- 29 of the 38 copyediting tasks (16 of the 21 tasks under correcting for pre-set rules, 11 of the 12 tasks under correcting for consistency and 2 of the 5 tasks under correlating parts),
- all 9 stylistic-editing tasks (all 5 tasks under tailoring language and all 4 tasks under smoothing the text),
- 9 of the 11 structural-editing tasks (4 of the 6 tasks under editing the physical structure of a text and all 5 tasks under editing the conceptual structure of the text),
- 9 of the 19 content-editing tasks (8 of the 12 tasks under micro-level content editing and 1 of the 7 tasks under macro-level content editing),
- 10 of the 11 proofreading tasks,
- 8 of the 10 technical skills (all 3 of the project-management skills and 5 of the 7 technology-related skills),
- all 9 personal and interpersonal skills,
- 3 of the 4 procedural skills, and
- all 4 items related to specialised knowledge.

Item		Mean	SD
COPYEDITING			
Group 1: Correcting for pre-set rules			
BA1	Correcting spelling errors	**1.17**	.383
BA2	Correcting punctuation errors	**1.17**	.383
BA3	Correcting errors of grammar	**1.33**	.594
BA4	Correcting errors of syntax (sentence structure)	**1.33**	.594
BA5	Ensuring correctness of terminology usage	**1.44**	.784
BA6	Querying correctness of terminology usage	**1.94**	.802
BA7	Ensuring correctness of numbers, units and measurements	**2.06**	.938
BA8	Querying correctness of numbers, units and measurements	**2.11**	.900
BA9	Ensuring correct use of foreign languages	3.24	.664
BA10	Ensuring correctness of headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.)	**1.59**	.870
BA11	Ensuring correctness in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are correctly formatted, that the content is accurate and correctly punctuated)	**1.56**	.856

BA12	Querying correctness of tables and lists (for example, querying whether tables and lists are correctly formatted, whether the content is accurate, and whether the tables and lists are punctuated correctly)	**1.83**	.985
BA13	Ensuring correctness of illustrations (for example, ensuring correct factual representation such as in maps)	2.72	.958
BA14	Querying correctness of illustrations	2.72	.895
BA15	Ensuring correctness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)	**1.78**	.943
BA26	Clarifying unexplained acronyms and abbreviations	**1.94**	.938
BA28	Ensuring that the text is in line with design specifications (such as layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)	**1.94**	.873
BA29	Querying irregularities with design specifications (such as the layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)	**2.00**	.767
BA31	Ensuring correctness of reference style of in-text references and reference lists	**2.44**	.984
BA32	Querying incorrect reference style for in-text references and reference lists	2.50	.924
BA37	Approving author's and proofreader's changes	2.56	1.247
Group 2: Correcting for consistency			
BA16	Ensuring consistency of spelling	**1.11**	.323
BA17	Ensuring consistency of punctuation	**1.22**	.428
BA18	Ensuring consistency of grammar	**1.33**	.594
BA19	Ensuring consistency of syntax (sentence structure)	**1.39**	.698
BA20	Ensuring consistency of terminology usage	**1.28**	.575
BA21	Ensuring consistency in the use of numbers, units and measurements	**1.69**	.793
BA22	Ensuring consistent use of foreign languages (particularly in terms of typographical style)	3.11	.900
BA23	Ensuring consistency in headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.).	**1.39**	.608
BA24	Ensuring consistency in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are consistently formatted and punctuated, and that information is presented consistently)	**1.56**	.705
BA25	Ensuring consistency of illustrations (in terms of the presentation of their content, formatting)	**2.17**	.924
BA33	Ensuring consistency of reference style for in-text references and reference lists	**2.39**	.916

BA34	Querying consistency of reference style for in-text references and reference lists	**2.44**	.856
Group 3: Correlating parts			
BA27	Ensuring completeness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)	**2.00**	.767
BA30	Correlating parts of the text (such as checking cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, table of contents)	**2.00**	.970
BA35	Ensuring completeness of reference list (ensuring that all the references cited in the text appear in the reference list, and that all the items in the reference list appear in the text)	2.56	1.042
BA36	Querying incomplete reference lists (querying instances where the references cited in the text do not appear in the reference list, or when references listed in the reference list do not appear in the text)	2.56	.984
BA38	Collating author's and proofreader's changes for the typesetter	2.89	1.183
STYLISTIC EDITING			
Group 4: Tailoring the language			
BB39	Ensuring appropriate use of vocabulary for the readership	**1.56**	.922
BB40	Ensuring an appropriate register is used in the text, based on the type of text and the readership	**1.78**	.943
BB41	Querying instances of inappropriate register in the text, based on the type of text and the readership	**2.11**	1.079
BB45	Removing or correcting instances of verbosity	**1.67**	.767
BB47	Removing or correcting repetition and redundancies	**1.56**	.784
Group 5: Smoothing the text			
BB42	Tailoring sentences for the readers of the text and the use they will make of it by ensuring that the sentences are well structured and concise (for example, by ensuring that the appropriate sentence structure is used (such as active/passive or complex/simple), appropriate inter-sentence connections are used, and that the sentence is focused)	**1.50**	.857
BB43	Ensuring an appropriate level of readability in the text (for example, ensuring that the text is cohesive by ensuring that the text is well-structured, contains clearly related sentences and paragraphs, and that discourse markers are used appropriately)	**1.44**	.705

BB44	Ensuring an appropriate level of clarity within the text (for example, ensuring that the text is coherent by ensuring that the message of the text does not contain any slips in logic, such as self-contradictory statements, wrong organisation of events)	**1.39**	.698
BB46	Removing or correcting ambiguities	**1.72**	.752
TRUCTURAL EDITING			
Group 6: Editing the physical structure			
BC50	Ensuring logic of headings (for example, that a heading accurately reflects the content that follows, and that headings are arranged in a logical order)	**2.06**	.802
BC51	Ensuring logical sequence divisions	**2.28**	.895
BC52	Ensuring logical order of sections	**2.28**	.575
BC53	Ensuring logic in the relationships between text, tables and graphics	**2.06**	.802
BC54	Ensuring logical use of verbal signposts (such as the positioning of standfirsts, page turns)	3.11	.676
BC58	Checking and imposing the correct physical structure for a text (for example, ensuring that a report published in a newspaper follows the *inverted pyramid* structure, or that an academic article follows the *introduction, discussion, conclusion* structure)	2.67	.686
Group 7: Editing the conceptual structure			
BC48	Ensuring optimal structure of the argument or discussion (for example, by rearranging sentences, paragraphs or sections of material)	**2.00**	1.085
BC49	Querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion	**2.17**	.985
BC55	Correcting missing markers (such as the incorrect or inconsistent use of *firstly, secondly, thirdly*)	**1.94**	.725
BC56	Correcting or removing unfulfilled announcements (for example, correcting or removing instances where a writer has indicated that something specific will be discussed in a later section, and then does not do so)	**2.39**	.979
BC57	Correcting problems with backward and forward references (for example, correcting or removing instances where reference is made to previous or subsequent information that does not appear)	**2.22**	.943
CONTENT EDITING			
Group 8: Micro-level content editing			
BD59	Correcting content for completeness	**2.00**	.907

