



Available online at <http://jgu.garmian.edu.krd>



Journal of University of Garmian

<https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.2070324>

Investigating Editing and Proofreading Strategies used by Koya University Lecturers

Paiman Zorab Azeez

Dept. English, Faculty of Education, Koya University

Article Info

Received: June, 2020

Revised: June, 2020

Accepted: June, 2020

Keywords

Investigate, editing, proofreading,
strategies, Koya University

Corresponding Author

paiman.zorab@koyauniversity.org

Abstract

Editing and proofreading a piece of writing can help make meaning clear, and clarity makes it easier to understand. While editing involves changing and correcting content and syntax, proofreading involves making only minor changes, additions, or deletions to a document in order to find and mark mistakes that need to be corrected. Some of the editing strategies are editing papers alone, with a partner, expecting others to edit your paper, using computer programs and self-editing checklist. The proofreading strategies include using self/peer reading aloud and the computer spellchecking software. The current paper aims at investigating the editing and proofreading strategies used by Koya University lecturers when reading through written documents and comparing English and non-English instructors in using those strategies. This study tries to find answers to these research questions: What are the editing and proofreading strategies used by Koya university lecturers? What is the difference between teachers whose specialty is English and those of non-English? To this end, the researcher administered and distributed a questionnaire of Five Point Likert Scale which composed of the participants' demography, editing, and proofreading strategies and sent it to all Koya University lecturers at all departments. The results demonstrated that Koya University lecturers use almost all of the editing strategies and all are in favor of using the strategy of editing by themselves rather than with others. The proofreading strategies are less used but all lecturers use self-proofreading strategy. The study concludes that all Koya University teaching staff regardless of being specialized in English and non-English are not that much familiar with different types of editing and proofreading strategies.

1. Introduction to Editing

Editing, according to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Hornby, 2000, 369), is preparing a piece of writing for publishing by correcting, commenting and removing some parts on it for others. It comprises of changes and corrections on content and syntax (Gilad, 2007).

Editing is an English word that is related to "copious" from the Latin root that means *plenty* or *abundance* (Gilad, 2007: 46). In Germany, late fifteenth century, was the time printing replaced script. Editors have been given more eminence in the sixteenth century than they had ever had or would have again in the history of editing. Editorial abuses were widespread in 1546. For instance, Francesco Doni's statement about the way editors work on writings was "one editor corrects in one way and another otherwise, some delete, some insert, some flay [the text] and others damage its hide [Beware of] stubborn editors, because they don't follow what is written but carry on in their own way." (Bell, 2007: 188) The end of the 1530 was the time when works of authors were getting published, and those authors had to figure out how to treat writers not only writings. The question, though, was who controlled a book-the person who wrote it or the one who made it possible for people to carry it around and read it at their leisure?

Many companies market editing software to assist writers make their works look perfect. Similar to other computer-assisted strategies, editing programs simply highlight possible problems; yet, do not correct for the writer (Šunková, 2011). Occasionally the software is programmed to suggest some changes, but students need to be aware to question this advice and make rhetorical decisions. For instance, the software may indicate "passive voice." Because active voice is usually clearer, more direct, so, writers are to consider revising the sentence,

using an active verb; however, since passive voice is sometimes preferable in a given sentence, the writer must decide. Warning students that, occasionally, the software will indicate "passive voice" when the sentence is not passive: For example: The spice *is seasoned* salt (Madraso, 1993: 41).

1.2 Types of Editing

Types of editing are divided under two categories which are the ongoing and the draft edits. To begin with the ongoing edit, it means, editing and writing simultaneously. Making consistent changes when changing a word in a sentence, writing three more sentences, then back up a clause to change the semicolon to a dash; or while editing a sentence, a new idea all of a sudden touches your mind to substitute a word until the moment nothing else was needed (Bell, 2007: 44-45).

Secondly, the draft edit is when the writer stops writing, gathers a number of pages, reads them, makes notes on what works and what does not, and then rewrites it (ibid).

Finally, the two more types of editing are *macro and micro editing* (Bell, 2007). While the macro editing involves intention, structure, and theme; the micro editing comprises language, repetition, redundancy, and clarity.

2. Introduction to Proofreading

In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Hornby, 2000, 928) proofreading is defined as reading and correcting a piece of written or printed work. It includes making only minor changes, additions, or deletions to a document, rather than major rewriting. Some skills and knowledge in areas of proofreading are spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc. (Gilad, 2007: 24-25).

The term *proofreader* originated in the printing industry, where one or more individuals were hired strictly to check for typographical errors on *proofs*, or the first runs of printed copy. It was, and still is, a critical job in the printing process (May, 1997). Thus, mistakes not corrected at this stage can be costly (Gilad, 2007: 29). Proofreading stems back to the fifteenth century. It is about as old as printing itself. With the invention of modern movable printer, which takes place in Strasburg, Germany, in 1439 A.D. by Johannes Gutenberg, authors should have taken responsibility for proofreading (Abby, 2017). As a matter of fact, proofreading methods employed today are enormously different from the forms in the past (ibid).

