all of the interviews will be transcribed using transcription software and you will be allowed to view your own transcripts upon request. Your interview transcripts will not be made available to any of the other participants. Furthermore, if you have any concerns that arise post interview or indeed at any other stage of the process, please email me and we will arrange to speak via Google Meet. In order to distinguish between the students, proofreaders and lecturers when presenting the findings of my research, pseudonyms will be used. If you wish to choose the pseudonym, please advise me once you have agreed to participate in the research.

7. What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

As previously stated, the purpose of my research is to investigate ethical perspectives from stakeholders into proofreading practices. This is due to the fact that very little research has been undertaken on the interventions that proofreaders make to students work for assessment. Therefore, the main focus of my research is on *proofreading interventions* in order to determine how universities can help students improve their academic writing skills through ethically acceptable forms of proofreading help. **However, I must advise you that if I suspect or detect plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader writes the entire text for the student), I am morally bound to report such behaviour.** Notwithstanding the aforementioned, I would like to reiterate that the focus of my research is *proofreading* and I do not anticipate that the students or proofreaders in my research would engage in plagiarism or ghostwriting. Any other unexpected discomforts, disadvantages and risks which may arise during the research will be brought immediately to your attention.

8. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for those people participating in the project, it is hoped that this work will develop university awareness and policies that uphold academic integrity, inform proofreading guidelines to reflect students', proofreaders' and lecturers' perspectives and further uphold academic integrity, and further develop students' academic writing skills through ethically appropriate forms of proofreading intervention.

9. Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?

All the information that we collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential and will only be accessible to members of the research team. You will not be able to be identified in any reports or publications unless you have given your explicit consent for this. If you agree to us sharing the information you provide with other researchers (e.g. by making it available in a data archive) then your personal details will not be included unless you explicitly request this. Furthermore, in order to retain participants' anonymity, every effort will be made to recruit both proofreaders and students from large classes.

10. What is the legal basis for processing my personal data?

According to data protection legislation, we are required to inform you that the legal basis we are applying in order to process your personal data is that 'processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest' (Article 6(1)(e)). Further information can be found in the University's Privacy Notice <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general>.

11. What will happen to the data collected, and the results of the research project?

The data collected will be stored on my University of Sheffield's UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. My supervisor and I will have access to the data throughout the research project. When reporting my data in my research, all data will either be anonymised or pseudonymised. I will not collaborate with any other researchers or partner organisation, however, I will use ELAN software to assist in transcribing the semi-structured interviews. ELAN is an annotation tool for audio and video recordings which has been chosen for its sophistication in allowing me to differentiate and segment the voice recordings of each speaker in the semi-structured interviews. This will allow me to transcribe each speaker effectively and efficiently. In regard to protecting your identity, ELAN is

available through the University of Sheffield's IT services <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/it-services/desktop/applications> and from communication with the university's IT department, I have been advised that the software will have undergone testing before being added to the available applications list. Furthermore, ELAN is not an internet-based tool so your data will initially only be stored on my computer. Further information about ELAN can be found through its webpage <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan> Once I have transcribed the interview recording using ELAN, I will save all related files and data, using your pseudonym, to my University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. As soon as the data has been saved on the aforementioned devices, it will be deleted from my computer.

Any identifiable personal data such as the key which links you to the data you provided will be destroyed as soon as possible and once it is clear that this will not affect my research purposes. This will be determined by the end of September 2021 when I will have collected all my data. As I plan to publish my research, all other forms of anonymised and pseudonymised data will be destroyed three years after publication and I will advise you where you can obtain a copy of the published results in due course. You will not be identified in any report or publication. Due to the nature of this research it is very likely that other researchers may find the data collected to be useful in answering future research questions. We will ask for your explicit consent for your data to be shared in this way.

12. Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being self-funded by myself, Fiona Richards, as a PhD student at the University of Sheffield.

13. Who is the Data Controller?

The University of Sheffield will act as the Data Controller for this study. This means that the University is responsible for looking after your information and using it properly.

14. Who has ethically reviewed the project?

This project has been ethically approved via the University of Sheffield's Ethics Review Procedure, as administered by the Department of English Language and Linguistics.

15. What if something goes wrong and I wish to complain about the research?

If you have any complaints during the research process, please contact my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood. Should you feel that your complaint has not been handled to your satisfaction by me or Professor Nigel Harwood, please contact Dr Kook-Hee Gil who is the PhD Director for the Department of English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature. Dr. Kook-Hee Gil will then escalate the complaint through the appropriate channels. If the complaint relates to how your personal data has been handled, information about how to raise a complaint can be found in the University's Privacy Notice: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general> ; the Data Protection Officer is Anne Cutler. When making your complaint please specify if it is regarding your treatment by myself, Fiona Richards or if it is something serious that occurs during or following your participation in the project.

16. Will I be recorded, and how will the recorded media be used?

The audio recordings (not the video recordings) and transcripts of the semi-structured interviews made during this research will be used only for analysis and for illustration in conference presentations and lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

17. Contact for further information

Should you wish to obtain further information about the project, please contact:

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of an L2 student, proofreader, and lecturers

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood – Primary Supervisor
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Please note that you will be given a copy of the information sheet and an accompanying signed consent form to keep.

Thank you very much for taking part in my project

Figure 4 Lecturer Participant Information Sheet

1. Research Project Title:

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

2. Invitation

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide whether or not to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask myself, Fiona Richards, the principal investigator, or my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood, if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

3. What is the project's purpose?

I am completing this research as part of my PhD in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). The purpose of my project is to assess the ethical perspectives of students who speak English as a second language, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. My study will determine how students, proofreaders and lecturers interpret ethical issues surrounding proofreading practices. At present, many British universities do not have proofreading guidelines and those that do provide little information for students, proofreaders and lecturers in regard to what is and is not ethically appropriate in terms of proofreading intervention (changes). Therefore, my findings will be used to: 1) investigate the ethical reasoning behind proofreading practices from the perspective of students, proofreaders and lecturers through semi-structured interviews; 2) raise student, proofreader and lecturer awareness at the University of Sheffield of proofreading practices by examining the types and amount of interventions that proofreaders make to student texts as well as conducting semi-structured interviews with all stakeholders that assess their perspectives of ethically appropriate interventions; 3) develop recommendations for university proofreading guidelines that consider the perspectives of each stakeholder, these guidelines being informed through stakeholders' responses in semi-structured interviews; and 4) determine how universities can better address the pedagogical needs of future students who speak English as a second language, achieved through semi-structured interviews at each stage of the writing process to assess the extent to which students and lecturers feel that writing skills have improved.

4. Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are a lecturer on a course that includes students who speak English as a second language. The term 'lecturer' also encompasses those involved in a supervisory role as will be the case for doctoral students involved in my research. Indeed, 'lecturer' is a broad term that I have chosen to include academics of all levels i.e. lecturer, senior lecturer, reader, and professor. For your information, proofreaders can be known to the students in an informal or formal capacity. As such, the proofreader can be a friend, family member, peer, or professional proofreader. Please note that employees of the University of Sheffield's XXX (University's Writing Centre) (WAS) will not be included in my research as the WAS stipulates on its webpage <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/eltc/languagesupport/writingadvisory/index> that they are not a proofreading service. Approximately eleven other lecturers will be involved in my research as well as twelve students and proofreaders.

5. Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep (and be asked to sign a consent form) and you can still withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. You do not have to give a reason and this will not impact you in any way. If you wish to withdraw from the research, please contact me or Professor Nigel Harwood. Please note that once the data has been anonymised, pseudonymised and included within my dataset,

whilst you can withdraw from any on-going or future data collection, your data cannot be removed from the research project beyond (.....) *Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.*

6. What will happen to me if I take part? What do I have to do?

I will conduct my pilot and data collection process from November 2020 to the end of September 2021. However, participants are invited to join my research at any stage between the aforementioned dates and as such this information sheet is applicable to all lecturers regardless of when they choose to commence participation in my study.

In order to do my research, I will ask the student and proofreader to provide me with the student's pre and post proofread work for assessment at each stage of the proofreading process so that I can begin my textual analysis. The textual analysis involves looking at the interventions that the proofreader does or does not make to the student's written work that is produced at each stage of the writing process from the student's first initial draft through to the work submitted for assessment. Once I have completed my textual analysis, I will then conduct recorded semi-structured interviews with you.

In the semi-structured interviews, for parts one and two, I will ask you questions based on changes that have and have not been made to a proofread student text, and whether you think the interventions are ethically appropriate or not. For part three, I will ask you to discuss your thoughts on students consulting proofreading services. For part four, I will ask you whether students who consult proofreaders show improvement in writing style, and for part five I will ask you about your awareness of proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield. The questions will be mainly open and in depth in style but could also include closed questions that are briefer in nature. After each interview, I will record interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data recorded. This will be logged in the form of diary or memo entries which will be for my use only but form an important part of my research. The number of semi-structured interviews will depend on how frequently the student submits work to their proofreader throughout the writing process.

As well as conducting interviews with you, I will also interview students and proofreaders. However, in order to protect the identity of both the aforementioned parties, I will firstly ask you to discuss during the interview the work of a student who is not one of your own. Secondly, as the proofreader will most likely be a coursemate of the student, I will ensure that they are also not one of your students. Furthermore, all work that I present to you during the interview will not display the student or proofreader's names.

Please note that the semi-structured interviews for both the pilot and data collection will be conducted via Google Meet and I will request your permission to record the interview either by video or audio only. Each interview will last approximately one hour. All interviews will be conducted in a professional manner and there are no foreseeable lifestyle restrictions that will occur as a result of participating in my research. All of the interviews will be transcribed using transcription software and you will be allowed to view your own transcripts upon request. Your interview transcripts will not be made available to any of the other participants. Furthermore, if you have any concerns that arise post interview or indeed at any other stage of the process, please email me and we will arrange to speak via Google Meet. In order to distinguish between the students, proofreaders and lecturers when presenting the findings of my research, pseudonyms will be used. If you wish to choose the pseudonym, please advise me once you have agreed to participate in the research.

7. What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

As far as lecturers are concerned, there are no foreseeable discomforts, disadvantages and risks to participating in my research. However, any unexpected discomforts, disadvantages and risks which may arise during the research will be brought immediately to your attention. Notwithstanding, I would like to make you aware of the fact that if I suspect or detect plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader

writes the entire text for the student), I will be morally bound to report such behaviour; the students and proofreaders will of course be made aware of this. However, as previously stated, the purpose of my research is to investigate ethical perspectives from stakeholders into proofreading practices. This is due to the fact that very little research has been undertaken on the interventions that proofreaders make to students work for assessment. Therefore, the main focus of my research is on *proofreading interventions* in order to determine how universities can help students improve their academic writing skills through ethically acceptable forms of proofreading help. As such, I do not anticipate that students or proofreaders in my research would engage in plagiarism or ghostwriting.

8. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for those people participating in the project, it is hoped that this work will develop university awareness and policies that uphold academic integrity, inform proofreading guidelines to reflect students', proofreaders' and lecturers' perspectives and further uphold academic integrity, and further develop students' academic writing skills through ethically appropriate forms of proofreading intervention.

9. Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?

All the information that we collect about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential and will only be accessible to members of the research team. You will not be able to be identified in any reports or publications unless you have given your explicit consent for this. If you agree to us sharing the information you provide with other researchers (e.g. by making it available in a data archive) then your personal details will not be included unless you explicitly request this. Furthermore, whilst the following does not directly affect you as a lecturer, I would like to advise you that in order to retain students' and proofreaders' anonymity, every effort will be made to recruit participants from large classes.

10. What is the legal basis for processing my personal data?

According to data protection legislation, we are required to inform you that the legal basis we are applying in order to process your personal data is that 'processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest' (Article 6(1)(e)). Further information can be found in the University's Privacy Notice <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general>.

11. What will happen to the data collected, and the results of the research project?

The data collected will be stored on my University of Sheffield's UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. My supervisor and I will have access to the data throughout the research project. When reporting my data in my research, all data will either be anonymised or pseudonymised. I will not collaborate with any other researchers or partner organisation, however, I will use ELAN software to assist in transcribing the semi-structured interviews. ELAN is an annotation tool for audio and video recordings which has been chosen for its sophistication in allowing me to differentiate and segment the voice recordings of each speaker in the semi-structured interviews. This will allow me to transcribe each speaker effectively and efficiently. In regard to protect your identity, ELAN is available through the University of Sheffield's IT services <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/it-services/desktop/applications> and from communication with the university's IT department, I have been advised that the software will have undergone testing before being added to the available applications list. Furthermore, ELAN is not an internet-based tool so your data will initially only be stored on my computer. Further information about ELAN can be found through its webpage <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan> Once I have transcribed the interview recording using ELAN, I will save all related files and data, using your pseudonym, to my University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive. As soon as the data has been saved on the aforementioned devices, it will be deleted from my computer.

Any identifiable personal data such as the key which links you to the data you provided will be destroyed as soon as possible and once it is clear that this will not affect my research purposes. This

will be determined by the end of September 2021 when I will have collected all my data. As I plan to publish my research, all other forms of anonymised and pseudonymised data will be destroyed three years after publication and I will advise you where you can obtain a copy of the published results in due course. You will not be identified in any report or publication. Due to the nature of this research it is very likely that other researchers may find the data collected to be useful in answering future research questions. We will ask for your explicit consent for your data to be shared in this way.

12. Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being self-funded by myself, Fiona Richards, as a PhD student at the University of Sheffield.

13. Who is the Data Controller?

The University of Sheffield will act as the Data Controller for this study. This means that the University is responsible for looking after your information and using it properly.

14. Who has ethically reviewed the project?

This project has been ethically approved via the University of Sheffield's Ethics Review Procedure, as administered by the Department of English Language and Linguistics.

15. What if something goes wrong and I wish to complain about the research?

If you have any complaints during the research process, please contact my supervisor, Professor Nigel Harwood. Should you feel that your complaint has not been handled to your satisfaction by me or Professor Nigel Harwood, please contact Dr Kook-Hee Gil who is the PhD Director for the Department of English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature. Dr. Kook-Hee Gil will then escalate the complaint through the appropriate channels. If the complaint relates to how your personal data has been handled, information about how to raise a complaint can be found in the University's Privacy Notice: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/privacy/general> ; the Data Protection Officer is Anne Cutler. When making your complaint please specify if it is regarding your treatment by myself, Fiona Richards or if it is something serious that occurs during or following your participation in the project.

16. Will I be recorded, and how will the recorded media be used?

The audio recordings (not the video recordings) and transcripts of the semi-structured interviews made during this research will be used only for analysis and for illustration in conference presentations and lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

17. Contact for further information

Should you wish to obtain further information about the project, please contact:

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood – Primary Supervisor
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Please note that you will be given a copy of the information sheet and an accompanying signed consent form to keep.

Thank you very much for taking part in my project

Figure 5 Student Consent Form



Student Participant Consent Form

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

Consent Form

<i>Please tick the appropriate boxes</i>	Yes	No
Taking Part in the Project		
I have read and understood the project information sheet dated DD/MM/YYYY or the project has been fully explained to me. (If you will answer No to this question please do not proceed with this consent form until you are fully aware of what your participation in the project will mean.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I agree to take part in the project. I understand that taking part in the project will involve: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) providing the researcher, Fiona Richards, with all pre and post proofread drafts of my work for assessment from November 2020 to the end of September 2021 depending on when I join the study; 2) completing a pre-interview task for each stage of the writing and proofreading process; 3) participating in video or audio-recorded, transcribed, semi-structured interviews via Google Meet for each stage of the writing and proofreading process; and 4) the researcher keeping diary or memo entries of the interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data recorded. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that the researcher will request that I forward all email correspondence between me (the student) and my proofreader throughout the entire time that I am involved in the research. All such forms of correspondence will remain completely anonymous in the researcher’s findings and will not be forwarded or communicated in any shape or form to a third party. However, forwarding the researcher email communication is optional and if I do not agree to this part of the study, it will have no adverse effects on my participation. Furthermore, if I initially agree to participate in this part of the study, I am free to opt out at any time and this will also have no negative impact on my participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that my taking part is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time; I do not have to give any reasons for why I no longer want to take part and there will be no adverse consequences if I choose to withdraw.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that whilst I can withdraw from the study at any time, data I provide cannot be removed from the project after (.....) <i>Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I understand that if plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader writes the entire text for the student) is suspected or detected, the researcher will be morally bound to report such behaviour.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that I should try where possible to obtain approval from the proofreader to use my proofread writing in the project based on the understanding that my proofreader will remain anonymous at each stage of the research process. Furthermore, the proofreader should ideally be involved in the project to complete the researcher's student – proofreader case study dyad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How my information will be used during and after the project		
I understand that my identity will remain anonymous as my name will not appear on any documents shown to a lecturer. Furthermore, a different lecturer will be shown my pre and post proofread writing drafts which means that my own lecturer will not see the changes that my proofreader makes to my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that my proofreader will also remain anonymous. This means that neither my lecturer nor the different lecturer that sees my pre and post proofread work will be informed of my proofreader's identity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that every effort will be made to recruit both students and proofreaders from large classes in order to retain participants' anonymity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that for the researcher to distinguish between each student, proofreader and lecturer, pseudonyms will be used when presenting the research findings. If I wish to choose the pseudonym, I can advise the researcher once I have agreed to participate in the research.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand my personal details such as name, phone number, address and email address etc. will not be revealed to people outside the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that my words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs. I understand that I will not be named in these outputs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers will have access to this data only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers may use my data in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs, only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the pre and post proofread drafts, pre-interview task, video or audio-recordings and transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews and email correspondence between me (the student) and the proofreader that I provide to be deposited in Sheffield University's CiCS Standard Research Storage system so it can be used for future research and learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the researcher to use ELAN software to assist in transcribing the semi-structured interviews, and I understand that every possible caution will be taken to protect my identity by the researcher saving related files under my pseudonym and storing data on the researcher's University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
So that the information you provide can be used legally by the researchers		
I agree to assign the copyright I hold in any materials generated as part of this project to The University of Sheffield.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of participant [printed]

Signature

Date

Name of researcher [printed]

Signature

Date

Project contact details for further information:

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood - Primary Supervisor
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Dr. Kook-Hee Gil – PhD Director for English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: k.gil@sheffield.ac.uk

The template of this consent form has been approved by the University of Sheffield Research Ethics Committee and is available to view here:
<https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/rs/ethicsandintegrity/ethicspolicy/further-guidance/homepage>