BD60	Querying incomplete content	**2.11**	.758
BD61	Correcting content for appropriateness	**2.00**	.767
BD62	Querying inappropriate content	**2.17**	.786
BD63	Correcting content for accuracy	**1.56**	.616
BD64	Querying inaccurate content	**1.83**	.618
BD65	Correcting content for logic	**1.89**	.900
BD66	Querying illogical content	**2.00**	.767
BD67	Correcting content for any legal issues (such as bias, slander, libel, plagiarism, copyright infringement)	3.06	.725
BD68	Querying any legal issues associated with the content and artwork (such as bias, slander, libel, plagiarism, copyright infringement)	3.11	.676
BD69	Ensuring appropriateness of illustrations	2.78	.943
BD70	Querying appropriateness of illustrations	2.89	.758
Group 9: Macro-level content editing			
BD71	Writing artwork briefs for the text	3.33	.907
BD72	Selecting illustrations and graphics for the text	3.33	1.029
BD73	Cropping illustrations and graphics for the text	3.44	.705
BD74	Editing illustrations and graphics for the text	2.83	.924
BD75	Copyfitting the text for the publication	3.56	.511
BD76	Suggesting rewrites for sections of the text	2.61	1.037
BD77	Writing/rewriting sections of the text	**2.17**	1.043
PROOFREADING			
Group 10: Correcting errors in proofs or print-ready pages			
BE78	Correcting spelling errors in proofs or print-ready pages	**1.71**	.849
BE79	Correcting inconsistent spelling in proofs or print-ready pages	**1.71**	.849
BE80	Correcting grammatical errors in proofs or print-ready pages	**1.76**	.831
BE81	Correcting punctuation errors and inconsistent punctuation use (for example, in abbreviations) in proofs or print-ready pages	**1.71**	.772
BE82	Correcting inconsistent punctuation use in proofs and print-ready pages	**1.82**	.809
BE83	Correcting errors in word breaks in proofs or print-ready pages	**1.94**	.966
BE84	Correcting errors of fact in proofs or print-ready pages	**2.41**	1.064
BE85	Querying possible errors of fact in proofs or print-ready pages	2.53	1.068
BE86	Correcting proofs or print-ready pages for correctness of type specifications	**2.47**	1.125
BE87	Correcting incorrect format and layout in proofs or print-ready pages	**2.35**	1.057

BE88	Checking that all the editor's and author's changes have been incorporated into the final/typeset document	**1.94**	1.088
TECHNICAL SKILLS			
Group 11: Project management			
CA1	The ability to plan projects (conventional or online) effectively	**1.56**	.856
CA2	The ability to manage projects (conventional or online) efficiently within budgetary and time constraints	**1.78**	1.003
CA3	Sound business and management skills	**2.11**	.832
Group 12: Skills relating to technology			
CA4	Expertise in the latest word-processing software	**1.83**	.786
CA5	Expertise in the latest desktop-publishing software (such as InDesign, PageMaker)	3.00	1.085
CA6	Expertise in correctly using track changes during electronic editing	**1.44**	.984
CA7	Expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript	**1.89**	1.079
CA8	Expertise in website design, management and maintenance	3.28	.958
CA9	Expertise in the various methods of querying (for example, using the comments function in Microsoft Word)	**1.33**	.840
CA10	The ability to source information effectively (for example, reference guides, reliable information on specific topics, or previous articles/texts)	**1.17**	.383
PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS			
Group 13: Personal traits			
CB11	Highly developed reading skills	**1.06**	.236
CB12	Intuitive language skills	**1.11**	.471
CB13	Dedication	**1.11**	.323
CB14	A good general knowledge and an interest in world news and events	**1.39**	.778
CB15	A desire to constantly learn	**1.50**	.707
CB16	A strong personal code of ethics and good judgement skills	**1.17**	.514
CB17	The ability to work under pressure and for long hours	**1.22**	.428
CB18	The ability to develop and maintain good working relationships with and between the various industry role-players (for example, journalists, authors, typesetters, designers, proofreaders)	**1.61**	.698
CB19	The ability to sensitively and diplomatically bring any issues and problems to an author's or client's attention	**1.33**	.686

PROCEDURAL SKILLS			
Group 14: Project coordination and industry knowledge			
CC20	Knowledge of the publishing process (for example, knowledge of the publishing process in its entirety, including planning, coordination, copy flow, marketing, design, printing)	**2.44**	1.097
CC21	An awareness of the function of the various role-players in the publishing process	**2.28**	.958
CC22	Knowledge of the costs associated with the various stages of production	2.67	1.085
CC23	General administration (such as following up queries, issuing invoices, managing finances, negotiating contracts, marketing)	**2.18**	1.131
SPECIALISED KNOWLEDGE			
Group 15: Expertise			
CD24	Knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines (such as text linguistics or normative linguistics)	**2.17**	1.098
CD25	Knowledge of the various text types and structures and their purposes (for example knowing how an instruction manual will be read and used, and then understanding how the information needs to be presented for optimal understanding)	**1.72**	.895
CD26	Knowledge of design (for example, the use of colour and contrast in texts) and layout principles (such as formatting, paragraph indentation, heading levels)	**2.06**	.938
CD27	Knowledge of specialised subject matter (for example, knowledge of the Revised National Curriculum Statement if editing educational textbooks, or knowledge of South African civil affairs if editing a governmental policy document)	**1.67**	.907

Table 5.6: Descriptive statistics for the technical-editing sector

For the copyediting category, means of 2.50 or above were scored on the following items:

- ensuring the correct use of foreign languages (u = 3.24),
- ensuring the correctness of illustrations (u = 2.72),
- querying correctness of illustrations (u = 2.72),
- querying incorrect reference style for in-text references and reference lists (u = 2.50),
- approving author's and proofreader's changes (u = 2.56),
- ensuring consistent use of foreign languages (u = 3.11),
- ensuring the completeness of reference lists (u = 2.56),
- querying incomplete reference lists (u = 2.56), and
- collating author's and proofreader's changes for the typesetter (u = 2.89).