The dictionary explanation of proofreading is while someone proofreads something such as a book or an article, he/she reads it prior to its publication so that finding and marking mistakes that needs to be corrected (Chang, Chang, & Hsu, 2009: 25). Proofreading is for sure a reading skill. However, involving different skills from reading, it “involves a deliberate effort to counteract the ‘normal’ process of reading.” (Harris, 1987: 464)

The question comes up here is are people really aware of the process of proofreading and are conscious of the strategies writers ever employ to proofread? Proofreading seems to be a necessary skill that is much talked about but rarely taught (Hall, 1984). Unfortunately, teaching of spelling or mechanics does not guarantee proofreading ability (West, 1983). They [the students] simply read their writing as they would read anything else-and think that they have proofread. It is not surprising, then, that simple reading is not an effective proofreading strategy (Madraso, 1993: 32). Proofreading is thus said to facilitate

spelling development (Chang, Chang, & Hsu, 2009: 27).

Is it right or wrong that proofreading is simply looking over a document before sending it or sending it out? Most of us naturally glance back over what we have written to check for accuracy. But rereading is not proofreading. Proofreading means making sure no errors get through (Gilad, 2007: 21). But proofreading any written document requires more than just glancing it over before sending it out (or worse, mass producing it) (May, 1997). Proofreading is tedious and requires uninterrupted concentration (ibid, 9). Proofreading can help you catch and correct every potentially embarrassing, troublesome, or costly error (May, 1997). It is a challenge for most of us, and so few of us really know how to do it. Therefore, proofreading offers knowing: What to look for, when to look for it and how to look for it and handle what you find.

Proofreading is simply careful reading. As you review every word, sentence, and paragraph, you will find errors (Smith, 2003). When you locate them, you can use proofreading symbols to shorten the amount of time you spend editing. It is an excellent idea to become familiar with these symbols. Of course, in order to find errors, you must know what they are. Read on to discover the culprits that can sabotage a good piece of writing (ibid).

2.1 Types of Proofreading

2.1.1 Direct proofreading

Most of the proofreading time will probably take the form of direct proofreading-working alone and with only one document. The experts agree on the following points:
-Proofreading quickly and well is virtually impossible. To proofread most effectively, read slowly and deliberately.

-Catching everything requires proofreading in several stages, typically focusing on particular aspects of the writing at each stage.

-Proofreading your own work is difficult because you are likely to see what you meant to write as opposed to what is actually on the paper. Always allow time between editing and proofreading (May, 1997).

-Proofreading on a paper copy may be inconvenient, but you will catch more, more quickly, and with less effort. Editors and writers summed up most experts' sentiments: "I will catch errors on paper that I will *never* catch on screen."

-Using the computer spell-check feature before you start can help save you a lot time.

-Using computerized grammar checkers are generally not helpful. Even documents considered well-written by most people qualify as poorly written if we are to trust the judgment of most grammar-checking software currently available (Gilad, 2007: 26).

2.1.2 Partner Proofreading

Partner proofreading is also an option. In partner proofreading, one person reads from the corrected document, punctuation and all, and the other person makes corrections on a second document or on computer. Partner proofreading does take extra manpower, but it may well be worth the effort. Two people tend to catch errors faster, and the proofreading becomes less tedious. Using either one or two copies of a document by both partner proofreading and partner editing are extremely valuable. Reading your own work aloud for another's critique helps you both hear problems in the writing (such as a negative tone, repetitiveness, poor word choice) that may not be apparent on the printed page. In the same way, when drafting a document, expressing your ideas

out loud can help you develop them into coherent thoughts (Gilad, 2007: 27).

3. Proofreading difficulties

Deficiencies in proofreading skills are usually due to a lack of instruction rather than "carelessness, laziness, lack of motivation, dishonesty-or even mediocre verbal skills" (West, 1983: 286). The other difficulties could be difficulties of texts, comprehension; text style and text familiarities and un-familiarities (Bell, 2008). Some other problems with proofreading are stylistic, spelling and typos, homophones and passive voice, nominalization, sentence structure, fragments, comma splices, and run-ons. However, owe to the time refrains, some of them are going to be explained (Madraso, 1993).

Proofreading for style can focus on many more areas than most writers have time to address specifically. However, periodically reviewing stylistic issues increases writers' awareness of potential problem (ibid, 34).

The most useful strategy for detecting spelling and typographical errors requires reading backwards word by word, either reading the lines right to left or beginning with the last word of the piece and reading in reverse order to the very first word. Although reading backwards can be effective for short pieces, it is very time-consuming, and it does not catch homophone errors or mistakes that spell other words such as quit/quite/quiet (Shaughnessy, 1977, as cited in Madraso, 1993: 36).

Homophone errors are not detected by either reading backwards or using a computer's spell-check program (Madraso, 1993: 37). Instead, writers can skim their papers looking for homophones, a process similar to skimming for problem spelling patterns. Writers are encouraged to circle

homophones in their sentences. Then, they can stop to check the appropriateness of their word choice based on the meaning of the word in the sentence. Although numerous words fit into the homophone category, writers have to focus on the most common errors which involve frequently used homophones: there/their/they're, to/too/two, its/it's, and whose/who's. Once the writers have learned the strategy for correcting homophones, they can add any other homophone groups they misuse to the list (ibid).