Figure 6 Proofreader Consent Form



Proofreader Participant Consent Form

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

Consent Form

<i>Please tick the appropriate boxes</i>	Yes	No
Taking Part in the Project		
I have read and understood the project information sheet dated DD/MM/YYYY or the project has been fully explained to me. (If you will answer No to this question please do not proceed with this consent form until you are fully aware of what your participation in the project will mean.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I agree to take part in the project. I understand that taking part in the project will involve: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) providing the researcher, Fiona Richards, with all pre and post proofread drafts of the student’s work for assessment from November 2020 to the end of September 2021 depending on when I join the study; 2) participating in video or audio recorded, transcribed, semi-structured interviews via Google Meet for each stage of the writing and proofreading process; and 3) the researcher keeping diary or memo entries of the interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data recorded. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that the researcher will request that I forward all email correspondence between me (the proofreader) and my student throughout the entire time that I am involved in the research. All such forms of correspondence will remain completely anonymous in the researcher’s findings and will not be forwarded or communicated in any shape or form to a third party. However, forwarding the researcher email communication is optional and if I do not agree to this part of the study, it will have no adverse effects on my participation. Furthermore, if I initially agree to participate in this part of the study, I am free to opt out at any time and this will also have no negative impact on my participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that my taking part is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time; I do not have to give any reasons for why I no longer want to take part and there will be no adverse consequences if I choose to withdraw.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that whilst I can withdraw from the study at any time, data I provide cannot be removed from the project after (.....) <i>Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that if plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader writes the entire text for the student) is suspected or detected, the researcher will be morally bound to report such behaviour.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I understand that I should try where possible to obtain approval from the student to use the proofread writing in the project based on the understanding that my student will remain anonymous at each stage of the research process. Furthermore, the student should ideally be involved in the project to complete the researcher's student – proofreader case study dyad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How my information will be used during and after the project		
I understand that my identity will remain anonymous as my name will not appear on any documents shown to a lecturer. Furthermore, a different lecturer will be shown my student's pre and post proofread writing drafts. This means that my student's lecturer will not see the changes that I (the proofreader) make to my student's work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that my student's identity will also remain anonymous as their name will not appear on any documents shown to a lecturer and as mentioned above, a different lecturer will see their pre and post proofread writing drafts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that every effort will be made to recruit both proofreaders and students from large classes in order to retain participants' anonymity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that for the researcher to distinguish between each student, proofreader and lecturer, pseudonyms will be used when presenting the research findings. If I wish to choose the pseudonym, I can advise the researcher once I have agreed to participate in the research.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand my personal details such as name, phone number, address and email address etc. will not be revealed to people outside the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that my words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs. I understand that I will not be named in these outputs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers will have access to this data only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers may use my data in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs, only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the pre and post proofread drafts, video or audio-recordings and transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews and email correspondence between me (the proofreader) and the student that I provide to be deposited in Sheffield University's CiCS Standard Research Storage system so it can be used for future research and learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the researcher to use ELAN software to assist in transcribing the semi-structured interviews, and I understand that every possible caution will be taken to protect my identity by the researcher saving related files under my pseudonym and storing data on the researcher's University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
So that the information you provide can be used legally by the researchers		
I agree to assign the copyright I hold in any materials generated as part of this project to The University of Sheffield.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of participant [printed]

Signature

Date

Name of researcher [printed]

Signature

Date

Project contact details for further information:

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood - Primary Supervisor
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Dr. Kook-Hee Gil – PhD Director for English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature
School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
Email: k.gil@sheffield.ac.uk

The template of this consent form has been approved by the University of Sheffield Research Ethics Committee and is available to view here:
<https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/rs/ethicsandintegrity/ethicspolicy/further-guidance/homepage>

Figure 7 Lecturer Consent Form



Lecturer Participant Consent Form

An investigation into proofreading practices at a UK university: the perspectives of L2 students, proofreaders, and lecturers.

Consent Form

<i>Please tick the appropriate boxes</i>	Yes	No
Taking Part in the Project		
I have read and understood the project information sheet dated DD/MM/YYYY or the project has been fully explained to me. (If you will answer No to this question please do not proceed with this consent form until you are fully aware of what your participation in the project will mean.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I agree to take part in the project. I understand that taking part in the project will involve: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) participating in video or audio-recorded, transcribed, semi-structured interviews via Google Meet for each stage of the writing and proofreading process that will run from November 2020 to the end of September 2021 depending on when I join the study; and 2) the researcher keeping diary or memo entries of the interpersonal forms of communication that cannot be evidenced in the transcribed texts but that add an important context when analysing the data recorded. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that my taking part is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time; I do not have to give any reasons for why I no longer want to take part and there will be no adverse consequences if I choose to withdraw.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that whilst I can withdraw from the study at any time, data I provide cannot be removed from the project after (.....) <i>Date to be inserted depending on when the participant joins the research project.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Even though this does not affect me directly, I understand that if plagiarism or ghostwriting (the proofreader writes the entire text for the student) is suspected or detected, the researcher will be morally bound to report such behaviour.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How my information will be used during and after the project		
I understand that I will not be made aware of who the students or proofreaders are as all work will be anonymised. This means that neither of the aforementioned party's names will appear on any documents in order to protect their identity. In addition, I understand that I will be shown the pre and post proofread work of a different student and not my own in order to further protect the student's identity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Although this does not affect me directly and even though I will not be made aware of the identity of students or proofreaders, I understand that every effort will be made to recruit participants from large classes in order to retain their anonymity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that for the researcher to distinguish between each student, proofreader and lecturer, pseudonyms will be used when presenting the research findings. If I	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

wish to choose the pseudonym, I can advise the researcher once I have agreed to participate in the research.		
I understand my personal details such as name, phone number, address and email address etc. will not be revealed to people outside the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that my words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs. I understand that I will not be named in these outputs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers will have access to this data only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand and agree that other authorised researchers may use my data in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs, only if they agree to preserve the confidentiality of the information as requested in this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the video or audio-recordings and transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews that I provide to be deposited in Sheffield University's CiCS Standard Research Storage system so it can be used for future research and learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I give permission for the researcher to use ELAN software to transcribe the semi-structured interviews and I understand that every possible caution will be taken to protect my identity by the researcher saving related files under my pseudonym and storing data on the researcher's University of Sheffield UniDrive and Google Drive, and an encrypted USB flash drive.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
So that the information you provide can be used legally by the researchers		
I agree to assign the copyright I hold in any materials generated as part of this project to The University of Sheffield.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of participant [printed] Signature Date

Name of researcher [printed] Signature Date

Project contact details for further information:

Fiona Richards - Principal Investigator and PhD student
 School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
 Email: fmrichards1@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Nigel Harwood - Primary Supervisor
 School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
 Email: n.harwood@sheffield.ac.uk

Dr. Kook-Hee Gil – PhD Director for English Language and Linguistics and Language and Literature
 School of English, Sheffield University, 1 Upper Hanover Street, Sheffield, S3 7RA
 Email: k.gil@sheffield.ac.uk

The template of this consent form has been approved by the University of Sheffield Research Ethics Committee and is available to view here: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/rs/ethicsandintegrity/ethicspolicy/further-guidance/homepage>

Appendix D – The Total Number of Proofreading Interventions For Each Analysed Text**Table 1 Literature Review**

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	25	16	41
1.2 Addition meso	0	1	1
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	29	29
2.1 Deletion minor	35	14	49
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	1	1
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	12	5	17
3.2 Substitution – form	3	1	4
3.3 Substitution – preposition	6	3	9
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	0	0
3.5 Substitution – agreement	8	0	8
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	29	48	77
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	21	0	21
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	0	0
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases, or sentences	7	3	10
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	3	3
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	0	0
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	2	2
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	0	0
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	205	6	211
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	0	0	0
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	0	0	0
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	35	7	42
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	4	12	16
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	3	0	3
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	2	0	2
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	10	2	12
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	75	0	75
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	1	5	6
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	30	16	46
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0

7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0
7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	253	38	291
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	4	4
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	1	1
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	8	1	9
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	0	0
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	1	1
9 Erroneous correction	11	0	11
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	5	5
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	0	0
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	783	224	1007
Minor	60	30	90
Meso	0	3	3
Major	0	1	1
Non- Interventions			10
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 18,271			

Table 2 Findings

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	7	14	21
1.2 Addition meso	0	1	1
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	12	12
2.1 Deletion minor	12	12	24
2.2 Deletion meso	0	1	1
2.3 Deletion major	0	9	9
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	5	13	18
3.2 Substitution – form	10	5	15
3.3 Substitution – preposition	1	1	2
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	1	1
3.5 Substitution – agreement	12	6	18
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	11	21	32
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	1	4	5
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	1	1
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	2	5	7
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	1	1
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	1	1
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	3	3
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	0	0
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	1	1
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	194	18	212
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	2	1	3
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	3	11	14
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	17	7	24
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	0	0	0
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	0	0	0
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	0	0	0
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	1	3	4
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	51	4	55
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	0	1	1
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	10	3	13
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0

7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	7	2	9
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	0	0
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	0	0
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	1	1
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	0	0	0
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	0	0
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	0	0
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	346	163	509
Minor	19	26	45
Meso	0	2	2
Major	0	10	10
Non- Interventions			9
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 12,591			

Table 3 Chapter 4

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	11	6	17
1.2 Addition meso	0	0	0
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	8	8
2.1 Deletion minor	14	6	20
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	2	2
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	19	2	21
3.2 Substitution – form	1	2	3
3.3 Substitution – preposition	6	3	9
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	0	0
3.5 Substitution – agreement	9	3	12
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	13	12	25
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	0	0	0
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	1	0	1
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	1	0	1
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	0	0
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	0	0
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	3	3
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	2	2
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	92	4	96
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	7	1	8
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	1	1	2
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	9	5	14
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	0	0	0
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	0	0	0
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	0	0	0
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	0	0	0
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	12	0	12
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	0	0	0
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	5	5	10
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0

7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	30	5	35
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	0	0
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	0	0
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	0	0
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	2	0	2
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	2	2
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	2	2
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	233	74	307
Minor	25	12	37
Meso	0	3	3
Major	0	4	4
Non- Interventions			9
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 8570			

Table 4 Chapter 5

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	3	6	9
1.2 Addition meso	0	0	0
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	8	8
2.1 Deletion minor	5	3	8
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	0	0
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	7	13	20
3.2 Substitution – form	3	0	3
3.3 Substitution – preposition	4	2	6
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	0	0
3.5 Substitution – agreement	6	1	7
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	6	17	23
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	1	0	1
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	0	0
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	1	0	1
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	0	0
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	0	0
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	0	0
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	1	1
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	111	5	116
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	2	2	4
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	0	0	0
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	2	2	4
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	0	0	0
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	0	1	1
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	0	0	0
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	0	0	0
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	8	1	9
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	1	2	3
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	6	1	7
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	1	1
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0
7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references	13	4	17
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	0	0

7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	0	0
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	1	1
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	1	1	2
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	2	2
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	0	0
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	180	74	254
Minor	8	9	17
Meso	0	0	0
Major	0	1	1
Non- Interventions			11
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 8966			

Table 5 Chapter 6

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	2	5	7
1.2 Addition meso	0	0	0
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	1	1
2.1 Deletion minor	7	2	9
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	0	0
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	2	3	5
3.2 Substitution – form	2	0	2
3.3 Substitution – preposition	1	0	1
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	0	0
3.5 Substitution – agreement	1	2	3
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	2	7	9
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	1	1	2
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	0	0
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	1	1	2
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	0	0
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	1	1
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	0	0
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	1	1
6 Recombining	0	1	1
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	56	3	59
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	1	0	1
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	3	0	3
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	12	1	13
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	0	0	0
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	0	0	0
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	0	0	0
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	0	0	0
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	13	2	15
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	0	0	0
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	14	2	16
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0

7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	4	1	5
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	0	0
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	0	0
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	0	0
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	0	0	0
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	0	0
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	0	0
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	122	34	156
Minor	9	7	16
Meso	0	0	0
Major	0	1	1
Non- Interventions			4
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 5770			

Table 6 Chapter 7

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	8	3	11
1.2 Addition meso	0	0	0
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	3	3
2.1 Deletion minor	5	2	7
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	1	1
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	6	8	14
3.2 Substitution – form	5	0	5
3.3 Substitution – preposition	4	3	7
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	1	1
3.5 Substitution – agreement	8	4	12
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	12	11	23
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	1	0	1
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	0	0
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	0	1	1
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	0	0
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	0	0
5.1 Rewriting Meso	0	0	0
5.2 Rewriting Major	0	0	0
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	28	5	33
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	2	2	4
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	4	0	4
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	7	0	7
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	0	0	0
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	0	1	1
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	0	0	0
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	0	0	0
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	2	0	2
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	1	0	1
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	4	1	5
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0

7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	5	2	7
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	0	0
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	0	0
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	0	0
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	0	0	0
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	1	1
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	1	1
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	0	0
All	102	50	152
Minor	13	5	18
Meso	0	0	0
Major	0	1	1
Non- Interventions			2
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 2393			

Table 7 References

In-Text Interventions

Text moved	Lower-case/upper-case change	Line indented	Punctuation	En dash/em dash exchange	Space inserted/removed	Font change	Line inserted/removed	Text deleted	Abbreviation/Acronym change	Text substitution	References repositioned to be in alphabetical order	Text inserted	Total
112	119	215	190	66	17	107	11	95	1	31	5	7	976

Comment Interventions

Overall incorrect format comment	Incomplete reference comment	Web links to additional sources of instruction	Broken weblink/page not found comment	Text deleted comment	Http to replace doi comment	Unclear reference comment	Review information and/or format of reference comment	Total of comment interventions	12) Non-Interventions
1	87	10	3	12	19	8	17	157	N/A

Total of all in-text and comment interventions	1133
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 4325	

Table 8 Entire Thesis

Codes & Descriptors	In-Text Interventions	Comment Interventions	Total of In-Text and Comment Interventions
1.1 Addition minor	124	17	141
1.2 Addition meso	1	0	1
1.3 Addition major	0	0	0
1.4 Addition comments for unknown word specification	0	12	12
2.1 Deletion minor	104	9	113
2.2 Deletion meso	0	0	0
2.3 Deletion major	0	2	2
3.1 Substitution – verb tense	55	8	63
3.2 Substitution – form	57	7	64
3.3 Substitution – preposition	37	3	40
3.4 Substitution – number errors	0	0	0
3.5 Substitution – agreement	91	11	102
3.6 Substitution – informal to formal	0	0	0
3.7 Substitution – a new word(s) entirely	79	31	110
3.8 Substitution – American to British English	19	0	19
3.9 Substitution - miscellaneous	0	0	0
4.1 Structural editing - reordering words, phrases or sentences	17	2	19
4.2 Structural editing – paragraph	0	0	0
4.3 Structural editing – sections/larger units	0	0	0
4.4 Structural editing – paragraph breaks	0	0	0
4.5 Structural editing – guideposts	0	0	0
4.6 Structural editing – moving sections	0	0	0
5.1 Rewriting Meso	2	0	2
5.2 Rewriting Major	1	0	1
6 Recombining	0	0	0
7.1 Mechanical alteration – punctuation	479	18	497
7.2 Mechanical alteration – spelling	20	2	22
7.3 Mechanical alteration – numbering	19	1	20
7.4 Mechanical alteration – capitalisation	248	4	252
7.5.1 Mechanical alteration – abbreviations	19	16	35
7.5.2 Mechanical alteration – acronyms	4	3	7
7.5.3 Mechanical alteration – ampersands	1	0	1
7.6 Mechanical alteration – font type and font size	4	8	12
7.7.1 Mechanical alteration – text layout	48	3	51
7.7.2 Mechanical alteration – document layout and design	3	2	5
7.7.3 Mechanical alteration – widows and orphans	0	0	0
7.7.4 Mechanical alteration – running heads	0	0	0
7.8 Mechanical alteration – headings	136	7	143
7.9.1 Mechanical alteration – correlating parts of the text	0	0	0
7.9.2 Mechanical alteration – page numbers	0	0	0

7.10.1 Mechanical alteration – in-text references style	261	40	301
7.10.2 Mechanical alteration – in-text references and reference list match	0	13	13
7.10.3 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list house style	0	0	0
7.10.4 Mechanical alteration – bibliography/reference list accuracy	0	2	2
7.11 Mechanical alteration – miscellaneous	0	0	0
8.1 Meaning and content – correcting words	0	0	0
8.2 Meaning and content – plagiarism	0	0	0
8.3 Meaning and content – judgemental	0	0	0
9 Erroneous correction	3	0	3
10.1 Phatic communication – positive comments	0	4	4
10.2 Phatic communication – proofreader/student interaction	0	0	0
11 Web links to additional sources of instruction	0	2	2
All	1832	227	2059
Minor	228	26	254
Meso	3	0	3
Major	1	2	3
Non- Interventions			9
Total Word Count Minus Tables and Figures = 63,455			

Appendix E – Interview Transcripts

Figure 1 Student Interview Transcript

Fiona Ok that's started and then I'll just put it on my Dictaphone (pause) there we are all ready.

Sarah OK

Fiona Thanks very much for attending the interview.

Sarah You're welcome, I'm excited!

Fiona Thank you erm so as I'll just tell you a little bit about it erm

Sarah Hmm

Fiona As mentioned in the information sheet for my research project I would like to find out what students, proofreaders and lectures believe are ethically appropriate forms of proofreading. So for the first part of the interview, I will ask you questions about your proofreader and whether you feel their feedback helps improve your writing skills and for the second part of the interview I will ask you to discuss the ethical appropriacy of the changes that the proofreader did and did not make to your text...

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...based on the pre-interview task and for the third part of the interview I will ask you about proofreading practices at the XXX (name of university), so do you have any questions you want to ask?

Sarah No, that's all clear.

Fiona Great, thanks. Ok so thanks for asking (answering) the questions in part A of the pre-interview task and I'd now like to ask you some more questions about your proofreader.

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona And then I'll ask you further questions as to whether you feel your proofreader has helped improve your writing skills. So for the first question could you tell me how your experience has been with your current proofreader?

Sarah Umm we'll she' been fantastic. Erm, I, we we are friends so we met working for the uni actually erm so we were first colleagues erm and yeah she's been really really helpful to be honest. I was not, how can I say this erm I'm a bit stuck for feedback in terms of like my supervisor cos I do find that he erm engages erm a bit of a superficial level so a lot of my feedback from my supervisor is actually you're missing a comma here or you're missing a capital letter which is not really the type of feedback that I would have expect from a supervisor at a doctorate level. Erm so I was chatting to (proofreader's name) about this and you know, erm she was like oh well you know if it's issues with erm you're missing a comma or something like that, I'll proofread the work and then he can comment on something else. Er which was good but it's not quite that's happened, he still engages at a superficial level but you know that that is another story. Erm so yeah, I think for me it helps with my confidence so in that sense it's working really well cos I know that there are no silly mistakes like I'm missing a comma here or you know I've been consistent with the referencing format and also issues like erm collocations as well, cos like sometimes and I know that I got in wrong because in my brain, I think about the word in Spanish and then I'm like oh how do I say this in English? I'm like I'm going at it wrong because it's not gonna, it's not gonna fit together so even though I use flash collocations and I

try to be very careful of like linking the language from what I read and stuff so sometimes (pause) I make mistakes but it's not my first language so if it's not mistakes impede communication like you can probably sort the meaning but I want it to be good, I want it to be perfect so yeah I think in that sense it's really really good and helpful.

Fiona And erm just going back to to your supervisor erm does does your supervisor tend to help with more for instance building the argument and...