The highest means were scored on the two tasks related to foreign languages, suggesting that technical editors do not ensure correctness and consistency in the use of foreign languages – possibly because there are few instances of foreign-language use in the texts with which they typically work. The means for these two tasks are similar to the means computed for the entire sample (although they are slightly higher for technical editors), indicating that, in general, editors do not check the use of foreign languages in texts. While high means were scored on the items related to ensuring and querying the correctness and completeness of reference lists, these means are only slightly higher than the cut-off mean, indicating that for some technical editors these are not infrequent tasks. High means were also computed for approving and collating the author's and proofreader's changes, indicating that these editors do not frequently perform these functions. This appears somewhat unusual, particularly given the low means for most of the items under the proofreading category (see discussion below). Lastly, high means were scored on the items dealing with ensuring and querying the correctness of illustrations. The technical nature of illustrations used in these texts may mean that specialists check the accuracy of these illustrations, rather than the editor. With the exception of the items mentioned above, it appears that technical editors perform most copyediting tasks frequently.

All items in the stylistic-editing category computed means well below the cut-off mean of 2.50, suggesting that stylistic editing frequently forms part of the editorial work of technical editors. Since most technical documents are used for instructional purposes, it is important that these texts relate the information in a clear and accessible way. While the means for the items in this category are low, they are not as low as the means scored in the mass-media sector, indicating that mass-media editors place greater emphasis on accessibility, appropriateness and how the readership identifies with the text than technical editors, who work with texts that have a mainly supportive informative function.

With regard to structural editing, most items computed acceptable means. Only two items, both relating to editing the physical structure of the text, computed means of 2.50 or above. These items deal with ensuring the logical use of verbal signposts (u = 3.11) and ensuring or imposing the correct physical structure for the text (u = 2.67). Overall the means for the technical-editing sector are similar to those of the book-publishing sector, but higher than those for the mass-media sector. This indicates that there is less strong agreement in the technical- and book-editing sectors than in the mass-media sector regarding the importance of structure. The only high means in this category are linked to editing the physical structure of the text, indicating that technical editors perform these tasks less frequently. However, the respondents in this sector did indicate that editing the conceptual structure of the text is important, which is not surprising, given the supporting and/or instructional nature of technical texts, where the facilitation of accurate comprehension is important.

Content editing, and more specifically macro-level content editing, appears to be of limited relevance for technical editors. The means computed for this category indicate that technical editors ensure that the text is complete, appropriate, accurate and logical; however, technical editors do not check for any legal issues or ensure that illustrations are appropriate for the text. The exclusion of the latter task appears unusual, particularly considering the fact that illustrations are commonly used as visual aids in instructional texts. One possible reason for the exclusion of this task may be that the illustrations used in these texts are checked by subject experts, and not editors. This explains why the items dealing with writing artwork briefs (u = 3.33) and selecting (u = 3.33), cropping (u = 3.44) and editing (u = 2.83) illustrations for the text computed very high means. Notably, the only macro-level content-editing task that scored a mean below 2.00 is the task related to rewriting sections of the text (but not suggesting rewrites). This indicates that technical editors may be responsible for rewriting substantial portions of text, implying that the context in which technical editors work is not such that the rewriting of portions of the text is referred back to authors.

In the proofreading category, means lower than 2.50 were computed for all items except the item dealing with querying possible factual errors in proofs or print-ready pages. However, the respondents did indicate that they would correct any errors of fact. Significantly, all items related to basic proofreading tasks (such as checking spelling, punctuation and grammar) scored means below 2.00, while the items related to correcting errors of fact, layout and format, and type scored means above 2.00 (but below 2.50), indicating that these tasks are carried out less frequently. The means computed for the items in this category suggest that most technical editors do perform proofreading functions.

The means calculated for the technical-skills category demonstrate that these skills are important for technical editors. With the exception of the items referring to expertise in DtP-software (u = 3.00) and website design, management and maintenance (u = 3.28), all of the items computed acceptable means. Overall, the means in this category are low, suggesting the respondents' strong agreement with the relevance of these skills.

The means on the items reflecting personal and interpersonal skills are very low, and suggest that technical editors view all the skills listed as essential for their everyday work. In terms of procedural skills, acceptable means were scored on all of the items, except for the item dealing with knowledge of costing (u = 2.67). In addition, the means for the items dealing with knowledge of the publishing process (u = 2.44) and the various role-players in the process (u = 2.28) are significantly higher than the means for these items in the book-publishing and mass-media sectors. This suggests that these skills are less important for technical editors who normally do not work in publishing contexts, but rather in corporate or freelance contexts.

Furthermore, while the means for the items in this category are acceptable, they are relatively high in comparison to the means scored for the items in the technical-skills category, suggesting that there is slightly less strong agreement among the respondents regarding the relevance of these skills.

Lastly, low means occurred on all items in the specialised-knowledge category. This is to be expected, since technical editors work on documents that are specialised in terms of their content. Clearly, the nature of the texts edited by these types of editors dictates that technical editors need knowledge of specialised subject matter, the various text types and their structures.

With regard to standard deviation, greater standard deviation occurred on only 20 of the 115 items. This suggests that for the most part, technical editors are in agreement regarding the relevance (or irrelevance) of most of the tasks and skills listed. Greater standard deviation occurred on thirteen items from the textual-skills category and seven items from the extra-textual skills category.

Greater standard deviation occurred on only three items from the copyediting category. Two of these deal with editorial changes made by third parties: approving the author's and proofreader's changes (SD = 1.247) and collating the changes for the typesetter (SD = 1.183). This suggests that these tasks are contentious among editors, and together with the high means for each of these items, indicates that editors do not perform these tasks frequently. The third item deals with ensuring the completeness of reference lists (SD = 1.042). Tasks related to references and reference lists seem to be unimportant for this sector, considering the high means computed for the items dealing with in-text references and reference lists. Overall, with the exception of the high standard deviation on the item dealing with ensuring the completeness of reference lists, respondents agree that checking these features of the text is not part of their work.

In terms of stylistic editing, greater standard deviation occurred on the item dealing with querying instances of inappropriate register in the text (SD = 1.079). In addition, two items computed standard deviations close to 1.000, suggesting some level of contention among the respondents on the importance of these tasks. These two items are ensuring appropriate use of vocabulary for the readership (SD = 0.922) and ensuring an appropriate register in the text (SD = 0.943). Notably, the only items under the stylistic-editing category that scored greater standard deviations (or standard deviations close to 1.000) deal with tailoring the language for the reader of the text. However, respondents did generally agree that they would ensure a high level of readability and clarity within the text, and that they would remove any instances of

verbosity, repetition and redundancy. This suggests that for editors working on technical texts (that primarily focus on informational content rather than on establishing a relationship with the reader), the suitability of vocabulary and register for the audience may be of less importance than the clarity and accuracy of communication.

Greater standard deviation occurred on only one item from the structural-editing category. This item deals with ensuring the optimal structure of the argument or discussion (SD = 1.085). In addition, a relatively high standard deviation occurred on the item related to querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion (SD = 0.985). The greater standard deviation on these items indicates that ensuring the optimal structure of a text is contentious among technical editors. However, both items scored acceptable means, indicating that while the item is contentious, the task is generally carried out by technical editors.