4. Differences between proofreading and editing

Proofreading and editing can help make your meaning clear, and clarity makes your piece easier to understand (Smith, 2003). Not only is the proofreader's job different in scope than the copyeditor's, but it also occurs at a different stage of the production process (Anderson, 1994: 114).

Proofreading and editing require two fundamentally different conceptual processes (May, 1997). Editing is a process of analyzing and resynthesizing conceptual chunks of information into coherent and effectively expressed ideas. Editing goals are clarifying, strengthening and condensing the message. However, its ultimate goal is to form a coherent and meaningful whole. It requires viewing the forest, not the trees (May, 1997). It involves a lot more effort and skill; since it involves altering and correcting content and syntax (Abby, 2017). <https://blog.papertrue.com/the-history-of-proofreading/>

Proofreading, on the other hand, requires viewing the trees, the branches, the leaves, and even the bugs on the leaves. It requires repeatedly separating the components of language from any meaning so the brain does not insist on allowing us to see what

we want to see. It is the last task in pulling together any meaningful and error-free piece of writing. The trick, however, is tackling this last stage in the writing process as efficiently as possible.

Copyeditors analyze, process, and transform copy into intelligible, easy-to-understand prose. They look at the big picture. They ask questions like "What's the author trying to say?" and "How will the reader best understand him?" It is a common error to think editing simply means to replace poorly written phrases with new, better-turned ones (Gilad, 2007: 64).

Proofreaders pore over every last letter and shred of punctuation to hammer the copy into error-free perfection (Gilad, 112). They check for many of the same things copyeditors do; but they put an extra emphasis on catching the kinds of errors others are likely to miss (ibid).

For many of us, it may be that we have never been clear about how to proofread effectively and we are not confident checking our own grammar and punctuation. Failing to proofread effectively means at least a little embarrassment for the writer (ibid, 14). Proofreading requires intense, focused concentration, requires extreme attention to detail, persistence to keep focused on information that may not be the most interesting or entertaining. It may feel like a roadblock to getting important things done quickly (ibid, 22).

It is argued that proofreading follows editing. The writers should spend at least 50 percent of their total writing time rewriting or editing the document. Editing is the writing task immediately preceding proofreading that attempts to ensure that the writer's fundamental message comes across as effectively as possible. It generally requires rewriting bits and pieces, and perhaps major sections of a document typically with the following goals in mind:

-Clarity of thought,

- Attention to the reader's needs,
- Clear expression of the document's purpose,
- Accuracy of information,
- Appropriateness of tone,
- Effective use of language (word choice), and
- Conciseness (ibid, 24)

But copyeditors step deeper into the intricacies of voice and language, plot and argument, and they maintain grammatical and tonal consistency (ibid, 46).

Proofreading, on the other hand, involves making only minor changes, additions, or deletions to a document, but no major rewriting. You would be well-served when proofreading to have developed skills and knowledge in these areas:

- Spelling,
- Punctuation,
- Capitalization,
- Typographical errors,
- Correct and consistent use of language,
- Adherence to an established style and format, and
- Professional appearance (ibid, 24-25).

5. Proofreading strategies

Some strategies have been introduced, including using the computer spellchecking software and self/peer reading aloud writings. As Eschweiler (1998) pointed out, computer spellchecking software does help a lot but it should not be a substitute for the human eye. Oral proofreading is being the most general and useful proofreading strategy.

5.1 Peer read-aloud

Have a proofreading partner read aloud your writing. After you work on a piece of writing for days, or even weeks, months, it could be difficult to distance yourself from the writing and come back to check it objectively. We are so familiar with what we

wrote that “we tend to see what we intended to write rather than what is actually on the printed page.” (Bruck, 1997: 578) Proofreading partners can only read exactly what is on the page. Errors; thus, become obvious when the proofreading partner catches some “strange feelings” in his/her read-aloud voice.

While listening to a colleague read, the writer pays close attention, noting the sections that give the reader difficulty. Sometimes those difficulties are caused by poor reading; more often they signal problems with the text: Sentence-structure, spelling, and mechanical problems (Madraso, 1993: 33).

5.2 Self-read-aloud

Having a proofreading partner is ideal but might not be always possible. Reading our own work might not be ideal but it can be done with caution and care. Eschweiler (1998) reported that teachers working with adult students in remedial writing courses found 60 percent of the grammatical errors/typos could be caught by these adult students when they read aloud their own writing. According to Eschweiler, when reading aloud, the writer should make sure the thoughts and the word combinations flow smoothly, check for redundancies, overuse of particular words or phrases, and sentences that could be misinterpreted by someone not familiar with the topic.

As students read aloud, they mark words or sentences or sections that give them difficulty, sections that they question, and to alert the writers to potential problems. The writers can then correct problems caused by oversight and verify or change other questionable areas (Madraso, 1993: 33)

In addition, some other tips are suggested and four of them are *Touch*, *Proof on Paper*, *Pace Yourself* and *Use the Handy Card*

Method. And also, alternative strategy has been suggested (Madraso, 1993: 33-34). Using a finger or pencil to point to each word and mark of punctuation can increase the effectiveness of silent reading during testing situations when sub-vocalization might be misconstrued as talking or sharing answers.