Sarah No

Fiona Right

Sarah No, he's never like, ok so we're all teachers so he gives general feedback and he tends to give general praise which is lovely but it's not helpful in terms of where I'm going wrong with things or what is it about my writing that is actually good. So in that sense it's not really helpful. Erm so I did have one negative comment so to speak, like on my methodology in fact I mean half of my methodology, I talked a little bit about my experience of being a researcher and because my experience was not great I was trying to be quite kind of like polite about it because I didn't want to sound like I'm having a whinge but obviously but I do want to have a whinge about it, so I really struggle to make it sound nice. And the only comment he said is erm oh this section falls short of your higher standard and I was like, yeah I know but tell me what to do so like it's good.

Fiona Right so you need more suggestions

Sarah So yeah I need to, I know it's crap I don't need that, do you know what I mean? Like I wrote it so I know it's crap. Tell me what to do to that it's not so crap.

Fiona I understand.

Sarah So I I don't that kind of feedback from him erm and it's, I think in a way getting feedback from my second supervisor was really bitter sweet cos his feedback on my erm like statistically bit.

Sarah My second supervisor, he he gave feedback on how I had moved on from describing the questionnaire to introducing the results and he said oh this transition is very abrupt and I was like oh that's the perfect feedback. I know what to do about it but I don't I get nothing from my supervisor like that and he's a lovely man and he's very friendly and he's very approachable but I ask him questions like I'm concerned about this, like what do you think about that and he just doesn't engage. It's all like oh it's fine, it's fine...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...and it might be fine like to standard but I wanna do my best and if he doesn't show me where I'm not doing my best then I can't see it myself.

Fiona Sure and I imagine, yeah I imagine that's where your proofreader comes in and provides you those suggestions and help.

Sarah Yeah I mean the thing is though, all the suggestions that my proofreader makes because obviously you know it has to be ethical...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...are about like the flow and the structure maybe or you know or this linking word is maybe not the right one in here which it doesn't cos OK first of all like she's can't because of ethical

things but she can't because she's not an expert on the field. Like the expert on my field is my supervisor so he should be the one saying like oh erm maybe this argument here, have you read blah blah blah? But he's not engaging with er the deeper level so I'm worried cos I'm gonna go to my viva, hopefully soon, and I don't whether my work is good or not so at least I want it to be well written.

Fiona I understand exactly yes I can understand your point of view.

Sarah packaged. Do you know what I mean, maybe maybe if they're crap at least they're nicely

Fiona Oh well just from my reading of your work it's it's extremely engaging, I really enjoyed reading it.

Sarah Oh thank you

Fiona Yes, definitely.

Sarah But I don't, yeah I think I'm a bit stuck for feedback, I think if I had a supervisor who was like really engaging with my work maybe I wouldn't be so worried about missing a comma here or having a weird collocation there but I am obviously worried.

Fiona I understand yes.

Fiona Oh, erm, er I hope erm everything gets resolved with that erm, erm I'll I'll just moved onto the next question, erm have you ever had any negative experiences with another proofreader?

Sarah I've never used a proofreader before.

Fiona Right

Sarah So like, throughout my higher education life erm so I did my degree in Spain but it was taught in English erm so it was kind of ok like the first two years cos like in Spain it's not like in Britain like the first year counts to the point that if you didn't pass your first year you were not allowed to continue cos you have to demonstrate that your English was good enough to engage with texts in English and you know create knowledge through English erm but because yeah, it was kind ok to have like a spelling mistake here and there, it was not a big deal. And then for my Master's I also did it in Spain through English er but my then partner was a Scottish guy and he had a look through my dissertation and made sure that there were no commas or anything but again I think if it was in Spain like no one expects the text to be perfect cos, you know it's our second language so it's fine erm and then I did my DELTA here in the UK with the XXX (University's Language Centre) as well, erm and I didn't it didn't even occur to me to go to a proofreader because I mean I guess from the modules really you do write er kind of like a big big writing but erm, yeah I felt like you know the proofreading and word that was enough because my teacher, she was really good, really again she was really good and engaging with what I was writing so I was not so worried about how I was writing it and I feel quite confident that my English is ok obviously (laughs) but for the dissertation it's a big deal and then, I don't know, when you're doing a doctorate you want to publish, right?

Fiona Yes

Sarah Erm and the publishing process is not just your work I mean you obviously have the final proofreader thing but when you get erm like reviewer comments, they contribute to your research erm that's absolutely fine and absolutely accepted within academia and it's still your work but you get feedback from other people, right?

Fiona Yes

Sarah So I think, erm when you're writing a dissertation and it's a big deal and it gets published, even if it's internally and no one's read no one reads it, it makes sense to have a proofreader to make sure that it looks good at least so yes, I've never used one before so I've never had any bad experience. I would be, I think I would be really uncomfortable getting a proofreader that I didn't know.

Fiona Right

Sarah Or not like one hundred percent on board with ethical proofreading, just because from the other side I have seen essays that have been proofread (laughs)

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah And erm they were like you know that the student has not written that at it all. It's just been fabricated so and I wouldn't want that and as well I feel like I would be losing ownership of my work I want my work to be my work, ideally with more feedback but you know my work, I just want it to look good so yeah I think.

Fiona OK that's great thanks so I'll move onto the next question now erm I'm just gonna show you a prompt card for this erm.

Sarah Oh!

Fiona Yeah I won't be a second.

Sarah Nice!

Fiona Yeah (laughs) I'll see if I can get it to work erm, let's see I think it's a window.

Sarah Ah ha!

Fiona Yes, can you see that?

Sarah Yes

Fiona Oh great, so erm my question is on the prompt card...

Sarah Mmm

Fiona ...so yes it's prompt card A so it says when you contact a proofreader could you tell me which term or terms best describes the type of help you're looking for so you've got some terms there. If you...

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yeah, if you could just have a look at them and then decide the best one or the best ones and if you could just explain your answer please.

Sarah Sure, I think it's be proofreading in the sense like you know maybe yeah punctuation erm issues with er referencing format which is terrible because I'm terrible at it, which is, it's so boring (laughs).

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah (inaudible) erm maybe er word class as well, I think er, I like using nominalisation and sometimes I overuse it.

Fiona Right

Sarah Erm so that's something that I know I have to have a look at for my own work so you know when the proofreader highlights it I'm like yes of course. Erm it's nice but I you know, it's nice for me when the proofreader makes comments and tends, I'm not sure whether you would call it text editing but maybe text flow.

Fiona Right

Sarah Erm so I, I've been researching this for this is my third year now so to me, I know what I'm talking about when I say oh like pillar 4 and I don't know like...

Fiona Sure

Sarah But you know, this text and examples that I use to me they are very clear in my head because it's the only thing that I do.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah But for er you know a reader erm the connections might not be so clear and I think that translates with my use of pronouns as well so sometimes the reference is so far away in the text that yeah to me it's super clear what I'm going on about but not to the reader and it's really hard to take that distance with my own text because I've written it so...

Fiona Sure

Sarah ...to me it makes sense and I need someone else to be like er does it make sense it's not the right connector or are you sure your reference is not too far away so in that sense that's that's really helpful but I guess it will be text editing maybe?

Fiona Great

Sarah So yeah, but the main ones will be punctuation if my referencing system use is systematic and like word class and collocations, I think collocations ah they worry me so much (laughs).

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah Yeah

Fiona (laughs) OK that's great thanks so erm for the next question erm I'd like to ask you if you think it is a good idea to always use a proofreader and if you could tell me why or why not please?

Sarah OK

Fiona Yeah, sorry there's no prompt card for that.

Sarah Oh OK so can you say that again sorry?

Fiona Yeah sorry so it's just why, if you think it's a good idea to always use the proofreader and why or why not.

Sarah Erm, I don't think always er, it's a good idea cos like OK for example if you're being assessed on your language ability, you don't wanna have a proofreader because you're showing your language ability. Erm I think when you're engaging with deeper meaning or actual content and you're looking at publication then yes, you need a proofreader because you have a proofreader in the real world like you know if you're publishing, if you're publishing a book, you've got someone editing erm if you're publishing in a journal you get someone editing and that editing I think it goes deeper than what a proofreader would do. Erm so I think, I don't see anything wrong with having a proofreader for a dissertation, but yeah for the dissertation when you're engaging with knowledge. I think something like a little essay in the summer school when they're looking at whether you can manage or not then no, cos that can be quite deceiving erm but yeah when we're not, I'm not being assessed on my ability to write in English erm that's kind of like yes that's why I'm writing a thesis, I'm all right, erm I'm being assessed on how I'm putting the ideas together and engaging with the wider context and the literature and so on and so forth so I yeah I think it's a good idea, I think, I mean as a reader as well, if I was looking at a dissertation and I would be like there's a comma missing here or the punctuation's not quite great. I won't trust it...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...cos it's looks (inaudible -ropey?) so I think, yeah I think it's presenting things in a way that look trustworthy as well.

Fiona Yes Ok thanks, erm now for the next question, there there is another prompt card erm so can can you see that,? It's prompt card...

Sarah Yes

Fiona ...prompt card B yeah so it just asks could you tell me to what extent feedback from a proofreader helps improve your writing skills?

Sarah Erm, honestly, I'm not sure, erm (pause) I guess it depends on what we might by writing skills erm I don't think it helps (pause) like the macrostructure, I don't think it helps erm the actual like coherence of the text, I think maybe it can help with cohesion when they're like highlighting ok this this connection is maybe not the right one.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Erm but again, they're highlighting this connection is maybe not the right one so it's up to the writer to come up with the right connection which like fair enough if they haven't highlighted it, it would probably stay the way it is but whether you know about making it work or not, it is up to you, isn't it?

Fiona Sure

Sarah And I don't know like to be honest with you, I'm sure seeing your errors pointed out helps at a deeper level erm I I know that I messed up the referencing system (laughs) so and I know I'm gonna keep messing it up because it's just fiddley so in that sense maybe it's not, it's not helping in that way so I don't know. I think I'm gonna have to end this, it's so annoying but I'm gonna have to go to neither agree or disagree

Fiona That's ok no problem, you gave a really nice in-depth answer there.

Sarah Is it?

Fiona Yes because it's important to know exactly how you feel because this is one of the things of course that I'm looking at, can it improve your writing skills so that's really helpful thanks.

Sarah Yeah

Fiona OK I'll just go onto the next question, there's erm so for question six and seven erm the we're looking at the same list so for question...

Sarah Yes

Fiona ...yes for question six it says in what areas in particular do you feel your writing has improved with the help of a proofreader, so you've got quite a few there, you can obviously pick as many as you think are relevant.

Sarah Erm definitely formatting and presentation of text.

Fiona Right

Sarah Erm I think as well cos the like the APA referencing guidelines change every six months.

Fiona Oh

Sarah It's so (inaudible -hard?) It's just like what am I using now but it's good and like I feel better knowing that someone who knows it cos obviously she is a proofreader like she trained as a proofreader. So, she knows what she's going on about so that that's really helpful.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah And you know, I know that my numbers are ok and my headings are centred and all that faff. Erm (pause) yeah the actual I mean not referencing in terms of like paraphrasing, summarising or synthesising but the actual mechanics of having the citation properly that's really I think that's really helpful. Erm also the reference list cos I use Mendeley...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...but Mendeley mess up and I just, I think I'm blind to Mendeley errors as well you know like I reach a point where I'm like where it just looks all the same.

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah So that's good erm I don't think my spelling is too bad because I use autocorrecter check so that's kind of good erm yeah punctuation yeah yeah like I think I have the tendency to have like random sentences cos like you know I just go on and on and on erm so it's good to have someone reading them and make sure that you know at least highlighting them erm...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...yeah I think sometimes er yeah maybe I use forms like I use the -ing form and I should use another form when I want to use a noun erm so that's in a way that's yeah I mean I'm not sure it has improved cos I am aware of my mistakes but I think having that highlighted erm gives me a kick up the bum...

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah ...and then I'm like, when I read my own text I I look for those mistakes as well it's good, er the other things not really erm yeah I mean I think in terms of organisation of ideas yeah I think sometimes cos for me it's all so clear, isn't it? So it's quite, I mean I'm not saying it has improved

because it's very difficult again for me to take that distance with my text but it is really helpful to have feedback on that so that's good. Yeah register, content, not really. Yeah, I think yeah I think so for improvement definitely the mechanics of referencing and formatting and presentation of the text erm because I know, I'm more aware of how to do it erm punctuation maybe has improved maybe will never improve (laughs) but yeah and maybe word class like word structure yeah.

Fiona Great thanks and then are there any areas from those that you would like to receive more help in, any areas in particular?

Sarah Well I would love to have erm more feedback on my actual argument because that cannot come from my proofreader that needs to come from my supervisor so (laughs) I don't know I mean it just it can't come from a proofreader they're not, you know, they don't know the topic that well they don't have so it's just yeah it's impossible erm no but I'm really happy with the the help the feedback I get from (proofreader's name) I think it's spot on really.

Fiona Great oh that's lovely thanks, I'll just stop sharing those a second...

Sarah OK

Fiona ...yeah OK erm I'll just go back to my questions erm, OK so that that's the end of part part one so erm thanks for completing, we'll move onto part two and thanks for completing the pre-interview task so erm do you actually have your proofreader task to hand? I should have said that sorry.

Sarah I have it here somewhere.

Fiona Oh thanks very much.

Sarah Let me just have a look er yes, yes I have it here.

Fiona Oh great thanks erm so if we just have a look at section one about addition erm...

Sarah OK

Fiona ...yeah you stated that the interventions helped you to change words in line with the rhetoric of your academic community...

Sarah Yes

Fiona ...so could you just tell me a little bit more about this please like erm...

Sarah Erm

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Yeah so (pause) I think er (pause) communities of practice have their own way of expressing themselves erm and technically speaking education is not my field cos I did erm philology even though I'm a teacher and whatever like my background is actually linguistics.

Fiona Right

Sarah Erm so I feel a bit happier to have a proofreader highlighting like erm maybe this doesn't sound so good for our our context so yeah that's that's what I mean like, it makes me feel a bit more confident that my language fits with the community that I'm trying to talk to.

Fiona Great. Yes, so that's answered already my second question if you've experienced any challenges but obviously, you're overcoming those and are there any other strategies that you use to help tailor your writing to your academic community or do you find that erm the interventions for from the proofreader is sufficient are sufficient?

Sarah Erm I feel like the interventions for from the proofreader are like they won't be that maybe (inaudible – using?).

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Like as an external reader er but actually there there is a lot of word underneath so I obviously have to read loads of texts to inform my literature review and everything like my whole dissertation really.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah So I have my list of favourite expressions erm so I compile them, I'm really obsessed with the spreadsheets.

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah So (laughs) I have a lovely spreadsheet when I write a summary of the article that I read and how it fits or not in my dissertation and if there is any vocabulary that I didn't know which you know sometimes happens or any new terms for me or something that was written in a way that I thought was beautiful I keep note of it erm and then you know when I don't actually go back to that column of my favourite expressions when I'm writing which is a bit silly but I do read through it and I hope that by reading those expressions when I have to express myself I'm gonna do it in a similar way.

Fiona Yes I find that as well just noting them down it does go in you do tend to retain that knowledge and you never know when you can use it again.

Sarah Yeah so I feel like that's that's kind of like my strategy to sound you know.

Fiona Great

Sarah Cos I want I want my work to be accessible and useful for my community and I feel quite strongly that if it's not presented in a way that fits with the community guidelines that like I'm not using their language and you know for in the punctuation and stuff, it's not gonna be taken seriously.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah And I feel it should be taken seriously...

Fiona Sure

Sarah ...because I'm working very hard.

Fiona Of course, yeah.

Sarah So yeah I think that's really important about that's kind of like my little tricks.

Fiona Oh great thanks and then erm your proofreader she only made minor interventions in the areas of addition so erm one to five words...

Sarah Yeah

Fiona ...but erm could you tell me erm what you think of the ethical appropriacy of making more substantial interventions such as six to nine words or ten words

Sarah I think that's a bit problematic.

Fiona Right

Sarah Erm (pause) I mean it's very very hard to say without looking at an example cos erm I don't know it could be like the intervention is a bit of an explanation.

Fiona Right

Sarah In which case, I do feel like it might cross a line a bit because when you're proofreader you're not teaching

Fiona Yeah

Sarah So but you know but I think it's quite problematic because at the end of the day your proofreader is helping you with what you've got and if they have to have six or nine words, I mean six or nine words then maybe you don't have them.

Fiona Right

Sarah So they're not they're work anymore.

Fiona Sure great

Sarah So that's why yeah I would a bit like not sure.

Fiona Oh that's great thanks, erm now we'll have a look at the next section this is about deletion so...

Sarah Yes

Fiona ...yes I can see that you've consulted erm the BAWE, erm...

Sarah Yeah

Fiona ...could you tell me more about how you use this to help with your thesis?

Sarah So I use it quite often actually erm (laughs) cos again what if I'm not using the right rhetoric or and maybe I use something that is perfectly fine in Spanish but super problematic in English which there are words like that where you can totally use them in Spanish and then in English it's like oh my God that's the worst word ever.

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah So that is a worry erm so what I do is er I try to look for words in context...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...but sometimes I use Mendeley to check for that word in the context of my like literature like things I'm reading.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah But other times it doesn't quite work so I go to the BAWE and I access it through FLAX because otherwise it's not free (laughs) so I go to FLAX collocations and I look up a Social Science collection and I just put like the expression that I want and then it gives you all the like concordances all the lines where it happens so you can click on it and then it gives you the whole document so I noticed that where there are questions marks like there is on mine it's mostly essays from students so I thought like ah so real people real academics are putting on question marks so that's why I change it.

Fiona Great and erm similarly with addition erm your proofreader only made minor interventions in the area of deletion so just one to five words...

Sarah Mmm

Fiona ...yeah again could you comment on the ethical appropriacy of deleting erm for instance six to nine words or ten plus words?

Sarah I think that's a (pause) I mean it's hard though cos I know a lot of people waffle so much in their writing...

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah ...and I mean I don't think it's the proofreader call to actually delete it, I think it will be something like have you considered being a bit more concise...

Fiona Hmm

Sarah ...I think that would be more ethical erm but actually deleting it again you know it's they're work and you know they might be well proud of waffling so I think it's more about maybe having a wider conversation of OK academic writing is concise so in this bit here you're just going on and on and on have you considered something like that I think that would be a bit more ethical.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Whether that's a proofreader thing to do or an academic tutor thing to do that's a bit more of a grey area for me to be honest.

Fiona Right so whether you could possibly follow up the proofreader's work with a separate meeting?

Sarah Yeah

Fiona Yeah

Sarah I think yeah cos that's that's (inaudible) if you really need to delete nine to ten words because you were waffling then there's probably something wrong with your academic style and that's not, I mean I don't know it's hard to say because it might be a one off or...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...and then obviously if it's deleting all that all those many words because of content issues and that's super wrong cos...