In the content-editing category, greater standard deviation occurred on some items related to macro-level content editing. Specifically, respondents disagreed on the relevance of selecting illustrations for the text (SD = 1.029), suggesting rewrites for portions of the text (SD = 1.037) and writing or rewriting portions of the text (SD = 1.043). The means for each of these items is relatively high (with the exception of the latter item), indicating that these items are contentious, but that they are generally not carried out very often.

About half of the proofreading tasks appear to be particularly controversial amongst technical editors, with five items computing greater standard deviation. These five items deal with correcting and querying proofs or print-ready pages for errors of fact (SD = 1.064, SD = 1.068), checking for correctness of type specifications (SD = 1.125), correcting problems with format and layout (SD = 1.057) and ensuring that all changes have been incorporated into the final document (SD = 1.088). However, the more basic proofreading tasks, such as correcting spelling and grammatical errors, met with greater agreement among the respondents. It therefore appears that there is a greater degree of variation in the frequency with which technical editors perform proofreading tasks that have to do with errors of fact, layout and type specifications.

With regard to technical skills, greater standard deviation occurred on the items that deal with managing projects within time and budgetary constraints (SD = 1.003), expertise in the latest DtP-software (SD = 1.085) and expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript (SD = 1.079). The greater standard deviation on these three items suggests that there is a significant degree of variance in the kinds of technical skills involved in the everyday working life of editors *working* on technical documents. However, the two items dealing with the ability to manage projects within time and budgetary constraints (u = 1.78) and expertise in correctly

marking changes on hardcopy manuscript (u = 1.89) scored means below 2.00, indicating that these tasks are carried out by most technical editors.

Greater standard deviation occurred on most items related to procedural skills. Technical editors disagree on the relevance of knowledge regarding the publishing process (SD = 1.097), knowledge of the costs associated with the various stages of production (SD = 1.085) and the importance of general administrative skills (SD = 1.131). This disagreement, as mentioned above, is also reflected in the relatively high means computed for these items and suggests that the importance of procedural skills for technical editors is debatable. This variance is evidence of the difference in the working contexts of, for example, book editors and technical editors. While book editors are often highly involved in the publishing process, technical editors (who work mostly in corporate or freelance contexts) are not as involved in the various stages of production.

Lastly, greater standard deviation occurred on the item dealing with the relevance of expertise in linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines (SD = 1.098). As discussed in previous sections, this is a particularly contentious matter among editors generally.

The analysis of means and standard deviations scored on the responses from this sector indicates that technical editors perceive most tasks as relevant to their work, and that there is relatively little variance in the frequency with which most tasks are performed. Specifically, stylistic editing and structural editing appear to be central to the work of technical editors. Copyediting is also very important; however, tasks related to illustrations and correlating parts appear to be less relevant. Micro-level content-editing tasks are important, while macro-level content-editing tasks are of less consequence. Extra-textual skills are also essential for technical editors, and a combination of technical skills, personal and interpersonal skills, procedural skills and specialised knowledge appear to be relevant for editors in this sector, even if there is some disagreement among respondents about the centrality of some of these skills. This suggests that technical editors, in addition to the various editing abilities, need a broad base of specialised skills that guide them during the editing process.

5.4.2.5 Descriptive statistics for the academic-editing sector

The means and standard deviations for the responses from the academic-editing sector (n = 23) are summarised in Table 5.7. Means lower than 2.50 were returned on 84 of the initial 115 items and are distributed as follows:

- 33 of the 38 copyediting tasks (17 of the 21 tasks under correcting for pre-set rules, all 12 tasks under correcting for consistency and 4 of the 5 tasks under correlating parts),
- all 9 stylistic-editing tasks (all 5 of the tasks under tailoring language and all 4 of the tasks under smoothing the text),
- all 11 structural-editing tasks (all 6 of the tasks under editing the physical structure of a text and all 5 of the tasks under editing the conceptual structure of the text),
- 8 of the 19 content-editing tasks (6 of the 12 tasks under micro-level content editing and 2 of the 7 tasks under macro-level content editing),
- 2 of the 11 proofreading tasks,
- 8 of the 10 technical skills (all 3 project-management skills and 5 of the 7 technology-related skills),
- all 9 personal and interpersonal skills,
- 1 of the 4 procedural skills, and
- 3 of the 4 items related to specialised knowledge.

The list above demonstrates that academic editors view copyediting, stylistic editing and structural editing as essential for their work. There was less strong agreement on the items in the content-editing and proofreading categories, suggesting that academic editors do not consider these types of editing important in their everyday work. In terms of extra-textual skills, only six items from this entire category computed means of 2.50 or above, indicating that academic editors utilise a number of extra-textual skills in their daily work.

Item		Mean	SD
COPYEDITING			
Group 1: Correcting for pre-set rules			
BA1	Correcting spelling errors	**1.35**	.487
BA2	Correcting punctuation errors	**1.17**	.491
BA3	Correcting errors of grammar	**1.22**	.422
BA4	Correcting errors of syntax (sentence structure)	**1.26**	.541
BA5	Ensuring correctness of terminology usage	**2.09**	.733
BA6	Querying correctness of terminology usage	**2.04**	.706
BA7	Ensuring correctness of numbers, units and measurements	**2.17**	.834
BA8	Querying correctness of numbers, units and measurements	**2.27**	.827
BA9	Ensuring correct use of foreign languages	2.78	.902

BA10	Ensuring correctness of headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.)	**1.52**	.665
BA11	Ensuring correctness in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are correctly formatted, that the content is accurate and correctly punctuated)	**1.45**	.596
BA12	Querying correctness of tables and lists (for example, querying whether tables and lists are correctly formatted, whether the content is accurate, and whether the tables and lists are punctuated correctly)	**2.04**	.767
BA13	Ensuring correctness of illustrations (for example, ensuring correct factual representation such as in maps)	2.74	.964
BA14	Querying correctness of illustrations	2.78	.850
BA15	Ensuring correctness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)	**1.48**	.730
BA26	Clarifying unexplained acronyms and abbreviations	**1.65**	.982
BA28	Ensuring that the text is in line with design specifications (such as layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)	**1.78**	.795
BA29	Querying irregularities with design specifications (such as the layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)	**2.04**	.878
BA31	Ensuring correctness of reference style of in-text references and reference lists	**1.39**	.783
BA32	Querying incorrect reference style for in-text references and reference lists	**1.61**	.783
BA37	Approving author's and proofreader's changes	2.87	.869
Group 2: Correcting for consistency			
BA16	Ensuring consistency of spelling	**1.17**	.388
BA17	Ensuring consistency of punctuation	**1.17**	.388
BA18	Ensuring consistency of grammar	**1.30**	.703
BA19	Ensuring consistency of syntax (sentence structure)	**1.30**	.703
BA20	Ensuring consistency of terminology usage	**1.52**	.846
BA21	Ensuring consistency in the use of numbers, units and measurements	**1.52**	.898
BA22	Ensuring consistent use of foreign languages (particularly in terms of typographical style)	**2.26**	1.137