Kemper, *et al* (2002) suggested that young writers touch each word with their pencil and underline words that may be misspelled. Bruck (1997) explained that proofreading the printout of a piece of writing is more effective than trying to proof off the computer screen because you proofread contextually (versus a screen at a time) and you can circle words, punctuation, numbers, etc. for checking later. Besides, instead of proofreading the whole piece, you can proofread a couple of pages or sections at one time. You allow yourself to take breaks to clear your mind and refresh yourself to avoid missing simple errors due to fatigue. Eschweiler (1998) recommended using a card or a piece of paper to block out all text except the one line to be examined. This method slows the proofreader down and if an interruption occurs, you know exactly which line to go to resume the task.

One of the best ways to check for grammatical errors is to read your writing aloud. When you read silently, your eyes make automatic corrections, or may skip over mistakes (Smith, 2003). Your ears are not as easily fooled, however, and will catch many of your mistakes. If you are in a situation where you cannot read aloud, try whispering or mouthing the words as you read. If something does not sound right, check the grammar (Anderson, 1994: 17).

Here are some of the most popularly used proofreading methods to get the reader a better understanding:

5.3 Copy holding or (copy reading)

Copy holding is done with two readers for any document. The first reads the text aloud literally as it appears, at a uniform rate. The second reader follows along while also marking discrepancies between what is being read and the typeset (Bell, 2007). The copyediting process, although methodical, is straightforward enough: It is a thorough, careful reading (or multiple readings) with an eye on the language and a brain on the intent. If a copyeditor does her job correctly, the mechanics are invisible to the reader, so that nothing interferes with the reader's experience of the story or with the message (Gilad, 2007: 45).

5.4 Double reading

Double reading is slightly similar to copy holding in the sense that the responsibility of the proof is shared by two people. It is essentially the first proofreader following the traditional method, and then passing it ahead to the second person for the same purpose (Bell, 2007).

5.5 Scanning

As the name suggests, scanning is used to proofread without exactly reading it word for word. It has only gained popularity in the last few years with the advancements in technology, and is now common with computerization of typesetting and the popularization of word processing (Bell, 2007).

5.6 Professional proofreading

Here, the professional proofreaders have a far lower rate of false than software programs, because real time experience and a human understanding of grammar structures will always beat an algorithm (Bell, 2007).

5.7 Comparison reading

When you must compare two pieces of copy to make sure they are identical in every way, you are comparison reading. During this reading, you will make sure that the newly typed (or typeset) copy is exactly the same as the original text, in terms of word sequence and format. You will also watch for misspellings, bad word breaks, and typing mistakes at this stage, but you will not use this reading to create your style sheet or look for any other errors or points of style (Anderson, 1994: 6-7). There are several ways of comparison reading:

a. Reading Alone

You will compare the original manuscript (dead copy) with the newly typed version (live copy), or if the copy has reached the typeset stage, compare the typed copy (dead copy) with the typeset copy (live copy). The newest version of the copy is always considered the live copy. The copy you compare it with is the dead copy (Anderson, 1994: 7).

b. Reading with Another Person

This is a more efficient and interesting way to comparison read. The copyholder reads the dead copy aloud, word for word, including punctuation and format, while you proofread the live copy. Just as when you are comparison reading alone, you will read only for deviations from text and format, misspellings, typing errors, and incorrect word breaks (Anderson, 1994: 8).

c. Using a Tape Recorder

Whenever there is no copyholder and the copy is long or difficult to read, a tape recording of the original (dead) copy will make comparison reading easier for you. As you record, you should read the copy slowly, enunciating every syllable, punctuation mark, capitalization, paragraph beginning, and format instruction. Then

proofread the live copy as you listen to the recorded version (Anderson, 1994: 8).

5.8 Non-comparison (or) Dry Reading

There are times when the proofreader will have only one set of copy—the live copy, to read. There will be no dead copy to compare your live copy with. Or you may have already compared the two and are ready to move on to the second stage of proofreading (Anderson, 1994: 8-9).

5.9 After Comparison Reading

After the newly typed (or typeset) copy has already been compared with the original text, your second, third, and any other passes will be those of non-comparison reading. From these dry readings, you will follow the proofreading checklist and create the style sheet (Anderson, 1994: 9).

5.10 On-Screen or on a Printout

Non-comparison reading is the only way to proofread when there is no dead copy to compare the live copy with, such as when you are proofreading from a computer screen or printout (Anderson, 1994: 9).

5.11 Reverse yourself

A great way to sleuth for spelling errors is to read a document backwards. This method forces you to analyze each word individually and not in the context of the words around it (Gilad, 2007: 116).

5.12 Reading with the Copyholder

The copyholder is a valuable commodity for a busy proofreader, especially when the text is long or handwritten, or if it contains many editorial changes or rows of numbers (Anderson, 1994: 12).