Fiona Right

- Sarah ...yeah
- Fiona OK thanks for that erm so I'll I'll move onto the next one, this is about substitution.
- Sarah Yes
- Fiona So erm for the pre-interview task, I noted interventions in area of areas of form and word choice...
- Sarah Yes
- Fiona ...erm yes there are other areas erm in which substitution could occur erm
- Sarah Mmm-hmm
- Fiona So I'm just gonna copy these areas into erm the message box.
- Sarah Ah OK
- Fiona Yeah, can you see those?
- Sarah Right
- Fiona Yeah
- Sarah Yeah, yeah I can see them?
- Fiona Right so erm are any of the five areas where you think it wouldn't be ethically appropriate erm for the proofreader to intervene?
- Sarah Hmm (pause) I mean I think they it could all be highlighted (pause) but I don't think they should be substituted erm maybe a preposition, because like prepositions they make no sense erm...
- Fiona (laughs)
- Sarah ...they don't and it's so hard and you have to go again like to FLAX collocations and make sure that you have the right the preposition and blah blah blah so I would be happy with the prepositions with substitute erm just because I don't believe in them, they carry no meaning to me erm the other things er that's a bit more verb tenses not changing you can highlight them.
- Fiona Right
- Sarah So are sure you don't want to use the present simple here? Like that would be OK...
- Fiona Yeah
- Sarah ...erm but not changing. Countable and uncountable agreement erm I think this can be a tricky one though cos if erm it's like sometimes specific vocabulary like for example in chemistry you don't use it the way you would in normal English, like normal English.
- Fiona Sure
- Sarah So I think not substituting maybe highlighting like do you wanna check with your literature that you got this right.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Informal to formal, I think maybe again highlighting rather than change it erm and American to British like that's so wrong.

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah What's wrong with American English? It's fine. Erm no I think I think you would need to say maybe OK let's say they are inconsistencies and at some point you are using the American words in another context...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...using the British English words, you wanna say maybe you wanna be consistent like stick to one of the two but not substituting cos you're making that choice for the student wouldn't you so I don't think that's OK.

Fiona OK that's brilliant thanks erm so now the next one was erm proof er reordering so...

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yes, your proofreader reordered several words.

Sarah Yes

Fiona Erm could you comment on the ethical appropriacy of reordering sentences?

Sarah Erm I think it depends on what is it that you are reordering.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Erm so like in the first example it's not really a massive change it I feel like the meaning is still the same and it's kind of the same thing...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...in the second one so there is a bit of a reordering, it makes it more concise, it makes it more formal that's fine.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Erm I think moving the whole sentences like within a paragraph or something like that that's more problematic.

Fiona Right

Sarah Again it's something that maybe you want to highlight as a proofreader and say like mmm...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...maybe you wanna look at your theme and rheme and something like that but not...

Fiona Sure

- Sarah Yeah
- Fiona OK that's that's great thanks erm and then the next category er
- Sarah Mmm
- Fiona I'll just get my questions sorry erm yes so the next question it's about structural editing so...
- Sarah Mmm
- Fiona ...so I've viewed your comments of course erm could you also let me know what you think about the erm other three so this was this was numbers two, three and four, do do you think they're ethically appropriate?
- Sarah OK erm so reorder paragraphs, no I don't think you can reorder the paragraphs for someone.
- Fiona Right
- Sarah I think you can highlight...
- Fiona Yeah
- Sarah ...the argument's not logically structured or it doesn't flow but you, I think that's taking it a bit too far because you're taking ownership of the work and it the ownership should be on the writer.
- Fiona OK
- Sarah Erm reordering sections of larger units to make sure it's logically structured, again I feel I feel like this is really problematic and oh if it's so like large that their argument is not logically structured I think that this is pointing at a problem that's deeper than what a proofreader can do.
- Fiona Right
- Sarah If something like this would come up honestly if I were a proofreader and just getting paid to proofread, I wouldn't even mention it because that's the academic side of things that's the content side of things so I wouldn't even engage with that.
- Fiona OK
- Sarah Erm insert a change paragraph, er (pause) I mean that's kind of like a cosmetic thing isn't it like when you put a line or yeah that, I would be all right with that I think maybe I would highlight it rather than doing it for someone else but I don't think that's a massive issue.
- Fiona OK
- Sarah Like er I not with inserting, I think highlighting...
- Fiona Right
- Sarah ...if it's just like highlighted that text or guideposts are missing yes for sure but inserting it cos you're making an assumption that those ideas are maybe erm like against each other or it's just further explanation of what's been introduced and you don't know that cos you're not the writer.

- Fiona Right
- Sarah So that I think that could actually end up being quite messy. If it's not clear for sure but yeah.
- Fiona Ok great and then the next section is about rewriting erm...
- Sarah Yeah
- Fiona ...yes your proofreader didn't make any interventions in this area erm
- Sarah I would be offended if she did though.
- Fiona Yeah (laughs) yeah could you tell me more about that?
- Sarah (laughs) erm well cos of like it's my work isn't it and even if it's crap I I wanna to be the one rewriting it so I need I need to be told where things are not working cos obviously, I might not be able to see because you know I'm super immersed in my work and whatever but I wanna be the one that rewrites it and the one who who improves erm if my proofreader rewrites where I've gone wrong then it's not just my work anymore is it, it's our work so...
- Fiona Great, yeah
- Sarah So I think...
- Fiona Well actually
- Sarah ...I think that would be upsetting for me if someone, yeah
- Fiona I understand
- Sarah I'd be like how dare you!
- Fiona (laughs) well you've, I was gonna show you an example erm but you've actually answered the question for me so that's great thanks.
- Sarah OK
- Fiona Erm the next one it's about recombining again erm your proofreader didn't do this erm so it's either for ex for instance combining one or more sentences or dividing one sentence into two or more sentences erm...
- Sarah Mmm
- Fiona ...yeah do you already have an opinion on that or I can show you an example if necessary.
- Sarah Er I think if its recombining in the sense of like OK so random sentence...
- Fiona Yeah
- Sarah ...like a full stop that's OK. If it's something a bit deeper in terms of meaning or you know you're like addressing too many ideas in the one sentence then no that's not OK.
- Fiona Great

Sarah And also if as well I think if you highlight fragment and it could kind of become a sentence like removing the punctuation there, I think you can highlight that...

Fiona Mmm

Sarah ...but I don't think it would be OK to actually remove that cos it might be cos I'm I'm a bit like that. Sometimes I write a fragment because I wanna keep saying things...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...but then I forgot what it was that I was saying and I just move onto my next sentence so erm yeah it might be that something's missing.

Fiona Yeah. OK then the next one this is about mechanical alteration so...

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yes, in your task er in your pre-interview task I noted interventions in areas of font type...

Sarah Yeah (laughs)

Fiona ...yeah (laughs) punctuation and citations.

Sarah Yes

Fiona So erm these are other areas.

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona I'll just copy these into the box. Yeah, these are other areas where mechanical erm alteration could occur. Are there any there that you think are nor ethically appropriate?

Sarah Erm what what's does it mean when it says correlating parts of the text?

Fiona Yes so so this is when erm for example if you've put erm in the footnotes a certain erm reference to something within the text it's making sure they match or for instance making sure if you've written in the text to refer to such and such a table making sure that they're the correct numbers and then it could be also for example if you've written in your erm literature review or any of the chapters you've written a number or a number or a reference making sure that it matches up to other chapters and making sure it links to the table of content so it's all the numbering and erm for example for lettering where you've got figures and table footnotes, table of contents, making sure they all align.

Sarah OK

Fiona Yeah

Sarah I think I would expect my proofreader to highlight those issues.

Fiona Right

Sarah I wouldn't expect my proofreader to change them for me...

Fiona OK

Sarah ...cos it could be like there's two things that could be happening there. The most likely is that I messed up the number...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...which is easily fixed...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...but it could also be that I am talking about the number that I wouldn't be talking that I'm not erm wording correct it around it so I think yeah, I think I would expect that to be highlighted to me rather than than changed erm er (pause) to be honest with you I don't think any of those things will be changed by the I mean maybe the spelling because the computer will change it for your anyway.

Fiona Sure

Sarah Capitalisation as well that's fine. Erm for number three I think it might make sense to have highlighted because it could be that you've messed up that particular abbreviation or that you are introducing a new concept that you thought you had explained before but you haven't...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...and that's you've abbreviated so that maybe a tricky one. Font size yeah I don't see a problem with that erm text layout and appearance erm (pause) like changing what exactly with the text layout?

Fiona Erm so for example if erm say for example you had erm you know the widows and orphans if you had...

Sarah Yeah

Fiona ...yeah for example things like that or it could be...

Sarah Oh

Fiona ...yeah it could be erm the appearance of a table in the text or maybe it could...

Sarah Mmm

Fiona ...yeah the appearance of the paragraphs you know for example sometimes erm you can justify them.

Sarah Yeah

Fiona Things that like that, how it looks.

Sarah Erm I think it might be better to just highlight those things again and just leave the option to the reader.

Fiona Right, yeah

Sarah and again Headings my proofreader doesn't change the headings for me she just highlights it again

Fiona Yes I noticed (laughs)

- Sarah So yeah fair enough.
- Fiona Oh
- Sarah Er creating (pause) yeah I think that feels the probably the worst one is say number seven.
- Fiona Right
- Sarah Erm I think it'll be better to probably highlight all of them except for like one and two, I think those changes they're very minor.
- Fiona Great. OK erm and then for the meaning and content one erm could you comment on the ethically appropriacy of correcting words words
- Sarah Yeah
- Fiona ...which have been incorrectly used in terms of their meaning?
- Sarah I think this a bit of a tricky one cos...
- Fiona Mmm
- Sarah ...like if it's a collocation type of thing I think it's it's all right to highlight it...
- Fiona OK
- Sarah ...erm yeah I think meaning it's er that's probably something like you wanna highlight...
- Fiona Yeah
- Sarah ...but maybe not a good idea to use a verb if you don't wanna change it cos you don't know what the author actually means.
- Fiona Right
- Sarah Erm so that's that's something to highlight rather than change probably erm like in my particular example, it's good that she highlighted that cos I don't wanna come across as judgemental, but I do have a lot of feelings about this so...
- Fiona I understand
- Sarah ...it's hard, it's my work so I I I cannot like emotionally detach myself from it so...
- Fiona Right
- Sarah ...it's nice that someone says oh you're being too passionate about things here because I don't, again I think that could undermine my whole research because academic writing should be like more objective and I should be guiding the reader to agree with me rather than saying to the reader you have to agree with me right?
- Fiona Yeah

Sarah Because so in those cases highlighting those things that's really helpful for me personally erm (pause) but yeah I think other changes in meaning and content that that's (pause) definitely not something for the proofreader to change.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah They can highlight for you but not change it cos again you kind of lose ownership of your work.

Fiona Right OK then the erm the last section from your pre-interview task is about consultation teaching points so...

Sarah Yeah

Fiona ...erm we had a look at parts one and two erm I've forgot sorry to add erm examples for parts three and four so I was just wondering...

Sarah OK

Fiona ...yeah, I was just I can show you example if you like or if you already have an opinion you can just tell me. The other one was adding more information to support a claim, do you think that's ethically appropriate?

Sarah Erm yeah she's just highlighted that, you know are you sure you wanna leave it like here erm...

Fiona Mmm

Sarah ...so erm (pause) yeah, so this is a bit of a tricky one cos those eight approaches, I've already talked about them.

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...in a previous section erm so it's ju (pause) it's a bit of hard one to kind of like help the reader with their cognitive load and not repeating myself...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...so I think having a second pair of eyes it might actually this will be helpful here.

Fiona Right

Sarah ...and again she just highlighted that rather than adding it for me which would have been a problem.

Fiona Yes erm that's that exactly what it was the for the for the comments that I found the proofreader wrote do you have a citation for this idea, so as I said it was a comment. She didn't add anything in.

Sarah Yeah. So you know that's that's fair enough like adding more information or adding a claim yeah things being (pause) erm yeah it's not a full sentence yeah, more information and you know keeping an eye on things like that erm greater clarity, I think highlighting issues where the argument is not clear...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...is important.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Erm

Fiona That's what your proofreader did it was in regard to the you know the LOTS and the HOTS verbs so...

Sarah Yeah she was like what? (laughs)

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah But again I think it comes down to having that distance with the text like I know exactly what I'm going on about with those verbs and why are there and why I think they're important.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah But I need to spell it out for my reader so obviously my reader is sitting there going like why are we talking about these all of a sudden.

Fiona Sure

Sarah Erm so yeah I think I think that's quite helpful and again as long as it's been highlighted rather than changed for me which is you know, that would be unethical...

Fiona Great

Sarah ...then I think that's actually really helpful. I do feel though that that type of feedback really should have come from a supervisor...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...so my supervisor looked at the chapter before and he it was not a problem for him and it just it makes me wonder how much he's actually engaging with the content and you know you could also say you know he's an expert on the field so he could follow your argument better...

Fiona Mmm

Sarah ...which is a lovely way of thinking about it er but the reality is that if I want to appeal to the academic audience I need to explain how I got to link these ideas together erm so this it's yeah this is I think in a way it's really helpful to have it pointed out to me but at the same time it makes me quite anxious about my viva cos (pause) what if I'm missing something and my proofreader is missing something which it could happen. My supervisor is not gonna catch it is he so I'm just gonna go to the viva and its' gonna be surprise.

Fiona Oh

Sarah So yeah I think in that sense that's that's helpful for me, I'm not sure, I mean I think it's OK ethically speaking cos I'm the one making the change, it's not her but yeah I wish this type of feedback came from a supervisor but you know, it is what it is so...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Yeah

Fiona Ok erm then we've I've given you erm a list of different types of interventions on the pre-interview task...

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...do you think there are any other types of interventions where it would be ethically appropriate to make changes that are not already in the list?

Sarah Erm I feel the list is is very very comprehensive to be honest I can't think of what other changes you can make erm well something that my proofreader highlighted is my use of colours in the text.

Fiona Right

Sarah So I'm a visual learner erm and for me to follow the argument, I need to have different colours (pause) erm and it was, I find it helpful so I assume everyone else in the world finds it helpful erm but obviously having different colours for like the different er key words it maybe doesn't look so grown and academic...

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah ...so the proofreader highlighted that, I was like right OK so I've I know what I've written and I understand so I can let go of the colours and make it look like a grown up thesis so erm so I'm glad she pointed that out for example erm I'm not sure whether a lot of people use colours when they're writing their dissertations, maybe it's just me (laughs) it's just like an intervention that only works for me erm but yeah I can't think of anything else to be honest.

Fiona That's fine and erm I mean maybe we've already answered the follow-on question for that, it's if you think there are any areas where you think erm any additional areas that weren't mentioned on the list where ethically appropriate changes should not be made or where the changes wouldn't be ethically appropriate.

Sarah Erm I kind of feel like I've kind of gone through that...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...like the ethical options and not ethic options

Fiona Yeah that's fine then only one more question in this section and then part three is very brief. Erm so for looking at your submitted paper...

Sarah Mmm

Fiona ...yeah I noted that you accepted most of the in text interventions that the proofreader made so these are the interventions that will not have appeared in the comments section

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...unless you used you used the compare documents function in Track changes in word.

Sarah Yeah

Fiona So could you advise me whether you were aware of the in-text changes?

Sarah Oh yeah yeah erm like when (proofreader's name) sent me that she actually sent me a document on how to compare those texts.

Fiona Right

Sarah Cos she's very good with that bit so...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah erm... she sent me instructions like I obviously followed the instructions, I could compare erm...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...what she had changed and what I had originally written.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Yeah and it was mostly like the space after the 'p' and yeah for the citations so yeah it all sounds good erm, fair enough.

Fiona Great and then just erm for the comments section erm so that's of course where she made all the comments in the right-hand margin erm I noted that you declined to make thirty-three of the proposed interventions.

Sarah Mmm-hmm

Fiona Could you tell me a little bit about your thought process when you were deciding to accept or decline the interventions in the comments section if you can remember?

Sarah Yeah, so obviously when I first looked at the mechanical bit when I compared the both documents and then I went through the comments one by one erm obviously like my cos this is the literature review so it has it has grown and changed as my research has been you know developed...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...so there are, there are some comments that are pertinent and I I feel like they can add to like my literature review and make it better and so on and so forth but I feel like there are others they were not really relevant for me or that I didn't agree with as a as a researcher and I can I see where she's coming from, it's not that the comments are not good.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah It's just that I didn't feel that that was particularly necessary or that I just want to follow up that comment that I'm like pleased with the way it looks.

Fiona Yeah

Sarah Erm so yeah that's that's why I mean it could be that there is one that I have have missed I've been quite thorough.

Fiona Yes

Sarah Erm but yeah that's yeah I think she suggested some stuff about adding clarity of something some bits and I thought OK if I can see that if you're not an expert an expert reader like if you don't know much about it because I think it was about (inaudible) theory.

Fiona Mmm

Sarah They are very familiar with this theory you may need this information but I'm actually thinking about my audience and I think it may be a wee bit patronising if I actually explain that.

Fiona Right

Sarah They'll be like we know (laughs) erm so I think pause) I don't know like maybe my audience could benefit from that but I think I am at this stage I'm writing for my panel and my panel will know this so if I put that in I'm just going to annoy them (laughs).

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah So yeah that's that's kind of like my thinking process.

Fiona Brilliant erm so the last section is very brief it's just erm questions about proofreading practices at the XXX (name of university) and we've already touched upon some of this in our email communication so the first question it was could you tell me if you are aware of any information that the XXX (name of university) provide regarding having a proofreader but of course you've already sent me the emails regarding this, haven't you?

Sarah I think like at some point ages ago I did hear that you have to declare that your erm dissertation has been proofread like you need to put a page and something. I can't find that information anywhere anymore.

Fiona Right

Sarah So I felt really (pause) it's just all so obscure and I don't think it helps anyone it would be so much better if they would just look you can have it proofread proofread or you can't have it and these are the rules if you have it. There's nothing like that...

Fiona Sure

Sarah ...which is frustrating.

Fiona I understand so erm I suppose that sort of almost answers the second question, have you been informed by a member of staff about proofreading practices but yeah based on what you said I imagine that's not the case?

Sarah Er well like don't do it because you might fall into collusion and I'm like that is so (pause) dishonest because they are having their works proofread.

Fiona Right

Sarah They publish it in journals where their work is proofread and they are having feedback on the research that they've done so to stand in front of a group of PGRs and like don't have your work proofread, I'm like really? Erm so I don't know it's just erm it feels weird, cos with that email it's like oh I don't know the rules but here are a couple of people that can do the work for you.

Fiona Right

Sarah I'm like erm actually on your webpage that you sent me the link to it says that you don't endorse any proofreaders but yet...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...here you are recommending people.

Fiona Yes, so that that actually leads onto the erm third question that I had erm because at the moment at many universities not all students, proofreaders or lectures so that means academics erm in terms of my research are aware of what is and is not allowed in regard to proofreading practices erm so...

Sarah No

Fiona ...yes so I was just have you got any advice that you could erm provide to the XXX (name of university) regarding erm the type of help of help that students can receive with their writing?