BA23	Ensuring consistency in headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.).	**1.17**	.491
BA24	Ensuring consistency in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are consistently formatted and punctuated, and that information is presented consistently)	**1.27**	.456
BA25	Ensuring consistency of illustrations (in terms of the presentation of their content, formatting)	**2.09**	1.041
BA33	Ensuring consistency of reference style for in-text references and reference lists	**1.39**	.783
BA34	Querying consistency of reference style for in-text references and reference lists	**1.87**	1.014
Group 3: Correlating parts			
BA27	Ensuring completeness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)	**1.57**	.788
BA30	Correlating parts of the text (such as checking cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, table of contents)	**2.00**	.853
BA35	Ensuring completeness of reference list (ensuring that all the references cited in the text appear in the reference list, and that all the items in the reference list appear in the text)	**1.70**	.926
BA36	Querying incomplete reference lists (querying instances where the references cited in the text do not appear in the reference list, or when references listed in the reference list do not appear in the text)	**1.74**	.864
BA38	Collating author's and proofreader's changes for the typesetter	3.13	1.140
STYLISTIC EDITING			
Group 4: Tailoring the language			
BB39	Ensuring appropriate use of vocabulary for the readership	**1.77**	.922
BB40	Ensuring an appropriate register is used in the text, based on the type of text and the readership	**1.86**	.910
BB41	Querying instances of inappropriate register in the text, based on the type of text and the readership	**1.95**	1.024
BB45	Removing or correcting instances of verbosity	**1.50**	.859
BB47	Removing or correcting repetition and redundancies	**1.36**	.790

Group 5: Smoothing the text			
BB42	Tailoring sentences for the readers of the text and the use they will make of it by ensuring that the sentences are well structured and concise (for example, by ensuring that the appropriate sentence structure is used (such as active/passive or complex/simple), appropriate inter-sentence connections are used, and that the sentence is focused)	**1.36**	.790
BB43	Ensuring an appropriate level of readability in the text (for example, ensuring that the text is cohesive by ensuring that the text is well-structured, contains clearly related sentences and paragraphs, and that discourse markers are used appropriately)	**1.41**	.734
BB44	Ensuring an appropriate level of clarity within the text (for example, ensuring that the text is coherent by ensuring that the message of the text does not contain any slips in logic, such as self-contradictory statements, wrong organisation of events)	**1.32**	.716
BB46	Removing or correcting ambiguities	**1.41**	.796
STRUCTURAL EDITING			
Group 6: Editing the physical structure			
BC50	Ensuring logic of headings (for example, that a heading accurately reflects the content that follows, and that headings are arranged in a logical order)	**1.74**	.864
BC51	Ensuring logical sequence divisions	**2.00**	.674
BC52	Ensuring logical order of sections	**2.04**	.767
BC53	Ensuring logic in the relationships between text, tables and graphics	**1.78**	.795
BC54	Ensuring logical use of verbal signposts (such as the positioning of standfirsts, page turns)	**2.48**	1.082
BC58	Checking and imposing the correct physical structure for a text (for example, ensuring that a report published in a newspaper follows the *inverted pyramid* structure, or that an academic article follows the *introduction, discussion, conclusion* structure)	**2.39**	.839
Group 7: Editing the conceptual structure			
BC48	Ensuring optimal structure of the argument or discussion (for example, by rearranging sentences, paragraphs or sections of material)	**2.00**	.953
BC49	Querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion	**2.17**	.937

BC55	Correcting missing markers (such as the incorrect or inconsistent use of *firstly, secondly, thirdly*)	**1.83**	.984
BC56	Correcting or removing unfulfilled announcements (for example, correcting or removing instances where a writer has indicated that something specific will be discussed in a later section, and then does not do so)	**1.96**	.878
BC57	Correcting problems with backward and forward references (for example, correcting or removing instances where reference is made to previous or subsequent information that does not appear)	**1.96**	.825
CONTENT EDITING			
Group 8: Micro-level content editing			
BD59	Correcting content for completeness	2.52	1.082
BD60	Querying incomplete content	**2.22**	1.043
BD61	Correcting content for appropriateness	2.65	1.071
BD62	Querying inappropriate content	**2.30**	1.105
BD63	Correcting content for accuracy	**2.26**	1.010
BD64	Querying inaccurate content	**2.13**	.920
BD65	Correcting content for logic	**2.39**	.783
BD66	Querying illogical content	**2.35**	.647
BD67	Correcting content for any legal issues (such as bias, slander, libel, plagiarism, copyright infringement)	2.91	.949
BD68	Querying any legal issues associated with the content and artwork (such as bias, slander, libel, plagiarism, copyright infringement)	2.78	.998
BD69	Ensuring appropriateness of illustrations	2.78	.795
BD70	Querying appropriateness of illustrations	2.83	.717
Group 9: Macro-level content editing			
BD71	Writing artwork briefs for the text	3.83	.388
BD72	Selecting illustrations and graphics for the text	3.78	.518
BD73	Cropping illustrations and graphics for the text	3.61	.783
BD74	Editing illustrations and graphics for the text	3.00	.905
BD75	Copyfitting the text for the publication	3.57	.843
BD76	Suggesting rewrites for sections of the text	**2.39**	1.033
BD77	Writing/rewriting sections of the text	**2.48**	.994
PROOFREADING			
Group 10: Correcting errors in proofs or print-ready pages			
BE78	Correcting spelling errors in proofs or print-ready pages	**2.48**	1.275
BE79	Correcting inconsistent spelling in proofs or print-ready pages	**2.45**	1.262
BE80	Correcting grammatical errors in proofs or print-ready pages	2.59	1.182

BE81	Correcting punctuation errors and inconsistent punctuation use (for example, in abbreviations) in proofs or print-ready pages	2.55	1.184
BE82	Correcting inconsistent punctuation use in proofs and print-ready pages	2.50	1.225
BE83	Correcting errors in word breaks in proofs or print-ready pages	2.64	1.255
BE84	Correcting errors of fact in proofs or print-ready pages	3.18	.958
BE85	Querying possible errors of fact in proofs or print-ready pages	3.14	.834
BE86	Correcting proofs or print-ready pages for correctness of type specifications	3.14	.941
BE87	Correcting incorrect format and layout in proofs or print-ready pages	2.95	1.046
BE88	Checking that all the editor's and author's changes have been incorporated into the final/typeset document	2.91	1.192
TECHNICAL SKILLS			
Group 11: Project management			
CA1	The ability to plan projects (conventional or online) effectively	**2.23**	1.193
CA2	The ability to manage projects (conventional or online) efficiently within budgetary and time constraints	**2.22**	1.166
CA3	Sound business and management skills	**2.43**	1.037
Group 12: Skills relating to technology			
CA4	Expertise in the latest word-processing software	**2.00**	.853
CA5	Expertise in the latest desktop-publishing software (such as InDesign, PageMaker)	3.26	.752
CA6	Expertise in correctly using track changes during electronic editing	**1.61**	.783
CA7	Expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript	**1.91**	1.276
CA8	Expertise in website design, management and maintenance	3.57	.728
CA9	Expertise in the various methods of querying (for example, using the comments function in Microsoft Word)	**1.87**	.920
CA10	The ability to source information effectively (for example, reference guides, reliable information on specific topics, or previous articles/texts)	**1.74**	1.096
PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS			
Group 13: Personal traits			
CB11	Highly developed reading skills	**1.04**	.209
CB12	Intuitive language skills	**1.04**	.209
CB13	Dedication	**1.17**	.388
CB14	A good general knowledge and an interest in world news and events	**1.65**	.647