6. Proofreaders' Marks

Proofreaders can use symbols to indicate necessary changes. Any consistently used and understood marking system can get the job done, taking the time to learn these symbols can save you time and help eliminate those frustrating moments when, on returning to the document to make changes. Proofreaders' marks are fairly standard among the professionals, but subtle differences in how they are used and occasional differences even in the marks themselves, do exist (Bell, 2007).

Some basic copyediting symbols with examples are shown below.

Mark	Meaning	Example
	Delete word, character, or punctuation	When does she really need it?
	Delete and close space	occasion
	Stet (undelete)	It went very well.
	Insert word or character	What ^{is} the time?
	Insert most punctuation	Sue's big old desk
	Insert colon	the following [:]
	Insert hyphen	world ⁻ famous
	Insert dash (em dash)	home ⁻ at last
	Change hyphen to em dash	home ⁻ at last
	Change hyphen to en dash	1970 ⁻ 1979
	Insert period	That desk is heavy [.]

May (1997: 73)

Some Tips for Using Proofreaders' Marks are:

1. Deleting Words, Characters, or Punctuation

Deletions are probably the easiest marks to make. Crossing out text comes quite naturally for most of the proofreaders (May, 1997). But the trick to doing this well as a proofreader is to mark the deletion so that the material you want deleted can still

be seen. The best mark for this purpose may be unfamiliar to the writers, but it is quite simple to use. The basic mark, useful for deleting a single character or punctuation mark, is an upward slash ending at the top with a loop (ibid). In order to delete an entire word or several words, run the mark horizontally still ending it with a loop (ibid).

2. Shortcuts to save you time

A few key strategies can help save you time:
-Always make sure the document has been spell-checked.

-Proofread on paper, not on screen.

-Make sure you know what is expected of you.

-Gain some distance from familiar material.

-Finally, do all you can to create an environment conducive to proofreading (May, 1997).

3. Five-step proofreading approach

Here are the steps professional proofreaders typically take when direct proofreading:

1. Read the entire document or a good-sized chunk of a larger document, through once slowly, reading for overall content and meaning.
2. Read the document again, this time *aloud* and even more slowly, correcting all errors you find.
3. Read the document a third time, silently, or aloud, focusing especially on trouble spots.
4. Read the document backwards.
5. Scan the document at arm's length (May, 1997: 28-31).

4. The Most Critical and Common Errors

While editors like to catch every single mistake in writings, missing some types of errors can be more detrimental than missing others. Mistakes that miscommunicate in a way that result in

embarrassing, costly, or even dangerous situations absolutely must be eliminated (May, 1997: 108). Editing is about streamlining your piece. Good writing is clear, concise, and to the point (Anderson, 1994).

Written errors can be categorized as errors of *mechanics*, *grammar* and *usage*. <http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/mistakes.htm>

Mechanical mistakes are those of orthography (spelling and capitalization) and punctuation. Anderson (1994: 23) suggests a list of the most common errors that can occur:

- Incorrectly spelled names,
- Reversed numbers in addresses,
- Incorrect dates,
- Incorrect capitalization,
- Doubly typed words or phrases,
- Omissions of words or parts of words,
- Incorrect or deleted punctuation,
- Non-agreement of subject and verb,
- Misspelled words.

7. Methodology

In this study, the quantitative method of research was employed. To this end, the researcher administered a closed-ended questionnaire of a Five-Point Likert Scale of (1=never, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=almost, 5=always) as a research instrument and sent to all Koya University teaching staff that write, publish and read papers in any language as a sample: 67 males and 19 females from all the Faculties. Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 23) is used as a technique for analyzing the collected data.

The current study aims at:

- 1- Discovering the editing and proofreading strategies used by koya university lecturers when reading through written documents.

Exploring the differences between teachers whose field of study is English and those of non-English in the use of aforementioned strategies.

The recent study tries to answer the following research questions:

What are the editing and proofreading strategies used by Koya university lecturers?
What are the differences between English and non-English teachers in the use of editing and proofreading strategies?

9.1 Data Collection and Analysis

To serve the aim of the study, a questionnaire was administered and sent to all the lecturers at Koya University through their Gmail. The adopted method was quantitative; the main characteristic of quantitative research is that it is mostly appropriate for big samples.

The scope of the current study is limited to the proofreading and editing strategies used on written documents by koya university lecturers.

The content, surface and structural validity of the gathered data was checked by a group of specialists in the field of applied linguistics. They reported that the questionnaire items were approved and confirmed that they were understandable, clear and achieve the aims of the study.

Cronbach's Alpha was used to find out the reliability of the instrument which was composed of a questionnaire. The reliability of the first part of the questionnaire, 'Teachers' use of editing strategies'; which consists of 15 items, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.75 which is regarded suitable as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Editing Strategies	.756	15

The reliability of the second part of the questionnaire 'Teachers' use of proofreading strategies'; which consists of 16 items, the Cronbach's Alpha was 0.66 which is considered acceptable as shown in table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Proofreading Strategies	.665	16

The low alpha value is owing to the very limited number of items. The high value of the Cronbach's Alpha indicates the internal consistency of the data in the sense that the items are interrelated. Consequently, it may be argued that the instrument has the required reliability and achieves the aims of the study.