Sarah Er they just need a policy wide like for all the departments in terms of what is ok for proofreading what is not OK for proofreading and all those bits that are not OK for proofreading actually just go book a XXX (appointment with the University's Writing Service).

Fiona Right

Sarah Cos that's what the XXX (University's Writing Service) is for so they are offering a great alternative solution to all the things that are unethical for a proofreader to do because you can get you know support from experts in academic writing and they'll show you how to fix your mistakes and the teaching process but when it comes to like literally cosmetic issues that even they con I don't know whether you've seen if that, they have this session during Writing Fest where they introduced this lovely software, I'll I'll send you the link cos it's fantastic.

Fiona Oh thank you.

Sarah And it literally does the same thing that a proofreader does.

Fiona Right

Sarah In terms of highlighting wrong collocations and so on and so forth. So they are OK with endorsing artificial proofreading...

Fiona Right

Sarah ...they are well apparently, they are OK cos they have that session at the university, I don't even know what they were doing.

Fiona (laughs)

Sarah They've got that. They have the help to help the students about their writing just come up with some clear guidelines but I feel that they just don't come up with those guidelines because they don't actually know what they want from a proofreader and it's a shame cos you know there are experts at the university that can write the policy...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...easily...

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...and it will, it will cost like, it will cost them nothing (laughs) and it will be so helpful cos every year you erm like misconducts and erm major misconducts and stuff like that and one of the reasons why it's cos there's no clear policy like at the XXX (University's Language Centre) we have a clear policy, you don't have a proofreader cos we're looking at the language level

Fiona Yeah

Sarah ...but the rest of the university they don't and I feel like that's the reason why there are so many issues...

Fiona Yes

Sarah ...because you don't I mean, you don't know. You do know what's ethical and what's unethical but maybe not everyone knows.

Fiona No exactly, there might be different interpretations and at different levels you know between undergrads, master's and yeah doctoral students might have different interpretations.

Sarah Yes absolutely so I think that's the one thing that they could sort out, just have a policy.

Fiona Oh that's great thanks very much for doing the interview. I'll I'll just stop the recording a second.

Sarah Sure

Figure 2 Proofreader Interview Transcript

Fiona Ok and then I'll just bring it up on here. I won't be a second (pause) it just says to get the consent of all participants. Is that OK?

Jane Yes

Fiona Great (pause) oh lovely OK I'll just erm start with the first few questions erm so thank you very much for attending today's interview. As mentioned in the information sheet, for my research project, I would like to find out what students, proofreaders and lecturers believe are ethical appropriate forms of proofreading. Firstly, I'll ask you questions regarding your proofreading background. Secondly, I'll ask you about specific changes that you did or did not make to the student's text as well as possible changes that could be made. For each type of change, I'll ask you to discuss the ethical appropriacy of such interventions. Thirdly, I'll ask you questions about the type of proofreading requests that your current and previous students have asked you to make and finally I'll ask you to discuss your communication with the student's lecturer or supervisor erm and also sorry there's another part, I will ask you questions regarding proofreading practices at the XXX (name of university). So do you have any questions you wanted to ask me at this point?

Jane Not at the moment no.

Fiona OK and if anything's not clear during the interview, feel free to stop me of course.

Jane OK

Fiona OK so the first erm set of questions, it's just preliminary questions regarding your proofreading background. So, erm I'm going to show you a prompt card and erm if you could tell me which description best fits your role as a proofreader. So I'll just bring those up. Are you able to see those?

Jane Yes, I am.

Fiona Oh great

Jane Erm

Fiona Yeah

Jane I'm number one

Fiona Number one. Lovely, thanks (pause) OK I'll just go onto the next question. Erm and could you tell me how many texts you proofread per month?

Jane Er yes erm (pause) so (pause) probably erm I probably average er twenty.

Fiona Right, great and erm I'll show you a prompt card B. Can you see that prompt card B?

Jane Yes

Fiona Thanks so yeah

Jane OK so number one...

Fiona Right

Jane ...and with regard to XXX (student's name) it's number three.

Fiona Great, thanks very much. Then I'll move onto the next question, erm in which subject areas are the texts erm that you have proofread from?

Jane Erm education (pause) erm well in my I work for a company called XXX (Jane's proofreading company) which you might have heard of it's a big international company on a freelance basis and I read and then I proofread texts from all areas, so I will, I will prioritise texts that are social sciences or education based. Erm I've recently started proofreading erm texts from law erm and er I also do quite a lot of non-academic proofreading as well so er for example psychiatry reports for doctors, medical reports. I've done terms and conditions for companies. Things like that.

Fiona Lovely thanks very much for that and then erm the next question, so I think we've already addressed that it was erm what kinds of texts have you proofread? Erm I'll just show you the prompt card just in case there's anything else erm it's number five but I think you've probably already answered that.

Jane Er so number five so erm all subject areas yeah. I do history, I've even done scientific things erm so yeah all subject areas, disciplines erm there's er a lot of er number five postgraduate MA MSc and assignments, postgrad, number seven postgrad MA MSc dissertations er number eight erm PhD level texts erm of which XXX (student's name) is one of them. Erm and then yeah articles, er book chapters yeah number nine as well.

Fiona Lovely thanks very much erm I'll move onto the next question now. So erm thanks very much for answering the questions about your proofreading background. Erm now I'll show prompt card D and this has excerpts of the student's original text on the left and then it has your proofreader changes on the right erm...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yeah so if a category doesn't have any excerpts it means that you didn't make any changes in that area. Erm so I'll bring up the prompt card again. OK so erm for each category, if you could tell me please why you did or did not make changes and then discuss ethical appropriacy of each one so so can you see erm those Ok the first category's addition?

Jane Yeah

Fiona Yeah so you've just got your, the student's text on the er left and then your change on the right. So if you could just comment on why you made those changes and then the ethical appropriacy.

Jane OK I'll just take a minute to read it.

Fiona Sure

Jane Yes so erm this was about flow of the text and er as a reader at that point erm I needed clarification about what the first FL principle was, a quick reminder for the reader so I added in flexible environment which was the first for clarity for the reader (pause) erm so that's number one erm (pause) the ethical appropriacy I mean erm (pause) in general when I'm proofreading academic work erm I aim to focus on language, cohesion erm and not to change content erm so by adding this erm I think I was improving the cohesion and the clarity of the document and not changing the content that XXX (student's name) had added erm it might be borderline adding in those two words because technical the language was OK without me adding those in erm so it's not a language error it's more than a language error but at the same time I don't think that it does change her content, I think it improves the cohesion, the flow and the clarity so erm I would think that stays within the ethics of the academic world.

Fiona Great

Jane And the second one (pause) so let me just read the second one (pause) yeah so this was about language erm so she needed to have a gerund in that sentence for it to be grammatically correct so I gave her two options she could choose just to give her an idea what needs to go in there.

Fiona Yes and erm I noticed erm something that you were saying in reference to content that the changes you made, they were minor changes cos it was usually just one to five words maximum.

Jane Yeah

Fiona Erm if for instance a proofreader changed six to nine words they'd be meso level changes or ten plus words which would be major level changes. Could you comment on whether you think that'd be ethically appropriate to add those amounts of words?

Jane Erm (pause) I think in principle, it's not about the number of words that you add necessarily, I think it's about your purpose for adding them. So if your purpose for adding them is to make the content of what is already there more readable then I think that's OK if your purpose for adding them is because you think there's some content missing and it needs to be added in then to me that's not ethically appropriate.

Fiona Right so there's the distinction erm between what you're saying in the purpose erm whether it's for instance for the language and then whether you would be erm looking more at the content itself.

Jane Yeah, I think I think my role is about readability of the content that is there rather than adding any additional content.

Fiona OK

Jane So and also you know XXX (student's name) English is fantastic.

Fiona Yes

Jane So it only needs minor changes in terms of language, but I proofread a lot of stuff that is nowhere near this level...

Fiona Right

Jane ...in terms of English language so sometimes you do have to add a little bit more or change a sentence in much more than I have had to with XXX (student's name) so I think it's also to do with the you know with the level with the ESL level of the original writer as well as to how many words you have to change in a sentence often.

Fiona OK erm and then the next section is very similar but it's about deletion so again you have, you've got a couple of examples and then erm just at the bottom here again it's asking you erm you made changes that were minor so one to five words you deleted erm...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yes so similarly to the erm addition ones you know your point of view on deleting six to nine words or ten plus words.

Jane OK let me just read these examples.

Fiona Sure

Jane Yes so the first one obviously 'their own' are redundant erm because er 'independence' you know by its nature is your own so erm that was a question of redundancy er that's why I deleted 'their own' erm again I don't think deleting those in any way changed the content I think it just made it more concise and readable er number two (pause) yeah again so erm the words 'what is referred to as' don't add anything erm they're wordy and er not necessary so again this was this was an area of redundancy and erm I thought it detracted from the sentence actually cos it makes people think well what else might they be referred to or why aren't you using a different term, you know, it's almost like a lack of confidence in putting that in so erm that's why I recommended that she might want to she might want to consider removing it er I didn't just remove this because that's a matter of erm author style so this is another thing you know, this is her style and maybe she wants that in there for a specific reason that I don't know. So I wouldn't just remove anything like that but I would comment on it I thought that it was unnecessary like this one.

Fiona Yes that that's something actually important. I'll needs to add that for my next interviews thanks erm the the first examples in each one, they're from you know the in-text changes that you made?

Jane Yes

Fiona Yeah but I I know that erm the student is is aware of erm the in-text changes (student's name) already told me that you've got...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yeah, you've got a system erm the second examples, they're ones from the comments so from the comments margin so of course XXX (student's name) will have seen that in ...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...the comment's section. I'll just erm add that to my notes actually erm (pause) Yeah thanks very much for that.

Jane I mean when when I proofread on an individual basis like I do with XXX (student's name) here...

Fiona Yes

Jane ...I will agree with her what she wants you know, does she want me to just change things and send her a track changed version or does she prefer comments. XXX (student's name) prefers comments erm...

Fiona Right

Jane ...so that then she is the only one that's really changing her work er when I work for XXX (Jane's proofreading company), the company I work for it's the other way round so for example with XXX (Jane's proofreading company) I would have just deleted 'their own' and perhaps left a comment just to kind of educate the writer a bit erm so I think you know it also depends of who you're working for really as to whether you do more comments or Track changes.

Fiona Right and erm (pause) could you let me know what you think erm if a proofreader were to change or delete six to nine words or also ten words?

Jane Yeah, I think erm the only occasion where I would delete that many words is if it's an obvious repeat of a sentence that has been done in error and I've had that you know, I've really long texts and in the middle of it you suddenly find a paragraph that you're sure you've read before and you

go back and sure enough it's the exact same paragraph and it's just been you know things happen in Word, people copy and paste or think they've copied and pasted one thing and, so if it's an obvious error that then I would delete a whole sentence or even a whole paragraph erm I would always leave a comment to say what I've done erm but I think to delete to delete that much text I would probably only do it if I could see if it's an obvious typo or obvious error.

Fiona Great thanks erm the next er category this is substitution erm so this is when erm the proofreader's replaced erm one to five consecutive words or...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yeah the replacement of the writer's text by one to five new consecutive words so you've just got the two examples here.

Jane OK exploring the, which requires exploration. Yeah so this was just erm it sounded more natural to change the form, the part of speech here erm 'requires exploration of the explicit relationship' rather than 'require exploring' erm everyone understands what exploring means but I think a native speaker would probably write 'exploration of' instead erm and the last one, if done students (pause) yeah (pause) erm (pause) again you know this is something that XXX (student's name) might have had a very specific meaning in mind but just reading it cold as I was 'slid' seemed inappropriate and it's got a negative connotation to it so that's why I suggested something with a more positive connotation 'worked'.

Fiona Right and erm the next category that's erm reordering so this is when words phrases or sentences in the text have been moved so again...

Jane Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yeah you've got a couple of examples.

Jane OK...yeah so the first one is just in the interests of being concise you know one of the features of academic of good academic writing is to be concise so why use three words when you can use two erm (pause) yeah so again 'key role' and 'essential' to me are synonyms so there was a bit of redundancy in this sentence we didn't need to have both of those words in there so again in the interests of being concise erm I made a suggestion that she use an 'essential role'

Fiona Great lovely

Jane I think...

Fiona Yeah

Jane ...one of my, when I proofread a piece of work it's you know it's not just about putting the commas in the right place, I want it to flow and sound as good as it can so erm so that's what these two are about really the originals weren't wrong but it could just sound a little bit better.

Fiona Yes exactly and that's erm something that erm XXX (student's name) commented on as well about you know the commas she wanted a lot more than that and of course you've helped her in many of the areas that she wanted, she said that you know how grateful she is for your help because erm it it's not just things like punctuation it's going into more deeper areas.

Jane Absolutely you know and her English is is better than mine you know she's a she's a very high level speaker so certainly with someone like her I think these are the important things cos she gets the grammar right, she gets the commas right, I mean we all make mistakes, I make mistakes when I write, so you know with XXX (student's name) it's about typos and then this kind of thing.

Fiona Lovely thanks erm the next category this is about erm structural editing so these erm are four examples of different types of structural editing that I'm looking at erm...

Jane Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yeah then I've just got erm for your student's work erm in the right-hand column, you didn't make changes erm in this category but you provided suggestions.

Jane Yeah

Fiona Erm yeah so these suggestions they were regarding the first one of reordering paragraphs.

Jane Yeah

Fiona Yes erm so these are two examples that I've taken erm regarding reordering paragraphs, if you could just have a look at those two please and again if you could comment on them.

Jane OK

Fiona Yeah

Jane Yeah OK so again this is erm you know she's got all the content in that she needs but as a reader some of didn't feel like it was in a logical place.

Fiona Right

Jane Erm so this was about giving more of a logical order to the content that was down there.

Fiona OK

Jane I agree that this is editing and not proofreading erm so you know I mean the two terms anyway are controversial aren't they in terms of what can what is proofreading, what is editing, is there a difference? Er but yeah I think this er definitely falls with structural editing and you know XXX (student's name) a friend and so for me in terms of proofreading this is going the extra mile this is going beyond proofreading into editing. I would never have made those changes for her cos I think if I'd done that that's potentially bordering on collusion or something that's not ethical academically er but I think just to to point it out when it occurs to you like it occurred to me erm I would do for XXX (student's name) in my other work that I do I might make comments like that but I might I might not you know it's definitely beyond the realm of what I'm paid for as a proofreader when I work for XXX (Jane's proofreading company) you know so if we want to make comments like this then they appreciate it but we still don't have to.

Fiona I understand and as you said they were comments, you didn't actually make the changes you brought it to XXX (student's name) attention it's something erm that could be constructive and help her with her writing development.

Jane Yeah exactly

Fiona Yeah erm so then you've got erm other examples here erm the second, third and fourth. Could you just have a look at each one and tell me if you think they are ethically appropriate?

Jane I think number four is definitely ethically appropriate I think that erm comes in with what I what I did earlier in some of the examples we looked at in terms of improving the cohesion and the coherence sometimes so I think you know those signals are for the reader they're not content based

they just help the they just help the reader follow what's going on and I think that's fine as a proofreader erm (pause) number two I definitely wouldn't do with an academic text I would only do that with you know a corporate text but within the realms of academia erm (pause) I couldn't be sure that I wasn't breaking any ethical guidelines there so I personally wouldn't do it for number two. Erm I would do what I've done the examples you've got, I'd leave a comment if something occurred to me that it needed seriously restructuring I would point out that I thought it did and maybe offer a couple of suggestions to help the writer get going on the restructuring but I wouldn't do it for them (pause) erm and number three (pause) again with paragraph breaks I would be more likely to leave a comment and something along the lines of your paragraphing doesn't seem logical here, is this the right place to have a paragraph break or would it be more appropriate at x, y and z? Just to get the the writer thinking and it's also about helping the writer as well cos if you just do it for them then when they come to write the next chapter they're gonna make the same mistakes so I think it's good especially if you're proofreading chapter by chapter that you get the read the writer to think about these things and then learn themselves rather than just doing it for them.

Fiona Exactly

Jane Yeah

Fiona Yes that that's something I've been looking at with my research how much erm to what extent can it be beneficial erm to to their writing development...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...and erm the pedagogical implications.

Jane Exactly, exactly cos you know it's like anything, if I just do it for you, you don't learn to make you think about it...

Fiona Yes

Jane ...and analyse it then er you're more likely to to get it and I might also erm if someone really is having a problem with paragraphing in that comment I might put a link to erm a website that gives help and advice on structuring paragraphs. In fact I haven't done it in XXX (student's name) but in the work that I do for XXX (Jane's proofreading company) in my comments there's lots of links to different academic writing websites or referencing guides to help people to find out more information.

Fiona Brilliant thanks, erm there's there's ten categories all together erm they're not much longer erm this one's about rewriting, you haven't rewritten anything in erm the student's text erm but what it would be if it would be replacing six or more consecutive words of the text with new words or...

Jane Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yeah or it would be replacing words from the text with six or more consecutive new words erm so could you comment on the ethically appropriacy of that?

Jane Erm I think again this comes back to the level of English language of the original writer so (pause) you know sometimes I will have a sentence and I didn't have any in XXX (student's name) work but in erm the students whose English is not great erm you might get a sentence where you know exactly what they want to say but they just haven't used the right words.

Fiona Yes

Jane Erm if I was a hundred percent sure of what they wanted to say but they just got the wrong words then I would be very likely to highlight that string of six or ten words and and make a comment saying 'meaning is unclear here, do you mean...?' and then write out what it is I think they mean...

Fiona Right

Jane ...would be my usual approach when it's a long string of words like that so I might I might potentially give them you know a nice a nicer string of six words to replace their original ones erm I probably wouldn't just change them in the text if it was that many words.

Fiona OK that's great then the next one is quite similar erm because again you didn't do this erm with the student's work but it's recombining so erm for instance, you might have erm combined one or more sentences er to make one...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yeah or divided one sentence into two or more sentences.

Jane Yeah er I think this is ethically appropriate, I think often combining sentences is often in the interests of being concise you know sometimes sentences repeat the same idea er or they're unnecessarily wordy erm so yes I think that's ethically I think as a proofreader I think that's acceptable and likewise you know I do have cases where I've got one incredibly long sentence that loses the reader and I would either divide it into two sentences myself or I would highlight it and leave a comment saying you know I got lost in this sentence, consider breaking it down into two or three shorter sentences.

Fiona Lovely erm then this section is about mechanical alteration so erm in in this case it's when erm formatting or cosmetic changes have been made so they don't affect meaning erm so in the first example erm you've got here it's it's a change of font, I've just highlighted it.

Jane Yeah

Fiona Erm yeah and then the erm scare marks and erm in the second one erm it's about the ampersand.

Jane Mmm-hmm

Fiona Yes so if you could just let me know your thoughts on those please.

Jane Let me just take a second to read that.