CB15	A desire to constantly learn	**1.43**	.507
CB16	A strong personal code of ethics and good judgement skills	**1.09**	.288
CB17	The ability to work under pressure and for long hours	**1.26**	.449
CB18	The ability to develop and maintain good working relationships with and between the various industry role-players (for example, journalists, authors, typesetters, designers, proofreaders)	**1.65**	.775
CB19	The ability to sensitively and diplomatically bring any issues and problems to an author's or client's attention	**1.30**	.470
PROCEDURAL SKILLS			
Group 14: Project coordination and industry knowledge			
CC20	Knowledge of the publishing process (for example, knowledge of the publishing process in its entirety, including planning, coordination, copy flow, marketing, design, printing)	2.65	1.152
CC21	An awareness of the function of the various role-players in the publishing process	2.52	.994
CC22	Knowledge of the costs associated with the various stages of production	2.87	1.014
CC23	General administration (such as following up queries, issuing invoices, managing finances, negotiating contracts, marketing)	**2.17**	1.029
CIALISED KNOWLEDGE			
Group 15: Expertise			
CD24	Knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines (such as text linguistics or normative linguistics)	**2.13**	1.014
CD25	Knowledge of the various text types and structures and their purposes (for example knowing how an instruction manual will be read and used, and then understanding how the information needs to be presented for optimal understanding)	**2.22**	1.043
CD26	Knowledge of design (for example, the use of colour and contrast in texts) and layout principles (such as formatting, paragraph indentation, heading levels)	2.52	1.201
CD27	Knowledge of specialised subject matter (for example, knowledge of the Revised National Curriculum Statement if editing educational textbooks, or knowledge of South African civil affairs if editing a governmental policy document)	**1.83**	.887

Table 5.7: Descriptive statistics for the academic-editing sector

The means computed for the items in the copyediting category suggest that academic editors edit most dimensions of a text for correctness and consistency, and also correlate parts of the text. Unlike their counterparts in other industry sectors, academic editors do ensure or query the correctness of in-text references and reference lists (u = 1.39, u = 1.61) as well as the

consistency of references and reference lists (u = 1.39, u = 1.87). However, academic editors do not check the correctness of foreign languages (u = 2.78) and illustrations (u = 2.74), and also do not query the correctness of illustrations (u = 2.78). In addition, academic editors do not approve the author's or proofreader's changes (u = 2.87) or collate these changes in the final document (u = 3.13). This suggests that academic editors are not involved in the preparation of the final, print-ready document, which is reiterated by the high means computed for the items in the proofreading category (see below).

With regard to stylistic and structural editing, all items in these two categories computed acceptable means, indicating that these two types of editing are considered important by academic editors. All items in the stylistic-editing category computed means well below 2.00, demonstrating that stylistic-editing tasks are frequently part of the academic editor's work. The means for some items in the structural-editing category are slightly higher, but they are in most instances still considerably lower than the cut-off mean of 2.50. The structural-editing tasks with a slightly higher mean (u = 2.00 or above) are:

- ensuring logical sequence divisions (u = 2.00),
- ensuring logical order of sections (u = 2.04),
- ensuring logical use of verbal signposts (u = 2.48),
- checking and imposing the correct physical structure for a text (u = 2.39),
- ensuring the optimal structure of the argument or discussion (u = 2.00), and
- querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion (u = 2.17).

All of these tasks deal with the structure of the argument and the ordering of the sections of a text. This possibly indicates a slightly less strong agreement among academic editors about the relevance of this kind of structural-editing task. However, the structural-editing tasks that deal with ensuring logic in headings (u = 1.74), logic in the relationship between text, tables and graphics (u = 1.78), correcting missing markers (u = 1.83), correcting or removing unfulfilled announcements (u = 1.96), and correcting problems with backward and forward references (u = 1.96) all scored means below 2.00, indicating that these tasks are relevant to the work of academic editors.

Compared to the means for items in the previous three categories, the items in the content-editing category computed high means (particularly the macro-level content-editing items). In fact, no item computed a mean lower than 2.10. This suggests that academic editors generally do not see content-editing tasks as a central part of their work (although there may be some variation in opinion about this, as evident from the greater standard deviation on some items; see below). Despite the generally higher means computed for these items, the respondents did

agree that they would query incomplete (u = 2.22), inappropriate (u = 2.30) and inaccurate (u = 2.13) content. In addition, the respondents did indicate that they correct content for logic (u = 2.39) and certain inaccuracies (u = 2.26). This seems somewhat unusual, since there may be some question about whether it is ethically acceptable to correct an academic text's content, particularly in the case of dissertations and theses. However, the relatively high means on these items suggest that these tasks are carried out fairly infrequently, and they in all likelihood usually involve limited instances of outright errors in the text. In addition, the exclusion of most items related to the correction of errors and the inclusion of the items related to querying possible errors, suggest that academic editors limit their editorial intervention at content level. Furthermore, the means computed show that the respondents do suggest rewrites for sections of the text (u = 2.39), and in some cases will write or rewrite portions themselves (u = 2.48). The latter is highly problematic, particularly considering the fact that academic texts must reflect the competencies of the author, and not the editor. The mean for the latter item is, however, quite high, indicating that this task is carried out less frequently and may be contentious. It may be that in a multilingual country like South Africa, where English or Afrikaans (the predominant languages of published academic texts) are the second or third language of many students and academics, editors feel obliged to rewrite portions of the text that are unclear due to problems with the linguistic abilities of the author.[3]

High means were scored on the items related to ensuring and querying the appropriateness of illustrations (u = 2.78, u = 2.83), and correcting or querying any legal issues such as plagiarism (u = 2.91, u = 2.78). The high means on these items indicate that academic editors do not perceive these tasks as relevant for their work, and may indicate that they consider these tasks the responsibility of the author and/or supervisor (in the case of dissertations and theses). With regard to the items in the macro-level content-editing category, significantly high means were scored on most items (with the exception of the two items dealing with rewriting or suggesting rewrites for portions of the text), suggesting that academic editors do not make substantial changes to a text's content.