To find the answer for the first research question, one-sample-t-test is used to know the editing strategies used by Koya University lectures as shown in table 3.

1. Generally speaking, Koya University lecturers use editing strategies because the (t-value=12.862) is bigger than the t-table (1.990) and also (P=0.000) is smaller than [α 0.05].

2. The items (1, 4 -15) of the editing strategies are used by lecturers. It is because the t-value is bigger than the t-table (1.990) and the p-value is smaller than (0.05).

3. The 2nd and the 3rd items of the editing strategies are not used by Koya University lecturers. The mean of the second item is (M=2.73) and the mean of the third item is (M=2.55), though the ($p < 0.05$).

An interpretation of this result could be that these lecturers prefer to edit the papers by themselves rather than with other lecturers. Moreover, they do not think that working on others' papers improves their editing skill.

Table 3: One-sample-t-test for editing strategies

	Mean	test Value	mean Difference	Std. Deviation	T		p-value	sig.
					archived	table		
	55.46	45	10.46512	7.54547	12.862	1.990	0.000	sig.
1. I edit my papers by myself.	4.16	3	1.163	1.016	10.615	1.990	0.000	sig.

2. I edit papers with a partner.	2.73	3	-.267	1.152	2.152	1.990	0.034	sig.
3. I expect others to edit my papers.	2.55	3	-.453	1.204	3.492	1.990	0.001	sig.
4. Editing others' papers, improves my editing.	3.66	3	.663	1.154	5.326	1.990	0.000	sig.
5. I use computer assisted technology programs for editing.	3.33	3	.326	1.202	2.511	1.990	0.014	sig.
6. I use editing symbols while editing.	3.24	3	.244	1.178	1.923	1.990	0.058	not sig.
7. I look for (intention) while editing.	3.76	3	.756	.993	7.056	1.990	0.000	sig.
8. I look for (structure) while editing.	4.07	3	1.070	.865	11.471	1.990	0.000	sig.
9. I look for (theme= main idea) while editing.	4.14	3	1.140	1.042	10.140	1.990	0.000	sig.
10. I look for (language) while editing.	4.29	3	1.291	.879	13.611	1.990	0.000	sig.
11. I look for (repetition)	4.02	3	1.023	.994	9.548	1.990	0.000	sig.

while editing.								
12. I look for (redundancy=unnecessary) while editing.	3.95	3	.953	1.028	8.602	1.990	0.000	sig.
13. I look for (clarity) while editing.	4.52	3	1.523	.763	18.520	1.990	0.000	not sig.
14. I use self-editing checklist.	3.56	3	.558	1.174	4.408	1.990	0.000	sig.
15. I use dictionaries while editing.	3.48	3	.477	1.093	4.047	1.990	0.000	sig.

N=86

df=85

P-value=0.05

Coming to the proofreading strategies, they are less used than editing ones as demonstrated in table 4.

The items (1, 3, 4, 9, 13 and 14) of proofreading strategies are used significantly and higher than the (sometimes) level by Koya University lecturers. This is because the mean of these items is bigger than the (test-value=3) and also (p-value < 0.05).

Regarding the (2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16) items of proofreading strategies as shown on the same table though there is a significant difference between the mean and test-value, the achieved mean is smaller than the test-value. It is seen that these strategies are used lower than (sometimes) level by koya university lecturers.

Table 4: One-sample t-test for proofreading strategies

	Mean	test Value	mean Difference	Std. Deviation	<i>T</i>		p-value	sig.
					archived	table		
1. I proofread papers alone.	3.76	3	.756	.981	7.142	1.990	.000	sig.
2. I proofread papers with a partner.	2.59	3	-.407	1.110	3.400	1.990	.001	sig.
3. I prefer proofreading on	3.40	3	.395	1.239	2.958	1.990	.004	sig.

paper.								
4. I prefer proofreading on screen.	3.29	3	.291	1.226	2.199	1.990	.031	sig.
5. I proofread papers backwardly.	2.48	3	-.523	1.412	3.437	1.990	.001	sig.
6. I proofread without reading word for word.	2.58	3	-.419	1.522	2.550	1.990	.013	sig.
7. I proofread with the help of a tape recorder.	1.95	3	-1.047	1.167	8.314	1.990	.000	sig.
8. I skim the paper as a proofreading strategy.	3.03	3	.035	1.231	.263	1.990	.793	not sig.
9. I use the computer spellchecking software.	3.29	3	.291	1.245	2.165	1.990	.033	sig.
10. I use self-read-aloud strategy.	2.06	3	-.942	1.067	8.189	1.990	.000	sig.
11. I use peer read-aloud strategy.	1.79	3	-1.209	.959	11.690	1.990	.000	sig.
12. I use oral proofreading.	2.03	3	-.965	1.011	8.852	1.990	.000	sig.
13. I touch each word with a pencil and underline words that may be misspelled.	3.29	3	.291	1.345	2.005	1.990	.048	sig.
14. I separate myself from my draft. I.e., I go through it after sometime between the first and the second draft to be	3.40	3	.395	1.009	3.633	1.990	.000	sig.

more objective.								
15. I read the paper and then pass it ahead to the second person for the same purpose.	2.65	3	-.349	1.225	2.641	1.990	.010	sig.
16. I compare two pieces of copy to make sure they are identical in every way.	3.21	3	.209	1.312	1.480	1.990	.143	not sig.
N=86		df=85		P-value=0.05				

To answer the second research question, an independent sample-*t-test* is conducted to indicate the results of the differences between the lecturers whose field of study is English language in using editing strategies and those who are not specialized in English as shown in table 5. There is a significant difference only in items (1 and 10). The mean score of the first item is ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 0.709$); $t(85) = 2.534$; $p = 0.013$) and the mean score of the tenth item is ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.779$); $t(85) = 2.037$; $p = 0.045$).