Fiona Sure

Jane OK so the first one this comes back to the fact that XXX (student's name) using erm APA referencing and in APA referencing there's very specific use for italics erm which is for example to introduce a key term the first time you introduce a key term or if you're using erm a term from a foreign language so APA's got very specific uses of italics. Now XXX (student's name) put it in italics the word 'chaotic' if that if the key if that was a key term then would be fine but as I read I realised that it wasn't a key term it was just the normal use of the word 'chaotic' er so it's wrong in the APA referencing system here to use that er she obviously wants to distinguish it as being perhaps her word or something a bit unusual and that's why I suggested or put in the scare quotes instead (pause) erm so yeah so that goes back to the style guide the referencing system and the second one (inaudible – participant read the example) yeah so again this is APA erm you'd need to use ampersand in your citations and your references...

Fiona Lovely

Jane ...er so both of those are just making her conform with the style guide she needs to use.

Fiona Yes erm OK then this one is with the meaning erm so it could be erm er correcting words that have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning erm you didn't make any changes in this area erm the was one change erm and it's erm alerting the student to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental so erm actually sorry I should tell this should be meaning and content, not just meaning.

Jane OK

Fiona Yes this is the example it erm about a part of a text that was judgemental and then you just put your comment so if you if you could let me know your thoughts on that too please?

Jane OK (laughs)

Fiona (laughs)

Jane (laughs) knowing (student's name) it's a wonder she only wrote bad.

Fiona Yeah (laughs)

Jane It's very mild actually.

Fiona Yeah we had a laugh about this too.

Jane Yeah OK so this comment here erm where I say although I'm sure it's terrible with a smile, I wouldn't write that to anybody I didn't know as well as I know XXX (student's name) so I wouldn't, I wouldn't write that to you know to to one of the erm students who I'm proofreading for through XXX (Jane's proofreading company) erm but XXX (student's name) and I have been friends for a long time and been to many bad presentations together er so this is a bit of banter with (student's name) really here in the comments but my point was serious.

Fiona Mmm-hmm

Jane I did think that the word bad could have been a bit more diplomatic er I don't know, did I make a suggestion? Oh no I suggested that she just blocked it out yeah.

Fiona Yes exactly cos that's something I've been looking at when I was erm devising my taxonomy to be able to measure the different types of interventions that erm a proofreader could make erm one...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...yes one of them was about erm being judgemental and bias so...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...so erm you know and things like being parochialism you know being narrow-minded and the one I...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...settled on in the end cos there were quite a few descriptors, I settled on judgemental and then when I saw...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...it in the text, I though brilliant (laughs)

Jane (laughs)

Fiona Yes but yeah that's the main thing it's erm yes it is it is something that is important that the er students are aware of where their text could be deemed judgemental and erm...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...it's no longer impartial.

Jane I think so and and whether it's the role of the proofreader or whether it's the role of their academic tutor is debatable er probably strictly speaking as a proofreader it isn't my role to point this out it's probably her academic tutor's role to point this out but academic tutors in general don't scrutinise the text as much proofreaders do so we're more likely to find the little detail erm so yeah yeah that's why that's there again, if it wasn't (student's name) if it was someone you know via XXX (Jane's proofreading company) that I didn't know would I have pointed it out? I think I would have still have pointed it out, I probably would have just written my comment a bit more formally than I have done there.

Fiona (laughs)

Jane (laughs)

Fiona Oh that's great thanks and then this is just this is the last category in this section erm so...

Jane OK

Fiona ...yeah it's about consultation teaching points.

Jane Yeah

Fiona So erm this is where the first one it's about adding more information, so they follow the numbers erm so number two of course this example is number two erm...

Jane OK

Fiona ...yeah

Jane OK (pause) yeah OK all right so I'll just take a minute to read this.

Fiona Sure

Jane So the first one again these are thoughts that I'm having as a reader erm and you know I thought it would be valuable to share them with the writer as they occur to me erm (pause) again you know if someone writes eight approaches then as the reader you expect to see what they are and they don't appear then the text in some way loses its flow erm so I think it is something that should be pointed out if it occurs to you erm (pause) number two (pause) yeah so this is a grammatical issue, adding a suggestion (pause) yeah so here er it's number two erm (pause) this is you know this is the role, this is

the standard role of the proofreader where someone writes the sentences grammatically incorrect it needs to be pointed out erm I didn't try and rewrite that sentence for her because erm I wasn't entirely sure which way she would want to take it and I knew that if it pointed to her that it wasn't grammatically correct XXX (student's name) would instantly realise what needed to be done grammatically to sort it out. If her level of English had been lower I might have said er this is not a full sentence, you might want to say and write out a full sentence as a suggestion erm number three do you have a citation (pause) yeah so she's making she's making a bold claim here and erm you know as as an academic erm it seemed like it needed some academic support which is why I er I wrote that question to her (pause) erm (pause) yeah so the last one (pause) erm this again is about the structure of her text erm it seemed like she was writing something in the place that it didn't fit er so you know although erm although the grammar and language was fine erm it didn't fit in the place that she was writing it and I wouldn't just ignore that I would make a comment for her I wouldn't change it but I would make a comment to point it out.

Fiona Great that's lovely thanks erm so I'll just move onto now the erm text as a whole just to ask you briefly erm we've seen a number of changes there, are there any other parts of the text, I know obviously you can't remember that whole text off the top of your head but is there...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...is there any other part that you would like to comment on that springs to mind that maybe hasn't been mentioned?

Jane No no I think you've picked out some er well I think you've picked out all the really pertinent bits that needed discussing so er yeah there's nothing else.

Fiona Oh lovely thanks erm I'll just onto the last few section, these these ones er are a lot shorter erm so this one is about the type of proofreading request that your current and previous students have asked you to make erm...

Jane OK

Fiona ...yes so could you tell me what type of proofreading requests students usually or generally ask you to make to their texts?

Jane Erm for most of the proofreading I do it's written by erm non-native speakers er and the main thing that they want is correct grammar er better words I get I want better words, I often hear that erm very few of them will ever mention cohesion, flow, coherence maybe cos they're not familiar with what those things are erm but usually it's it's about grammar it's about better flow erm I'll often get requests to for a specific word count er which I will never guarantee, the word count is not my responsibility as a proofreader erm so you know, if someone, if someone says it's three hundred words over then I I might really looking at making it more concise where possible but I would certainly never guarantee that I can bring it down by three hundred words or stick to a certain word limit erm (pause) some students will say erm (pause) make suggestions as to how I can improve the content and I'll always say I can't, that's not my job erm so I'm very clear that I'll I'll look at your language, your punctuation, your grammar, your cohesion erm and really that's where it stops.

Fiona Right and I think actually answers erm the second part of this first question erm do you find such requests to be ethically appropriate but it sounds like you erm give them a clear idea from the outset of what you can and can't do so...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...I imagine yes, you don't get so many ethically in appropriate requests.

Jane I don't and I also I I lose a lot of private work because I'm not what a lot of international students want.

Fiona Right

Jane You know there's a lot of international students that want you to just sort it out for them in terms of content, in terms of structure in terms of everything and I just won't do that, you know that not it's not my job as a proofreader erm and I also make it quite clear to people that I want them to send me their final draft, you know, I'm not here to give suggestions on how to improve the content of your first draft, you know once you've got your final draft sorted out, once you've been to your academic tutor and they're happy with it all you know that's the point where the proofreading comes in.

Fiona Right so you're really looking at it each stage, I think that's something that's really important cos that's something I'm looking at with my research the help that the proofreader can give at each stage of the writing process so you've seen of course the student's first draft and erm you know, made the changes in the Track changes document can you hear me sorry? Can you hear me? Can you hear me? (Due to a connectivity issue, the recording was stopped and had to be restarted)... Yeah there we are yes so erm my next question was how did you manage the situation if the requests were not ethically appropriate but as we've already said, you make it clear from the outset what you will and won't do so I imagine that you don't even have that problem.

Jane I don't and that's why you know the bulk of my work is also through this company XXX (Jane's proofreading company) because they deal with all that...

Fiona Right

Jane ...and they're very clear about what our role is and I actually I like their approach to to the academic proofreading cos not all companies are as ethical as them erm but they're they're very clear and think in the same way as me you know that we, they won't academic work they will only proofread and they won't guarantee a word limit, they won't touch content so erm you know we check references we make sure you're following the right referencing guidelines, we make sure that your grammar's correct and that it reads like a native speaker's written it erm but not not changing content, structure or anything like that.

Fiona Lovely so that's very clear erm and then thanks very much for allowing me to access the email communication between you and your student erm I've noted that you also communicate via er telephone so er would it be to OK to ask how often you communicate by email and phone if you're comfortable asking answering that?

Jane Erm with XXX (student's name) specifically do you mean regarding this?

Fiona Yes thanks

Jane Yeah so erm I mean I've only I think I've only proofread two of her chapters so far you probably you know more than me I can't rem.

Fiona (laughs)

Jane I know I've done the introduction and the literature review, I don't think I've done the methodology yet or have I?

Fiona Right

Jane Erm so for both of those chapters we will have had I would guess one probably one phone call about it and erm (pause) there will have been two or three emails from me probably telling

her off for not using APA referencing guidelines properly and still having double spaces even though I pointed it out last time so there'll have been a couple of...

Fiona (laughs)

Jane ...things like that I would think but that's cos she's a friend you know, she's if she was a paying client it might be a bit different erm but yeah I would I would say with a private client then it would be an initial phone call erm and then one or two emails once I'd had a look at it erm...

Fiona Right

Jane Yeah

Fiona Yeah cos that's you've you've already mentioned when you talked about APA and the other things that that was the next part of my my interview questions just to say if you talked about anything else but I think you've covered it when you said speak on the phone...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...and you you email. Yeah they're the main things you speak about erm and then can I ask again if you're comfortable answering this do you meet up with erm (student's name) or any of your students post erm proofreading?

Jane No, not specifically to discuss the proofreading, I will do it all erm via computer.

Fiona Great OK erm the next section it's about erm the questions erm sorry it's erm questions about your communication with the student's er supervisor it would be in this case er...

Jane Mmm-hmm

Fiona ...yes could again if you feel comfortable answering this could you tell me if you advise lecturers that you have proofread er you have proofread their student's text?

Jane No I don't.

Fiona OK

Jane I expect the student to do that and I know that on many of the PhD courses (student's name) for example the (students' course) that she's doing they were advised by their course director to get their dissertations proofread before they hand it in.

Fiona Right

Jane Erm and I know at that point they had a discussion about proofreaders, XXX (student's name) recommended me to of a couple of other people on it so erm I wouldn't think it's necessary for me to then get in touch and tell lecturers that their work's been proofread I would expect the student really to discuss that with their tutor.

Fiona Right OK erm so OK the next two questions they were in reference to if erm you did have the communication with the erm student's lecturer. I won't be a second sorry (pause) yes so that those two questions are fine. Yeah, we're just onto the last section now it's erm about erm proofreading practices at the XXX (name of the university) erm so could you tell me if you are aware of any information that the XXX (name of the university) provide regarding having a proofreader?

Jane Yes so erm there is a set of guidelines or at least there was last year when I started proofreading erm for XXX (student's name) as a student then, there's a set of guidelines on the university website...

Fiona Right

Jane ...that very clearly expresses the limits er the remit within which students can instruct a proofreader erm and I think it had three or four bullet points erm about making sure that they're focusing on language and grammar erm and it's very clear also about what does constitute plagiarism and collusion.

Fiona Right

Jane So it as all it all on the university's website and I know when I've I've quoted er for a couple of students there, I've er I mean this must be going back probably beginning of 2019 was the last time I did this in the email I would put a note to say that I proofread within the remit of the XXX's (name of the university) guidelines and I've put a link to that website so they can see what they are.

Fiona Oh brilliant if again if you feel comfortable erm with this erm you don't, no obligation to do it, if you wouldn't mind sending me that link...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...erm just so so I could refer to it too just so I know what it is but again only if you're...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...happy to do that

Jane Yeah, no problem, no problem in fact I can probably find you erm would it help if I actually found an email that I sent then you've got the whole thing.

Fiona Oh if you you don't mind that would be really kind of you thanks.

Jane OK let me just erm I'll just do it now while we're talking.

Fiona Oh thanks very much. Yeah cos I had a conversation erm with XXX (student's name) about this and we know one specific website it's the erm it's the erm(pause) which one is it, yeah it's the XXX (University's Study Skills Service) they call it study skills so we we know about that...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ... but I I don't know about the one you're mentioning so that would be lovely if you erm were able to find that link.

Jane Ah here you go, I've got the proofreading policy.

Fiona Oh great

Jane Oh the page request it can no longer be displayed.

Fiona Ah right I thought, I wondered if things have changed erm because erm XXX (student's name) had seen it before and she...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...couldn't find it anymore and I'd not been able to see it at all so erm...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...Yeah I I don't that's what I'm wondering as as the page is not showing now, I'm wondering if maybe they've made the university has made changes.

Jane I think so I mean erm (pause) yeah I'll let me just (pause) is there a chat here I can send it to you? Here we go.

Fiona Yeah

Jane So this was the link.

Fiona Yeah

Jane I've just sent it in the chat...

Fiona That's oh...

Jane ...and you can see it's plagiarism and what constitutes plagiarism and in there it was very specific about what proofreaders can and can't do that, the last time I sent out was erm the 25th January 2019.

Fiona Right

Jane So it's changed some time after that.

Fiona Ah yeah that's why I won't have been able I won't have seen this because this is with SCHARR isn't it?

Jane Yeah

Fiona Right cos I'm in the School of English you see so mine's erm a different department but oh that that's really helpful thank for that cos I wasn't aware of that.

Jane OK you're welcome.

Fiona Thanks erm yeah and then the the last question it's just erm (pause) I won't be a second (pause) yeah it's just erm so currently as I'm sure you're well aware, at many universities not all students, proofreader or lecturers are aware of what is and is not allowed in regard to proofreading practices erm so do you have any advice that you could give to the XXX (name of the university) erm regarding erm information we could provide to all stakeholders about the type of...

Jane Yeah

Fiona Yeah

Jane Well I think put that page back up...

Fiona Yes (laughs)

Jane ...because that was very useful you know it was very clear, there was like four points a proofreader can and can't do.

Fiona Right

Jane Erm and it was useful er I can probably, I've got, I'll have a look afterwards erm I will probably have written them out as well you know in an email to someone so erm I've got all my stuff upstairs on a hard drive, I'll have a look if I've got written them down.

Fiona Oh thanks very much, I really appreciate that if that's OK.

Jane Yeah, I mean the page was never easy to find to be honest because you had to search for plagiarism rather than proofreading.

Fiona Yes

Jane But if you knew it was there erm.

Fiona Yeah this is one of the things that I'm coming across from my research that the guidelines are just not easily accessible so...

Jane No

Fiona ...it's it's very hard for all parties to know...

Jane Mmm

Fiona ...what what the situation is and this this is something that I'm hoping to work on with my research making sure that the erm guidelines are accessible...

Jane Yeah

Fiona ...are easily accessible, yeah.

Jane And they should be you know if the course director of the EdD is recommending that all the students get their dissertations proofread before they hand them in then that should come with er here are our proofreading guidelines you know...

Fiona Exactly

Jane ...so that these students know what to ask for and know and also that they know (pause) that they they don't do anything that's gonna get them in trouble you know it's not just about perhaps the proofreader getting in trouble but it's you know the students, isn't it...

Fiona Yes

Jane ...they need to make sure that they're not gonna get themselves in trouble and undo all their hard work.

Fiona Exactly yeah. Erm I'll just stop the recording now, I won't be a second.

Jane OK

Figure 3 Lecturer Interview Transcript

Fiona OK, I'll start now so thanks very much for attending the interview and as mentioned in the information sheet for my project, I'm aiming to find out what students, proofreaders and lecturers believe are ethically appropriate forms of proofreading erm so for the first part and part two, I'll ask you questions based on the interventions that have and have not been made to a proofread text and whether you think they're ethically appropriate or not then for part three...

Michael Uh-huh

Fiona ...yes, for part three, I'll ask you to discuss your thoughts on students consulting erm proofreading services and for the final part I'll ask you questions about erm proofreading practices at the XXX (name of the university). Erm so for the first part, I'm going to ask you about changes that have or have not been made to a student's text so I'm just gonna bring up a prompt card (pause) OK are you able to see that prompt card? Erm it says prompt card A.

Michael I can see that yeah.

Fiona Oh brilliant, so erm if you could have a look at the first category please. As you can see you've got the student's original text and then the proofreader's version. This is addition so where words, phrases or sentences have been added. So if you could just have a look at the first one what the student wrote and then I've put in bold what the proofreader did. If you could tell me if you think that's ethically acceptable or not please.

Michael OK erm (pause) OK (pause) erm (pause) yeah OK so the first one then erm (pause) erm erm well well I I yeah I mean I suppose (pause) it seems a little bit dodgy for me in terms of ethical appropriateness erm because the proofreader's adding things. Now presumably the proofreader's adding things that are that have been previously included in the student's work but I don't know that at this at this point so I think there's a there's a there's a there's clearly a difference, isn't there? If this flexible environment which is the first FL principle whatever that is (laughs) erm erm has been referred to by the student previously in the essay then there's less of an issue whereas than if it hasn't and if it hasn't then that's definitely ethically suspect I think because I think the I think the proofreader's then adding adding something there that that would that would presumably be something that the student would be being tested on i.e. what are these FL principles and which is the first one for example. If they've referred to it previously then then it's something to do with readability isn't it? Erm and then it seems it still doesn't seem particularly ethically sound but it's less it's less bad than if had not been mentioned before, that's that's my feeling. Erm so erm and the and two the proofreader's suggested so the bit in quotes there erm is erm is oh as well as oh right as erm (pause) so Ridley further explains how this also influences the formulation of RQ as well as a justification for research at the top as well as strengthening providing providing strengthening oh right OK erm yeah I think that's I that's suspect as as as well erm because it's changing the meaning of the sentence, isn't it really? Explains how this influences the formulation of the erm research question erm erm as well as influencing the justification whereas the proofreader's adding erm additional information there so I think that's problematic.

Fiona Right and erm just to let you know as well that the first example that's a change that was made to the text and the second one that was written in the comments section so...

Michael OK

Fiona ...yeah the student had the option of erm well the student had the option of deciding accepting or rejecting for the both of them but the first one it was actually made in the text whereas the second one it was in the comments section in the right-hand margin.

Michael OK so that I mean I suppose in in that case the student has the opportunity to reflect on that, don't they?

Fiona Yes

Michael One (inaudible due to connection issue - possibly 'kind of') situation in which a student sends off an essay to a proofreader or proofreading service they do a Track changes in word and the student accepts all the changes without looking at them whereas there's a difference here, isn't there? Because if the if the and I think that what's you're asking me to reflect on (laughs)...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...erm it's a suggestion then the student has to make a decision about whether that what's they mean so I think if this was just included er and the student could sort of blanket accept it then it would be problematic. If it's a suggestion then I don't think it is such a problem because you know I think students who are at liberty to get input on their work er so I think that's I think that's fine. If it's not it just a change that could be automatically accepted.

Fiona Great and then erm the proofreader they made minor interventions in the area of erm addition so just one to five words erm if a proofreader were to erm add six to nine words they're meso level changes or ten plus they're major level changes erm could you comment on the ethical appropriacy of that please?