In terms of proofreading, only two items computed acceptable means, albeit somewhat high means in both instances. The respondents indicated that they correct proofs or print-ready pages for incorrect and inconsistent spelling (u = 2.48, u = 2.45), but for nothing else. However, the items dealing with correcting proofs or print-ready pages for grammatical errors (u = 2.59) and errors and inconsistencies in punctuation (u = 2.55, u = 2.50) could be considered borderline cases, since their means are only slightly higher than 2.50. The means for the basic proofreading tasks are notably higher in this sector than in other sectors. This suggests that

[3] This issue is very important in the South African context and some research has been conducted in this regard (see, for example, Van Aswegen, 2007, Kruger & Bevan-Dye, forthcoming).

academic editors perform basic proofreading tasks less frequently than other editors. Furthermore, the fact that the respondents from the academic-editing sector indicated that they generally do not fulfil most proofreading functions is unusual. This may be because of the different working contexts within the academic-editing sector. In general, two main working contexts exist: academic editors who edit dissertations and theses, and academic editors who are employed by journals and work with academic articles. Editors who work on dissertations and theses normally accept freelance work from students. The dissertation or thesis is edited (usually electronically) and then returned to the student who accepts or rejects the editorial changes, and ultimately takes responsibility for the quality of the manuscript. In this instance, editors would not typically be involved in the proofreading of the final manuscript of the dissertation or thesis before going to print. At journals, editors may be responsible for editing articles (although authors frequently have their articles edited prior to submission, and so some journals do not take responsibility for editing). However, journals would, typically, employ a proofreader to check proofs, and so this might not fall to the editor. The two examples discussed here, may therefore account for the fact that only two proofreading items scored acceptable means in the academic-editing sector.

In the technical-skills category, the respondents agreed that project-management skills are important (u = 2.23), as is the ability to plan and manage projects within time and budgetary constraints (u = 2.22). Respondents also indicated that sound business and management skills (u = 2.43) are important for their work. While the means for the skills related to project management are below 2.50, they are higher than the means for these items in the other sectors, indicating that academic editors utilise these skills less frequently than other editors. In terms of skills that relate to technology, acceptable means were scored on all items except the items dealing with expertise in the latest DtP-software (u = 3.26), and expertise in website design, management and maintenance (u = 3.57). The means for these items are significantly higher than for the other items in this category (which are all below 2.00), suggesting that editors strongly agree that these skills are not important for their work. This is a predictable finding, since academic editors work mostly with documents in a word-processing file format.

Very low means were scored on all of the items under personal and interpersonal skills, indicating that there is very strong agreement among academic editors on the relevance of these skills.

In the procedural-skills category, skills linked to general administration (u = 2.17) (such as invoicing and managing finances) appear to be important, while knowledge of the publishing process (u = 2.65), the function of the various role-players (u = 2.52) and the costs associated with production (u = 2.87) are less relevant. The high means for these items may be linked to

the fact that many academic editors (with the exception of those working at academic journals) are not involved in the publishing process. The fact that some of the means are only slightly higher than the cut-off mean, reflects that a considerable number of editors do work in contexts where knowledge of some aspects of the publishing process is important.

With regard to specialised knowledge, lower means were computed for the items related to knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines (u = 2.13), text types and text structures (u = 2.22) and specialised subject matter (u = 1.83). The only item with a mean of 2.50 or above was the item dealing with knowledge of design and layout principles (u = 2.52). Academic editors therefore view knowledge of design and layout principles as less relevant to their work because they are not typically responsible for preparing a text for print.

Greater standard deviation occurred on 31 of the 115 items. In total, greater standard deviation occurred on four items under copyediting (12%), one item under stylistic editing (11%), one item under structural editing (9%), six items under content editing (32%), eight items under proofreading (73%), five items under technical skills (50%), three items under procedural skills (75%) and three items under specialised knowledge (75%). It is noticeable that greater standard deviation occurred predominantly on the items listed in the procedural-skills, specialised-knowledge, proofreading, technical-skills and content-editing categories.

In the copyediting category, greater standard deviation occurred on the items dealing with ensuring consistent use of foreign languages (SD = 1.137) and consistency of illustrations (SD = 1.041), querying the consistency of reference style (SD = 1.014) and collating the author's and proofreader's changes for the typesetter (SD = 1.140). The greater standard deviations on these items demonstrate that the frequency with which these tasks are performed is contentious among academic editors. Notably, the greater standard deviation on the item dealing with ensuring the consistency of foreign languages is similar for the entire sample and each sector, indicating that overall this task is controversial for all editors. With regard to the standard deviation on the item related to collating changes, this difference may result from the fact that editors who work predominantly with dissertations and theses do not collate changes as they do not work in a formal publishing environment, while editors who work for academic journals are responsible for collating changes from various sources.

In the stylistic-editing category, greater standard deviation occurred on querying instances of inappropriate register (SD = 1.24). In addition, the item dealing with correcting instances of inappropriate register (SD = 0.910) scored a standard deviation just below 1.000. The standard deviations on these items indicate that tasks related to correcting register in academic texts are contentious among academic editors, possibly because some editors feel that this is a skill that

authors working in the academic context ought to have mastered. However, both items scored very low means (below 2.00) indicating that academic editors do frequently correct and/or query inappropriate register.

In the structural-editing category, one item under editing the physical structure computed greater standard deviation, although three items under editing the conceptual structure scored standard deviations close to 1.000. Ensuring the logical use of verbal signposts scored greater standard deviation (SD = 1.082) indicating variance among academic editors on the relevance of this task. This item also scored a relatively high mean (u = 2.48), suggesting that overall this task is contentious among academic editors. This disagreement may be because verbal signposts, such as standfirsts and page turns, do not feature very often in academic texts. The three items under editing the conceptual structure that scored standard deviations close to 1.000 are ensuring the optimal structure of the argument or discussion (SD = 0.953), querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion (SD = 0.937) and correcting missing markers (SD = 0.984). Although each of these items scored means well below 2.50, the greater standard deviations indicate that these tasks are perceived as somewhat controversial, probably since one might argue that, in the academic context, the ability to structure an argument in a logical way is one of the skills at which an author should be able to demonstrate competence.

With regard to content editing, greater standard deviation occurred mostly on the items related to micro-level content editing. Editorial tasks that are particularly contentious amongst academic editors include correcting content for completeness (SD = 1.082), appropriateness (SD = 1.071) and accuracy (SD = 1.010), and querying incomplete and inappropriate content (SD = 1.043, SD = 1.105). The high standard deviation, together with the generally somewhat higher means (compared to other sectors) computed for these items, suggests that academic editors themselves disagree on the level of micro-level content intervention in academic texts, and that any tasks related to improving the content of the text are highly controversial. However, the high means and low standard deviations for the macro-level content-editing items (with the exception of the items dealing with suggesting rewrites and writing or rewriting portions of the text) show that academic editors strongly agree that macro-level content editing is not the responsibility of the editor, but rather the author. In addition, the greater standard deviations on the two items dealing with suggesting rewrites (SD = 1.033) and writing or rewriting portions of text (SD = 0.994) indicate that while these items did score means below 2.50, they are controversial among academic editors.