The *t*-value is bigger than the *t*-table and (p -value < 0.05). This difference is in favor of the lecturers who are specialized in English as the means of these items for them is bigger than the means of the same items for other lecturers. This means that the teachers whose specialty is English use these editing strategies more than the others who are not.

Table 5: Independent-sample-*t-test* of editing strategies by English and non-English teachers

	Dept.	Mean	mean difference	Std. Deviation	p-value	<i>t</i>		Sig.
						achieved	table	
Item 1	English	4.44	0.53	.709	0.013	2.534	1.990	sig.
	Others	3.91		1.184				
Item 2	English	2.63	-0.19	1.280	0.453	0.754	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.82		1.029				
Item 3	English	2.39	-0.300	1.202	0.253	1.151	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.69		1.203				

Item 4	English	3.83	0.32	1.138	0.203	1.282	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.51		1.160				
Item 5	English	3.41	0.17	1.117	0.515	0.658	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.24		1.282				
Item 6	English	3.17	-0.14	1.340	0.584	0.550	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.31		1.019				
Item 7	English	3.78	0.05	1.037	0.827	0.219	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.73		.963				
Item 8	English	4.20	0.24	.782	0.201	1.298	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.96		.928				
Item 9	English	4.24	0.20	.888	0.379	0.896	1.990	not sig.
	Others	4.04		1.167				
Item 10	English	4.49	0.38	.779	0.045	2.037	1.990	sig.
	Others	4.11		.935				
Item 11	English	4.10	0.14	.944	0.509	0.663	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.96		1.043				
Item 12	English	4.02	0.14	1.037	0.545	0.608	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.89		1.027				
Item 13	English	4.66	0.27	.617	0.117	1.608	1.990	not sig.
	Others	4.40		.863				
Item 14	English	3.76	0.38	1.179	0.137	1.502	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.38		1.154				
Item 15	English	3.59	0.21	1.048	0.382	0.882	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.38		1.134				

N=86 df=85 P-value=0.05

Concerning the difference between English teachers' proofreading strategies and others, an independent sample t-test as indicated in table 6 shows that there is a significant difference between English teachers' use of proofreading strategies and others in only items (13 and 15). This is because the t-value is bigger than the t-table and ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$).

What needs to be considered is item 13, 'I touch each word with a pencil and underline words that may be misspelled'; that the English teachers adopt this proofreading strategy as the ($M=3.63$). As a result, the use of this strategy is at the (always) level but for other teachers the ($M=2.98$) that is close to (sometimes).

But, in regard to item 15, 'I read the paper and then pass it ahead to the second person for the same purpose'; there is a significant difference in favor of teachers whose field of study is not

English. While the mean for other teachers ($M=2.96$) which is close to (sometimes), the mean for English teachers ($M=2.32$) is close to (seldom). It means that though this strategy is not used significantly by both groups of teachers, it is far more used by non-English specialized teachers than English ones.

Table 6: Independent-sample-*t-test* of proofreading strategies by English and non-English teachers

	Dept.	Mean	Mean difference	std. Deviation	p-value	<i>t</i>		sig.
						achieved	table	
item 1	English	3.90	0.28	1.091	0.193	1.314	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.62		.860				
item 2	English	2.39	-0.39	1.202	0.110	1.633	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.78		.997				
item 3	English	3.46	0.130	1.267	0.630	0.484	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.33		1.225				
item 4	English	3.27	0.04	1.205	0.873	0.161	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.31		1.258				
item 5	English	2.41	0.12	1.581	0.699	0.387	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.53		1.254				
item 6	English	2.54	-0.09	1.645	0.796	0.259	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.62		1.419				
item 7	English	2.07	0.23	1.367	0.367	0.907	1.990	not sig.
	Others	1.84		.952				
item 8	English	3.12	0.17	1.327	0.535	0.624	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.96		1.147				
item 9	English	3.20	-0.18	1.346	0.500	0.677	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.38		1.154				
item 10	English	1.88	-0.34	1.029	0.136	1.508	1.990	sig.
	Others	2.22		1.085				
item 11	English	1.61	-0.35	.945	0.095	1.688	1.990	not sig.
	Others	1.96		.952				
item 12	English	2.02	-0.02	1.129	0.927	0.091	1.990	not sig.
	Others	2.04		.903				

item 13	English	3.63	0.65	1.299	0.023	2.318	1.990	sig.
	Others	2.98		1.323				
item 14	English	3.24	-0.29	1.157	0.193	1.315	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.53		.842				
item 15	English	2.32	-0.64	1.171	0.015	2.487	1.990	sig.
	Others	2.96		1.205				
item 16	English	3.12	-0.17	1.400	0.561	0.587	1.990	not sig.
	Others	3.29		1.236				