Michael Er erm er yeah I suppose there's you've got a cut of point to want to have a cut off point for your analysis I suppose erm and so you can actually operationalise what major and minor might be erm (pause) it it's probably not that clear cut er I I would I would think in reality erm and I suppose if they add they words I think again with this principle that if they add words that are just just added and the student doesn't necessarily need to reflect on them then I think adding words is I think generally problematic erm I would suggest because these are words that the student hasn't written. Now if they make suggestions to add words or change words or whatever in regard to changing things then that's something different I think because the student then has make a decision about whether upon reflection what they've written is appropriate. I think adding any words is perhaps it is problematic I think as far as I'm concerned.

Fiona OK thanks then the next section this is similar but it's erm referring to deletion so again you've got a couple of examples erm the number one that's in-text changes and number is in the comments section and then erm as you can see just at the bottom I distinguished between minor meso and major level changes. These two changes were both minor ones.

Michael Yeah erm so the developing both their own independence and autonomy well I mean it it erm doesn't make sense (laughs).

Fiona (laughs)

Michael So it's not a well-formed sentence, is it? So it these are the sorts of things that are presumably a student would use a proofreader to do essentially to correct grammatical errors these are both grammatical errors erm and and and therefore I think are fine er...

Fiona Mmm

Michael ...erm because in both cases the the it's either not a particularly well formed sentence of it sort of obscures the meaning or it just seems clunky and erm and doesn't read particularly well in the first case the proofreader's deleted something erm that that essentially is ungrammatical and the second the the proofreader's suggesting that they take out something that's superfluous.

Fiona Yes

Michael Er I don't see that as problematic. I think adding words yes, deleting words no erm I think I think there obviously comes a point, I think moving onto your next question where you know I think it where you know a wholesale deletion from an essay then I suppose there is a cut-off point but I think ten words is probably fine.

Fiona Right

Michael I'm ok with deleting things I think erm erm erm and I think I'm OK with what you term as major erm interventions.

Fiona Right OK thank you. Erm we'll move onto the next one now. This is substitution so it's a replacement of one to five consecutive words or the replacement of the writer's text by one to five new consecutive words so erm there's a number of different types of things you can do for substitution, I've just picked two examples, two types so you've got exploring becoming exploration that was in the text and then erm slid erm was it was adjusted to replace it with a new word work and that was in the suggestions so if you could let me know your thoughts on those two please?

Michael Yeah I mean I think again these are I can imagine myself erm(pause)writing a erm erm a comment on a on a erm piece of erm essay feedback that would suggest proofreading your work carefully. I don't, I've never suggested the use of a proofreader...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm myself but I I would probably say make sure you check your work. If I saw somebody writing they've already slid through Bloom's inverted taxonomy, I would say that's not the right word. I'd put a note in the in the text and say you know you wanna consider changing that word and then that would cause me to say that you wanna proofread your work carefully. So if so I'm not I wouldn't be advocating the use of a proofreader...

Fiona Right

Michael ...er in my feedback but I'd be saying these are these are reasons to proofread your work (laughs)...

Fiona Oh

Michael ...and that could therefore be understood if the university allows people to use proofreaders as I should use a proofreader to do to to read my work through to catch things like these slight you know poor word choice or maybe a translation of you know...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...translation error or you know the slightly wrong form of the verb the so these are the sorts of things that I'd pick up on and say (pause) word choice and then they would say then it would cause me in my summative feedback to say you need to check your work more carefully...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...erm and that could therefore be something that that somebody might understand as I should employ a proofreader to do this if the university allows me to do so. So erm I don't have a problem with this erm erm but again I think erm I think the the automatic sort of change is is less ethically acceptable than the suggestion.

Fiona OK thanks erm the next one these are about reordering so this is where words, phrases or sentences in the text have been moved so erm here you've got the first one that was done in text so

discussion among peers becomes peer discussion and then erm the second one the key role erm essential that was erm a suggestion that the proofreader made.

Michael Mmm-hmm OK so this one (pause) erm I mean I think again it's similar to the substitution I think...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm that the the erm the again these sorts of things I think are erm are similar to substitution again the sorts of things that that you might pick up on when commenting on an essay erm I don't, I wouldn't, I wouldn't have a problem with discussion among peers peers really erm play play teachers do play a key role maybe I'd suggesting deleting (laughs)...

Fiona (laughs)

Michael ...erm erm erm yeah I I think it's similar to three actually I think these these are the sorts of things that I imagine a proofreader would do.

Fiona Right

Michael Erm sort of slightly you know slightly reordering words or phrases perhaps substituting a poorly chosen word with another word or you know correcting a erm a verb ending that that these are things that I would imagine a peer a proofreader would do a peer reader (laughs) erm but again the the the suggestions are are more acceptable to me than the sort of automatic change.

Fiona OK erm the next one this is about structural editing so erm there's four different types of structural editing that I'm looking at erm so for this student's work, the proofreader didn't make any changes in the text they just provided suggestions and erm here where you've got one and two these are the two suggestions and they are in accordance with reordering paragraphs to ensure the argument is logically structured erm so could you let me know your thoughts on that please?

Michael OK so on the left this is what they've actually done?

Fiona Yes

Michael On the right these are suggestions. So I think that the...

Fiona Sorry on on yeah the left erm that's the example number one then on on the right can you see where you've got on page nine of the proofread draft?

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah that's that's the first suggestion and then you've got the second suggestion below.

Michael Right yeah OK

Fiona Yeah

Michael Er sorry let me just be quite clear about the...

Fiona Yes sure.

Michael So the so the erm the the left is something that the the oh no right OK yeah OK so so this is the the sort of idea and then this is the actual instantiation on the right.

Fiona That's right exactly yes I'll need to make the clearer. These are the things that could happen numbers one to four.

Michael OK

Fiona Yeah

Michael And only one and two have happened erm and this is how, how they happened yeah.

Fiona That's right and they correspond numbers both numbers one and two to number one the left where it's reordering paragraphs.

Michael Yeah OK

Fiona Yeah

Michael I mean (pause) I think these are suggestions aren't they?

Fiona Yes

Michael And and I think I (pause) again I think if the (pause) these are the sorts of things that I would expect a proofreader might do erm I mean whether the use of proofreaders or not is generally ethically appropriate erm I'm not sure, I kind of don't know but erm the I think if if you're reading a piece of work then and you knew it was you know it was structurally problematic er and again you know these are the sorts of comments that you can imagine you know writing on the summative feedback for for an essay.

Fiona Yes

Michael To think about the structure of your work you know you need to consider you know the logic progression of an argument. Saying that is one thing, actually enacting it is another...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm so so I think to a proofreader saying look at the structure and here are some suggestions, erm I think that's I think that's ethically fine erm I would say because the student then has to do the work.

Fiona Yes

Michael But all of these examples I think I suppose the sort of principal that I'm adhering to here is that that the student has showed their work to somebody else, the somebody else whether they've been paid to do it or not has said why don't you think about doing this or thing about doing that you know you might consider you know perhaps maybe not completely specific you know saying move paragraph three to you know where paragraph five is...

Fiona Right

Michael ...you know you've really talked a lot about this concept here but you haven't defined it earlier on I think that's I think that's ethically OK erm because the student then has to do that and the student has to find the appropriate point to introduce this definition, introduce this idea the student then has to take the feedback understand the feedback and integrate it into their piece or change their piece in order to to apply the feedback so they have they still have to do the work and they're essentially using an aid to help them learn how to do that work erm erm I mean they could always ask their tutor (laughs)...

Fiona Yeah (laughs)

Michael ...they could always ask the module convenor or the seminar convenor or whatever...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...you know to about the structure and present them with the plan or whatever erm but short of that they are actually you know if they're acting on these comments these suggestions then they're presumably learning how to do this...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...and the the point of this is for them to learn (laughs)...

Fiona Yes, exactly.

Michael ...and to demonstrate their learning erm and so I think if proofreading suggestions I think as long if they're general and you know in in no if they're general then I think I think that's fine because the student's got to then interpret that and apply it...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...and learn how to do things better as a result.

Fiona Right

Michael Yeah er and the others erm (pause)yeah I think anything the anything the proofreader's doing automatically is a problem.

Fiona Right

Michael Erm anything a you know anything where a student sends an essay and either gets a new essay back with a load of changes that they don't know that have been made or sends an essay off and gets a load of Track changes that they can just say apply all...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...I think that's problematic.

Fiona Right

Michael I think if something comes back with a load of comments or maybe a student has a conversation with somebody in which they say oh well you might wanna introduce that earlier I think that's that's on the ethical dodginess spectrum the the sort of getting an essay back with everything changed for you is seriously ethically problematic erm getting something back with lots of comments about erm whatever we've talked about earlier I think is somewhere on the ethically dodgy scale but is much less egregious that the other I think.

Fiona OK erm then the next for the next couple of categories there's ten altogether erm rewriting and recombining the proofreader didn't do this to the student's text but erm could you let me know your thoughts on rewriting, that's when you replace six or more words of the text or with recombining it's when you erm join together sentences or divide them.

Michael OK rewriting erm I I I mean mmh it seems similar to sort of examples above but I suppose this six this is more sort of substan substantial.

Fiona Yes

Michael ...of version of number two or three, isn't it?

Fiona Yes, exactly.

Michael Yeah, I (pause) has replaced six or more consecutive words of the text with new words or replaced words from the text with six or more consecutive new words er (pause) oh right right OK erm yeah I think that's problematic erm I think erm I think it would be difficult to know how that would be if we've got my sort of suggestion automatic change er divide it'd be difficult to know how this could be a suggestion (laughs)...

Fiona Right yes (laughs)

Michael ...yeah uh you know I suggest you do this Ok I'll do that then.

Fiona Yes

Michael ...er so I think that's a problem and I think erm I think the recombining erm yeah (pause) I think if it was a suggestion along the lines this is a very long sentence consider splitting it up...

Fiona Yeah

Michael ...I think that's OK if a proofreader sort of automatically does it than that's a problem...

Fiona Right

Michael ...because a student then has to then has to say OK this is a long sentence how how am I gonna split it up into smaller sentences or erm or I've got lots of little sentences and I've how would I combine them into a longer sentence with you know commas or other devices so rewriting bad (laughs)...

Fiona (laughs)

Michael ...recombining erm more acceptable but again in the form of a suggestion erm because the student would have to then actually enact that suggestion and and erm you know if the if the sentence if the sort of section is rewritten out and put as a you know rewritten it's sort of final form and put as a comment then that's a problem erm but if it's a more general sort of comment on the lines of this is a really longer sentence you should consider splitting it up that's OK...

Fiona OK

Michael ...or more OK.

Fiona Sure erm and then the next one is mechanical alteration so the these changes they don't affect meaning it's usually formatting or cosmetic changes so I've just got two examples here erm the first one is in regard to chaotic so as you can see the student had it in italics and then the proofreader's just changed it into normal print and put the erm er quotation marks the er scare marks and then erm the second one this is when erm the proofreader said that and erm needed to be replaced by an ampersand with in line with APA referencing.

Michael Erm yeah OK. I'm just gonna close my door.

Fiona Sure

Michael OK erm so erm (pause) yeah er (pause) er OK this is a this is I'm just trying to work out this specific example. Is chaotic supposed to be a quote here? Is this the...

Fiona Erm what I think the student I think they were trying to emphasise it so erm I think that's why they put it in italics but then erm from from speaking to the proofreader it wasn't a quote it was just trying to underline erm this type of word to bring attention to it in the sentence.

Michael ...er erm...

Fiona Ye

Michael ...that's funny.

Fiona Yes

Michael I don't know, I don't know why in either case they'd want to emphasise it er...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...erm (pause) yeah I don't to that's I need to focus less on the (laughs) less on the specific example and more on the more on erm more on the general...

Fiona That's right yeah it's just it yeah in the case I guess it it's more erm this one actually corresponded to the criteria of erm changing the font and...

Michael Yeah

Fiona ...yes yeah and the size

Michael Yeah I mean I think I mean that could be problematic if if a and proofreader might not necessarily know this erm and you know you could imagine a student maybe being assessed on this very criteria you know, ability to use appropriate academic conventions...

Fiona Right

Michael ...ability to follow a particular style erm you know you could imagine an assessment brief that might that might ask people to do that you know if you're saying you know you're practising writing for a journal for example and a journal has a particular style that says you know in this situation you you do italicise so I think this sort of cosmetic or formatting changes erm I don't know it's er...

Fiona Yeah, I've I've just sorry I've just realised it's in line with the quote you see at the top they've got is it Licht...

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah I think they what they're trying to do is say that this is come a word directly from the author.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Right yeah.

Michael Yeah that's kind of how I'd I mean I if I looked at the version on the left...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...I knew that Licht (2014) had actually said that this looked chaotic and then somebody had put it in italics...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...then I wouldn't put it in a quote and I'd probably mark it as a formatting error erm so erm yeah I mean if this was if this came as a part of general sort of comments about make sure you're formatting things correctly that would be fine again if that's an automatic change then it wouldn't be er again with the erm er the ampersands for the erm citations erm yeah again it could be erm this is a suggestion so it seems fine to me erm but if a student has been told to use a particular referencing style which they are (laughs) in ELL to be honest I don't care what they use as long as it's consistent but they are...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...they use a specific style then erm then they should follow that style but these are comments, aren't they?

Fiona Yes

Michael Er oh no but they said I've replaced and...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...so this is all...

Fiona That's right yeah the first one was a change and then the second one was a comment.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah oh but but yes exactly as you say they have made the decision to replace add in the text and they've just brought it to the student's attention yeah.

Michael Yeah so so I think that's I think if it's a more general comment again I think it's fine if it's not then if it's if it's automatic then it's then it's a problem especially when students will be being told to use a particular referencing style so they they yeah yeah.

Fiona OK erm the next one is about meaning erm so erm it can either be correcting words that have been used incorrectly in terms of their meaning or erm for the case of my research alerting the student to text that could be interpreted as being judgemental. Erm so for this the student erm they referred erm to something in their text they referred to a presentation and erm the student said that this presentation was bad so...

Michael (laughs)

Fiona ...yeah(laughs) so the proofreader made this suggestion and it was yeah it was a suggestion.

Michael If mean if it's a suggestion then that's fine I think generally my rule of thumb seems to be although I hadn't really considered it before this interview, I think my rule of thumb seems to be that er if erm these things are suggestions then they're more OK than if they're sort of erm blanket changes...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...so I think yes I mean a general comment just watch what you say and just think about the possible impact if somebody saw this or the you know how this reflects on you writing this and perhaps think of a better (laughs) perhaps think of a more elegant way to say something was bad.

Fiona Yes

Michael You know these are the sorts of things that that students need to learn how to do so I think that's OK if it's a suggestion.

Fiona OK great and then just the last category for this one so this is when it again a suggestion so I think it echoes what you've already been saying it it's advice to add more information so we've got four categories so simply add more information, add more information and provide a suggestion erm advising the student more information to support a claim and then add more information to provide clarity so if you could just let me know your thoughts on those please?

Michael Yeah I mean again I mean these are the sorts of things that students would get picked up on in er their comments and (pause) I mean I wouldn't necessarily expect but this wouldn't wouldn't then induce me to say proofread your work.

Fiona Right

Michael This would be erm in fact they highlight eight common which characterise FL it may erm cause me to comment on the essay and say what are these eight approaches...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...erm erm so erm the the I wouldn't necessarily, I don't know if I'd necessarily expect a proofreader to do that but I can see a utility in somebody saying that because it's the sort of thing you get picked up erm so add more information and a suggestion was provided erm I mean it seems to me to be on the border of acceptability so this is not a full sentence that would be fine and then you could say that is in incidentally a much more dot dot dot that sort of going close to the edge I think of acceptability...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm for me erm but they don't write the entire erm sentence so the student still has to make something up so I suppose there's my cline there, isn't it? So the sort of acceptable and unacceptable the acceptable for me is this is not a full sentence, think about how to try and make it better. The sort of unacceptable is just replacing with you know with a just rewriting it and just not letting the student think about it and in the middle there is the comment the add more information plus the suggestion which the student could sort of take sort of wholesale so there's I suppose that's it in this example.

Fiona Yeah

Michael Yeah so the proofreader wrote er does he have a citation for this idea, well yeah I think that's erm I think that's probably OK. Sort of thing that would get picked up on in essay comments and would would you know cause summative comments you know like you know you need to work on citations citation and supporting your work or demonstrating your reading around the subject. They're not saying which citation it should be they're not saying who they should cite, they're not suggesting a a format for it they're just saying you you do perhaps need to think about where you're getting this information from...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...so that seems to be OK. Add greater clarity erm (pause) erm (pause) er (pause) yeah er yeah I don't, I don't know erm (inaudible-the participant was reading the prompt card) what's this quote this third pillar explores how low order thinking skills need to be autonomously explored by students before the session, where's that quote from is that quote from the essay?

Fiona Yes that's exactly that's something the student's written.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah

Michael Er (pause)

Fiona Because this one it's from a thesis from an EdD student it's from their literature review so it's quite lengthy as you can imagine and I think they're jumping back and fore between sections.

Michael Mmm-hmm yeah I suppose again it's not you know it's it's more of a general suggestion, isn't it?

Fiona Yes

Michael You know to make it clearer why you're doing this here erm I understood this to be the case from what you've written but you don't seem to be focusing on that erm I think again that it's probably quite a lot of work to put this right (laughs).

Fiona Yes

Michael And I think that's I think that's the point that I'm perhaps coming back to that if the student's doing work to correct the problem then then it's more OK than the proofreader just correcting the issue erm you know this is not a straightforward fix here...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...the student's gotta to do some work and presumably they're learning whilst they're doing that I think that's the key thing, are they learning whilst they're enacting these suggestions and changing these things in these in this way erm yeah.

Fiona Great thanks very much erm I'll just go onto the next questions erm so from those list of interventions, are there any ones any other types where you think ethically appropriate changes could be made?

Michael Erm (pause) er from from these are there...

Fiona Yes any other type of erm interventions that they you may know that you think would be acceptable?

Michael I can't think of any really these this seems to be a relatively exhaustive list well an exhaustive list...

Fiona Yeah

Michael ...to me er again I think it's just the sort of automatic versus erm sort of students enacting of suggestions that that that discrepancy I think is an important one to make.

Fiona Yes erm and I I guess that answers the next question, it was if there was there were any other interventions that we've not already discussed that you don't are ethically appropriate but I think we've we've covered that from our our conversation.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah. OK great so that's the end of the first section, the next erm for part two I'd just like to show you erm the interventions that the proofreader made to three pages of the student's text so you have a sense of the scale of the changes made but if you do wish to see the entire text just erm let me know erm for the first one can you can you see that OK it says...

Michael Yes

Fiona Yes so what I'll do, I'll show you first of all erm the comments and if you could let me know if the amount of inform interventions made to the text are ethically appropriate or not so as as you can see the comments are here in the right-hand margin erm so you've got a couple there.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah I'll just scroll down, these are the first three so that's page one, page two (scrolling down the text) and then this is page three (pause) so altogether you had thirteen comments in the first three pages.