10. Conclusions

The study concluded that Koya University lecturers use almost all of the editing strategies except two of them and all are in favor of using the strategy of editing by themselves rather than with others. The editing strategies are used more in compare to proofreading ones. Some of the proofreading strategies are used more than the others. The lecturers whose specialty is English use only two of these editing strategies more than the others and those who are not specialist in English. Finally, both groups of English and non-English lecturers at koya University use only a few of proofreading strategies. It is also concludes that all Koya University teaching staff regardless of being specialized in English and non-English are not that much familiar with different types of editing and proofreading strategies.

It is recommended that Koya University lecturers need to work, practice and use more on editing and proofreading strategies whether going through their papers or others' papers as they play a crucial role in their academic career.

References

- Abby, (2017). The History of Proofreading. Retrieved on February, 25 2020 from <https://blog.papertrue.com/the-history-of-proofreading/>
- Anderson, L. K. (1994). Hand book for Proofreading. NTC Business Books, USA.
- Bell, S. (2007). The Artful Edit on the Practice of Editing yourself (1st ed.). New York, London.
- Bruck, L. (1997). Proofreading: Little things mean a lot. *ENT: Ear, Nose & Throat Journal*, 76, 578.
- Eschweiler, K. A. (1998). Proofreading prowess. *Women in Business*, (50)4, 36-39.
- Chang, F. C., Chang, S. I., & Hsu, H. F. (2009). Self-and Peer-Proofreading for EFL Young Beginning Writers. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, (6)1, 23-51.

Hall, R. J. (1984). Orthographic problem-solving. *Academic Therapy*, 20, 67-75.

Harris, J. (1987). Proofreading: A Reading/Writing Skill College. *Composition and Communication*, 38(4), 464-466. Johnson

Country Community College (n. d.). Retrieved 20 Feb. 2020 from

<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/general/index.html>

Hornby, A.S. (2000). Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (5th ed.). Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gilad, S. (2007). *Copyediting Proofreading for Dummies*. Wiley Publishing, Inc. Canada.

Kemper, D., Nathan, R., Sebranek, P., & Elsholz, C. (2002). *Write away*. Wilmington, MA: Write Source.

Madraso, J. (1993). Proofreading: The skill we've neglected to teach. *English Journal*, 82(2), 32-41.

May, D. H. (1997). Proofreading Plain and Simple Plain and Simple Series. U.S.A. Delmar Thomson Learning.

Smith, B. (2003). Proofreading, Revising, & Editing Skills Success in 20 Minutes a Day. US A. New York

Šunková, J. (2011). Revising Translations: Corpus Investigation of Revision and Self-revision. Unpublished Master's Diploma Thesis. Masaryk University

West, L. J. (1983). Review of research on proofreading. *Journal of Business Education*, 58, 284-288.

Appendix

Section 1: General Information

- Gender:** A. Male B. Female
- Age:** A. 30-40 B. 41-50
C. 51-60 D. 61-70
- Scientific Title:** A. Asst. Lecturer B. Lecturer
C. Asst. Professor D. Professor
- Faculty:** A. Humanities and Social Sciences
B. Education C. Science and Health D. Engineering
E. Medicine
- Field of Study:** A. English B. Non-English

Section 2: Teachers' Editing Strategies

No.	Strategies	Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Sometimes (3)	Almost (4)	Always (5)
1	I edit my papers by myself.					
2	I edit papers with a partner.					
3	I expect others to edit my papers.					
4	Editing others' papers, improves my editing.					
5	I use computer assisted technology programs for editing.					
6	I use editing symbols while editing.					
7	I look for (intention) while editing.					
8	I look for (structure) while editing.					
9	I look for (theme= main idea) while editing.					
10	I look for (language) while editing.					
11	I look for (repetition) while editing.					
12	I look for (redundancy= unnecessary) while editing.					
13	I look for (clarity) while editing.					
14	I use self-editing checklist.					
15	I use dictionaries while editing.					

Section 3: Teachers' Proofreading Strategies

No.	Strategies	Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Sometimes (3)	Almost (4)	Always (5)
1.	I proofread papers alone.					
2.	I proofread papers with a partner.					

3.	I prefer proofreading on paper.					
4.	I prefer proofreading on screen.					
5.	I proofread papers backwardly.					
6.	I proofread without reading word for word.					
7.	I proofread with the help of a tape recorder.					
8.	I skim the papers as a proofreading strategy.					
9.	I use the computer spellchecking software.					
10.	I use self-read-aloud strategy.					
11.	I use peer read-aloud strategy.					
12.	I use oral proofreading.					
13.	I touch each word with a pencil and underline words that may be misspelled.					
14.	I separate myself from my draft. I.e., I go through it after sometime between the first and the second draft to be more objective.					
15.	I read the paper and then pass it ahead to the second person for the same purpose.					
16.	I compare two pieces of copy to make sure they are identical in every way.					