Michael Mmh-hmm

Fiona Yes so if you could just let me know your thoughts on whether you think those that amount of erm that those amounts of changes are OK if they're ethically appropriate or not?

Michael Right so whether this amount, this number of changes is OK erm are they erm are they are these all the changes that have been commented on?

Fiona Right some of them are they're all comments, some of them we've already looked at erm...

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yes for for examples these ones, we haven't looked at like does this need to be a capital L for erm flipped learning.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah and then other ones erm for instance we've already looked at the providing and the strengthening.

Michael Uh-huh

Fiona Yeah it's just to...

Michael Yeah

Fiona ...really it's just to give you an idea of the amount of changes, yeah.

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah

Michael I mean they're quite different I mean just looking at the number of them it seems like a lot but then some of them are erm some of them are they're all different types aren't they so it's difficult to tell just from this...

Fiona Right

Michael ...and whether that's acceptable and I don't know if I'd necessarily want to put a number on it without going through them all and saying er you know cos one of them that one that you've got you mouth, mouse on just now is...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...I love this paragraph and the points you make in it now that's that's not a change, it's not a suggestion, it's just it's just a reassurance for the for the erm the author.

Fiona Yes

Michael ...the student erm and that's quite different to erm erm to erm well the one above it using find and replace just to change everything wholesale.

Fiona Yeah

Michael Erm so that implies that the proofreader done that you know a lot when er it's suited them er and again the one above is this necessary couldn't you just say minorities erm we've seen that...

Fiona Yes exactly.

Michael ...so they're quite different I mean it looks like a lot to me erm and if it continues in this vein across the entire piece then it looks like a lot it looks like the student's received a lot of help erm having said that some of the comments you know are not you know about changes that the student needs to make they're more about reassurance that the student's on the right track or maybe there in there because there's a lot of changes (laughs)

Fiona Right (laughs)

Michael ...but the proofreader's making a lot of changes, suggesting a lot so thinks actually say something good at some point so the student doesn't get demotivated or whatever...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...so they come back and pay me again erm...

Fiona Right (laughs)

Michael ...erm so it seems like a lot to me just looking at on the face of it it seems like a lot. Thinking about it a bit more carefully because they're quite different it's difficult to give a judgment on it erm...

Fiona Right

Michael ...it seems quite high.

Fiona Yes and then this so these ones were the comments erm I had to then to separate because the extensive length of this type of text. I had to separate on this page these were the actually in-text changes so not not in the comments section this is what the proofreader did the student was averted to

these erm changes through the track Track changes document so the proofreader said to the student erm these are all the changes I've made in text but as well as those changes that you've seen on the on this erm PDF you've also got the in-text changes and this is just for the first three pages you've got thirty-one erm types of change erm (pause) most of them most of them are mechanical alterations so more erm superficial type of things cosmetic like punctuation and capitalisation. But altogether you probably get about erm this yeah there's thirty-one changes in the first three pages.

Michael It's a lot it seems. It's a lot.

Fiona Right

Michael Yeah erm I mean again you know erm the the sort of answer I gave to the first part of the interview I think it sort of still stands in terms of in terms of what I think about each type of intervention. Obviously when you see them all sort of stacked up like this, it looks like a lot, doesn't it? It looks like the student's actually had a lot of help (laughs).

Fiona Right

Michael Erm with this and especially as these are things that are simply added that the student doesn't need to think about because I I wouldn't have thought although I don't know and presumably you're gonna speak to students who use proofreaders erm I wouldn't have thought that you know a student writes the draft they get a erm they get a Track changes document back with lots of changes, I would be amazed that, your research could prove me completely wrong, but I would be amazed if any of the students go through line by line and consider whether to accept these changes...

Fiona Right

Michael I would suggest that they will blanket accept them and er never look at the comments (laughs) erm and I and that to me means that sort of no work on the parts of the students in terms of correcting their work and and and very little chance for them to learn from from this process which if it has a role it it should be to help students learn how to write more effectively erm so this looks like a lot of automatic changes even though they are all on the sort of lower end of ethically ethical unacceptable for me.

Fiona Right OK and then erm the next one erm OK these these were instances of non-intervention, so this is where the proofreader erm didn't intervene erm but actually I think I think we'll erm skip that part because I think it covers already what what we've discussed. OK so...

Michael Yeah

Fiona Yeah thanks so that's the end of section so erm for the for parts three and four they're they're not as lengthy so they they shouldn't take we shouldn't take much longer. Erm so for part three it's about students consulting proofreading services. So could I ask you well I think you've already said this, you you don't advise your students to use proofreading do you?

Michael No I mean I (pause) I might say you know a student might say (pause)oh I've shown it to my (pause) you know in the course of a student consultation might say I've shown my work to a classmate or actually over the you know over the past year I've shown my work to my mum (laughs) cos everyone's...

Fiona (laughs)

Michael ...or whatever, so I don't see a problem with that you know so long as the student's thinking about their and and how to improve their work and their expression and whatever erm but I I

haven't, I haven't students to use a proofreading service and erm (pause) that's partially because I don't know what the university policy is.

Fiona Right

Michael Er and partially because I do think it's perhaps ethically dodgy and I suppose the you know the reason why it might be ethically dodgy is because you know a proofreader could do these changes without having the student's input into them and the students might therefore not be presenting their own work on the more serious end of things erm...

Fiona Right

Michael ...er I and and also a student could be wasting their money erm by employing a proofreader especially if there's a whole load of non-interventions erm that that the proofreader has failed to spot errors and issues erm you know or perhaps even worse has introduced errors into the...

Fiona Right

Michael ...document so I think students pay enough erm and erm I think we have you know we have the XXX (University's Writing Centre) and we have you know we have the ability to you know as tutors we can't look at drafts but we can look at plans so we can look at the structural stuff. I'm always happy with my students my personal tutees and offer this regularly the opportunity to go back over work that they've submitted look at marks and feedback and try and find common themes and and help students to do that. So from my point of view I kind of feel like we have that that students have a level of support within the university and and very often have informal support networks that they could use er to look over their work and to check it for sort of sense and style and punctuation and grammar and stuff like that erm erm and for those reasons as well not ever being clear on what the university's policy is about proofreaders I've never recommended er one.

Fiona Right and I think I think what you've said, I think that covers the second and third questions erm I'm just gonna go back to the erm prompt cards erm it says for the er question 3.2 it says what extent you agree that students should be allowed to consult erm professional proofreading services and then non-professional erm proofreaders and then as you've already erm mentioned, to what extent do you agree that students would benefit from consulting a professional proofreader or a non-professional erm so we've got a scale here I mean you know you've touched on it already well you've spoken about it already in depth, if you could for each one one and two for each question, if could erm indicate how strongly you agree or disagree please?

Michael OK so 3.2 i or 3.2 one (inaudible - participant read the prompt card) I disagree that they should be allowed to consult one erm for the reasons that I talked about

Fiona Yes

Michael ...non-professional proofreaders yeah I think they should be allowed to show their work to people and see if they can improve on it so I think I'd probably agree with that so two. Erm 3.3 er would they benefit from consulting professional proofreading services well (pause) it it depends what you mean by benefit, doesn't it? I I you know if a student presents and especially a non-native speaker of English and I speak as somebody who speaks English (pause) and maybe not very well erm you know I I I'm only able to write and speak and understand English and so I can't imagine the erm level of er er of difficulty that is involved in studying a a subject that even that even that you're familiar with and then...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...writing that in a in a language that is not your native language. I obviously know that students have come to study with us have a certain level of IELTS qualification. I obviously understand that they've got a they've had a test but that's certainly very difficult now (pause) so I I think I think they would benefit in terms of their mark I suspect by using a professional proofreading service and certainly lots of students that I have taught probably would have benefitted in terms of their mark in terms of by using a professional proofreading service. So if the mark is the only important thing which it isn't (laughs) then I probably that they would benefit from consulting a professional proofreading service but I don't think the mark is the pointer I actually think the learning is the point...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...and for me it's it's about student's learning, learning about the subject but also learning how to express themselves well...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm in a written text and that is a skill and it's a skill that I am OK at but I'm still learning and developing and I do that by (pause) you know by at university I did that by getting feedback at PhD level I did that obviously by getting feedback on draft submissions and...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...now I get it by erm getting (laughs) sending things for peer-review and and people telling me what I've written it doesn't make sense and that a difficult it's a difficult erm thing to undergo...

Fiona Right

Michael ...but it's a learning process so I so in terms of the the benefit in terms of what they learn and how they learn then I disagree that they would benefit from consulting a professional proofreading services because if these if if such services will simply blanket change the work without the student's input their not learning anything and therefore they're not they're not they're not benefitting from it but the...

Fiona Right

Michael ...mark which is perhaps something that's more important in the moment to students will probably improve but if if if you know the you know an essay was wholesale change but then it's a bit of a slippery slope, isn't it? They would also benefit from some students would also benefit from somebody else writing their essay.

Fiona Right (laughs)

Michael In terms of their mark you know but they've not learned anything and I think it's the same point.

Fiona Yes

Michael That if things have just been changed without the input from the students then I don't think they're benefitting in the wider, we want them to benefit at university er even if their mark does increase so I'm gonna say disagree but but obviously acknowledging that that for some students a professional proofreading service would improve their mark and therefore their their mark would benefit so that it's not perhaps as straightforward answer.

Fiona That's brilliant. It's really in depth.

Michael Erm yeah and and the same goes for non-professional proofreading proofreaders I mean non-professional proofreaders such a on a on coursemate, friends and family that conversation is presumably gonna be much more two way you know much more of a you know would you have a look at this for me. The person's feels under some obligation but you know there can be a conversation about it and and you know I don't think any of those those those people are likely to just wholesale change something...

Fiona Right

Michael ...because the (inaudible - possibly 'relationship') that they'd have with the students and and therefore you know things would be likely to be much more likely to be suggestions, comments, have you thought about that? I really didn't understand that could bit you need to explain it a bit more. I've heard on my course that if you don't cite things you know it's a problem so I think that perhaps you need to you know those sorts of conversations are much likely are more likely to happen I think with...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...with (inaudible - possibly 'non-professional') proofreaders than they are with professional proofreading services where they say you need to cite here.

Fiona Yes

Michael So I think I think (pause) in terms of non-professional proofreading services I probably go up to a 3 maybe a 2.5 that they perhaps agree perhaps benefit from that both their mark and their learning erm...

Fiona Right

Michael ...and (inaudible - possibly 'would benefit')

Fiona Great thank you erm and erm for the and one prompt card erm so you've got the question it says could you tell me which of the terms below best describes the type of help that students should seek if they do procure erm third-party help so if you could let one which you think is the best erm description please.

Michael Er er (pause) what what what it should it be called?

Fiona Yes which ones so yes exactly so if you would advising erm your students to have proofreading help would you want them to for instance to looking at the erm editing aspects like for example structural and editing or would you erm prefer for instance like number two for the proofreader to check for errors erm or would you like number six would you prefer the student has more of a tutorial rather just rather than just having their work proofread?

Michael Yeah I think six I think six I mean we do refer students to the XXX (University's Writing Centre) so it's...

Fiona Right

Michael ...at the university so yeah I think that's you know a tutorial on writing and and and how to do that and how to construct an academic piece of work erm that that that maybe it's tailored to a particular piece of work but would be you know there'd be you know there'd be more general learning there. I think it it's the point I'm making about learning to do this. It's not a something that come

necessarily straight forwardly to everybody especially when not working in your native language I imagine erm but I think so you need to learn...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...and I think simply by having things corrected erm in a piece of work that's relatively high stakes because it's part of your degree...

Fiona Ye

Michael ...I think much better to get some tutorials on writing so you you know how to do that better from the start erm so yeah six I think.

Fiona OK great thanks very much. I'll I'll stop sharing that a second erm and then just the last few erm questions erm (pause) so erm I I think you've already answered this one it's have you ever oh no sorry have you ever been advised by a proofreader erm that a student has erm used their services and if so erm if you've been advised about the amount erm changes that were made to the student's text?

Michael No I'm sure my students have used proofreaders but I've no no proof no no student's ever told me and no proofreader's ever told me.

Fiona Right yes and then again we've touched on the next question do you think it's a good idea for students to always use a proofreader?

Michael Erm no not necessarily I think it's always a good idea for students to proofread their work but that's not the same thing.

Fiona Right

Michael I mean (pause) it's difficult isn't it because you know when you're writing academic articles (pause) you know (pause) what I will say PhD students is you know write the write the piece show it to me show it to your other supervisor but show it to some critical friends as well you know show show it to other people.

Fiona Yeah

Michael ...er it will help er now these people that you show it to, your friends you know your fellow PhD students from other universities or perhaps from your own university so I know we're not necessarily talking about PhD students here but it it seems you know it seems a bit disingenuous to say erm that to PhD students but not to undergraduate or Master's students.

Fiona Right

Michael You know because it does. I mean so I think that I wouldn't advise all students to use a proofreading service. If a student was struggling or had struggled or came to me and said I'm taking your module erm but I've been really rubbish at essays in the past and I see you've got an essay for 60 per cent or whatever then I would say to them right well let's, I would say to them in the first instance well let's meet and let's plan it together you know for the modules that well for the second year module that I have that's got an essay in it and I have these are undergraduate students but I've got two essay planning individual meetings with the students so we go through and we look at the content we've covered we look at the topic they're gonna look at and we work on the essay and the plan. So if a student came to me and said I've got particular problems with essays then I would say well let's meet let's plan you know let's see what you've got erm in in terms of how you're gonna structure things and who you're you know what what you're gonna look at and and who you're gonna cite bring me to you know to a full plan and then I may very well say to that student OK so if especially if that student had issues with

spelling with grammar with you know with phrasing with word choice I'd say well it might be a good idea to you know to show the work to somebody before you submit it you know or to give yourself a good few days before finishing you know between finishing it and submitting it. So I think I would always say it in in that case that to students to to proofread and if they felt that they couldn't to perhaps show it to somebody else but I wouldn't advise them to use a professional proofreading service for the reasons that I've I've talked about so not for every student, if a student came to me with particular difficulties, if they had particular problems I might suggest that they don't just keep the work to themselves that they use my input to help plan it and then perhaps show it to somebody else to spot those errors that they aren't picking up on themselves.

Fiona Great thanks very much and the last erm section this just about proofreading practices at the University of Sheffield, it's only a couple more minutes erm I think again we've already mentioned this it's if you are aware of any information that the XXX (name of the university) provides regarding having a proofreader?

Michael No (laughs) I probably should be I probably er and if you are you'll let me know.

Fiona (laughs)

Michael I probably should be I probably er and if you are you'll let me know.

Fiona Yes (laughs) this is the thing that I'm looking at in my research because it is a a major issue across all universities, the students, proofreaders and lecturers they're they're not being made aware of the guidelines so this is something I'm hoping to...

Michael Yeah

Fiona ...erm yes.

Michael And when I worked at I worked at XXX (name of another university) before...

Fiona Right

Michael ...I wasn't (internet connection was interrupted - possibly 'aware') there either and so

Fiona Yeah

Michael ...yeah I've never been aware of of what there is, I'll Google, I'll have a look on the website when we've finished the interview (laughs)

Fiona Yes (laughs) I can send you think link if you like I can put it in the chat box.

Michael Yes put it in the chat cos I'd be interested.

Fiona Yes this this is what they've got. It's you know the XXX (University's Study Skills Service)?

Michael Yes yeah yeah.

Fiona Yeah I'll just pop that in that should come through.

Michael And I refer people to XXX (University's Study Skills Service) so...

Fiona Yes

Michael ...so er (pause) uh...

Fiona Yeah cos it's erm I'll just bring it up myself as well yes this is what they provide so erm they've got proofreading and they provide two videos so it's more erm they're it's more informative for the erm students and then if you just scroll further down it gives advice proof paid proofreading services.

Michael ...with a bit caution sign, yeah I can see (laughs).

Fiona That's right (laughs) but up there's er there's no such there's not really a policy as such at the moment...

Michael Yeah so I mean

Fiona ...or guidelines so to speak.

Michael ...it's relatively reassuring to know that that what I've been telling students is in line with what the university's policy is i.e....

Fiona Yes

Michael ...to finish your draft put it away for a bit, get it out you know give yourself a couple of days and then go back and do it and go back and do your proofreading...

Fiona Yeah

Michael ...erm and yeah and and there's you know there's other things there erm yeah OK right.

Fiona Oh great and then...

Michael Yeah OK.

Fiona ...yeah I think I think probably we've already answered erm the next question it's just if you've received any university directives or training about proofreading practices but based on what you've told me...

Michael Clearly not (laughs)

Fiona ...(laughs) oh that's great and then the last question so erm as as as we've just mentioned many universities at many universities not all students, proofreaders or lecturers are aware of what is or is not allowed in regard to proofreading practices so is there any advice that you could provide to the XXX (name of the university) to advise all type of stakeholders of the type of help that a student can receive with their writing?

Michael Well I mean looking at the website that you just sent, I mean there's clearly a grey area isn't there erm and the obviously you know the conversation that we've had is exploring that grey area, isn't it?

Fiona Yes

Michael There's clearly a line of acceptability isn't there between you know things between things that are OK and things that are that are that are ethically poor erm and so I suppose, I suppose your research is gonna be quite important in this respect erm I mean I think in terms of I think my my red lines would would be that that the students must enact any changes that are suggestions that any changes that are made must be suggested and that erm and that it may be I mean I don't know how you'd enforce this but it might be you know I don't know if you I I don't know if a university policy you know

could be developed around proofreading and we're under the assumption that you know proofreaders are widely used you know maybe there needs to be a dual submission of work erm you know with a you know proofreading if it's gonna happen should be sort you know a final draft erm erm proofreading should be suggestions only and that that erm you know students submit both versions so you could check you know to make sure that there wasn't a problem, I mean that would be a problem for Turnitin cos it would (laughs) it would count both versions and you'd have a hundred percent in both but and you know the students have a declaration to say their work's their own erm you know that that maybe students need to you know have another declaration to say that to say whether they've used a proofreader or not...

Fiona Right

Michael ...erm erm it's it's difficult to enforce a policy isn't it erm I would suggest erm and erm I think you know only a tiny minority of students are gonna be well may be not but I suppose a there's probably a minority who use proofreaders who use proofreaders who change such a lot of the essay for it to become seriously ethically problematic but I suppose we don't know we don't know if this is a problem or the extent of the problem if it is one so I don't know I just rambled for like five minutes on this so I don't know if there's a particular recommendation I could make really erm other than to say that that that my clearly my view is although I hadn't really considered it before this interview clearly in my view is that that suggestions are much more ethically acceptable than than changes erm and er that that's my line and the point and but then I don't necessarily have a problem with I don't necessarily have a problem with that so long as the students are learning how to become better writers as a result of it so it's not all about the grade, it's not all about changing everything so you just get a better grade er it's more about actually learning and learning a skill of writing erm erm that than than anything else yeah.

Fiona Yes

Michael Erm maybe a policy suggestion but there we are.

Fiona Yes oh that's brilliant and if if I'll just stop the recording a second, I won't be a minute.