Nearly all items in the proofreading category demonstrated greater standard deviation. As pointed out above, many of these items scored borderline or high means, suggesting moderate

agreement about their relevance; however, the greater standard deviations on these indicate that there is high variance among editors regarding the relevance of these tasks. This suggests differences in the editorial practice of academic editors, which in all likelihood may be linked to differences in the working environment (freelance or in-house) of the respondents and the kind of academic texts they typically work with (dissertations/theses or academic journal articles/books).

In the technical-skills category, greater standard deviation occurred on all items related to project management. This contrasts sharply with the other three sectors, where the majority of items demonstrated lower standard deviation. This variance may be due to the working context of the individual academic editors in the sample. Project-management skills are essential for freelance editors and less relevant for in-house editors. Academic editors may work in-house (for example, for journals), in which case project-management skills would be of lesser importance. However, editors of dissertations and theses are often freelancers, for whom project-management skills may be of greater importance. These possible differences in the sample may also account for the greater standard deviation that occurred on the other items in the technical-skills category. For example, two items under skills relating to technology scored greater standard deviation. These items are: expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript (SD = 1.276) and the ability to source information effectively (SD = 1.096). The variance on correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript may be the consequence of the fact that many editors (particularly freelance editors) work on electronic documents only. Nevertheless, this item scored a very low mean, suggesting that it is an important skill for most editors.

Greater standard deviation occurred on three items in the procedural-skills category, and one item scored a standard deviation close to 1.000. The respondents disagreed on the relevance of knowledge of the publishing process (SD = 1.152), knowledge of the costs associated with the various stages of production (SD = 1.014) and general administrative tasks (SD = 1.029). The last item did, however, score a mean below 2.50 (u = 2.17), suggesting that it is relevant to the work of most academic editors. However, the items related to knowledge of the publishing process (u = 2.65) and the costs associated with the various stages of production (u = 2.87) did score high means, indicating that these skills are generally not relevant to the work of academic editors.

In terms of specialised knowledge, the respondents generally agreed that knowledge of specialised subject matter is important, but disagreed on the relevance of knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines (SD = 1.014), the various text types and structures (SD = 1.043) and expertise in design and layout principles (SD = 1.201). This is

similar to the findings for the entire sample as well as the findings for the book-publishing and technical-editing sectors, suggesting that there is variance among editors in general. However, most of the items in this category (excluding knowledge of design and layout principles) scored acceptable means, indicating that overall academic editors do agree that these skills are important.

The analysis of the means and standard deviations computed for the responses from the academic-editing sector demonstrates that the essence of the academic editor's work is copyediting, stylistic editing and structural editing. More specifically, the low means on most of the copyediting and stylistic-editing tasks indicate that these types of editing form the heart of the editing process for these editors. The high means for the content-editing and proofreading items suggest that academic editors agree that these types of editing are not performed as frequently as copyediting and stylistic editing. In addition, while a number of the items under the extra-textual skills category computed acceptable means, many of these items demonstrated greater standard deviation, suggesting that certain skills are contentious. Overall, academic editors strongly agree that personal and interpersonal skills are vital for their work; however, skills related to management, planning and the various aspects of the publishing process are of lesser value. Some extra-textual skills did score particularly low means, and these skills reflect knowledge of the various methods of querying or correctly marking changes, suggesting that academic editors place great emphasis on guiding the author through the editorial process.

5.4.2.6 Comparative analysis of descriptive statistics for all sectors

The preceding sections have discussed the means and standard deviations for the entire sample's responses and for each individual sector's responses. This discussion has demonstrated that the sectors do differ on the relevance of certain items. The analysis of the entire sample's responses does not clearly reflect the differences among editing tasks and skills in the different sectors, and therefore does not provide a clear view of what the core editorial tasks for South African editors are. To illustrate this point, it is clear that item BA37 computed an acceptable mean for the entire sample (u = 2.40), which suggests, at face value, that this task forms part of the everyday work of the editors in the sample. However, the analysis of the responses from each sector show that editors who work in the technical-editing and academic-editing sectors do not view this task as relevant to their work, since this item scored a mean of 2.56 and 2.87 in these sectors, respectively. Therefore, simply calculating the mean for the entire sample's response to an item is not sufficient in delineating which items are central to the role of all editors.

In order to arrive at an accurate list of core tasks and skills, it is therefore necessary to compare the means for each sector's responses. It was decided that the first parameter for a task's inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills for editors (subject to further significance testing) is that it should have scored an acceptable mean across all four sectors. For example, the means for item BA36 show that editors from the book-publishing and academic-editing sectors consider this item relevant to their work, while editors from the mass-media and technical-editing sectors do not. Therefore, item BA36 is considered a sector-specific task (for the book-publishing and academic-editing sectors) and does not form part of a core list of skills for editors in South Africa. However, as discussed in the preceding sections, some items scored means slightly higher than the cut-off mean of 2.50 in some sectors. In order to ensure that the identification of core tasks and skills is more nuanced, it was decided to devise a way of including borderline cases in the set of core tasks and skills generated by the first parameter for tasks' inclusion. A borderline case is defined as an item that scored acceptable means in three sectors and a mean of between 2.50 and 2.59 in the remaining sector.

Table 5.8 reflects the means and standard deviations scored for each item per sector. Items that are in bold scored acceptable means across all four the sectors, while items that were categorised as borderline are in bold italics.

Of the initial 115 items, 67 scored acceptable means across all four sectors and 10 items scored borderline means. Borderline means were scored in the following categories: one copyediting task, one micro-level content-editing task, three proofreading tasks, one technology-related skill, one procedural skill and three items related to specialised knowledge. Therefore, 77 items meet the first parameter for inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills for South African editors. These items are distributed as follows:

- 25 of the 38 copyediting tasks (14 of the 21 tasks under correcting for pre-set rules, 9 of the 12 tasks under correcting for consistency and 2 of the 5 tasks under correlating parts),
- all 9 stylistic-editing tasks (all 5 of the tasks under tailoring language and all 4 of the tasks under smoothing the text),
- 9 of the 11 structural-editing tasks (4 of the 6 tasks under editing the physical structure of a text and all 5 of the tasks under editing the conceptual structure of the text),
- 8 of the 19 content-editing tasks (7 of the 12 tasks under micro-level content editing and 1 of the 7 tasks under macro-level content editing),
- 5 of the 11 proofreading tasks,
- 7 of the 10 technical skills (all 3 of the project-management skills and 4 of the 7 technology-related skills),

- all 9 personal and interpersonal skills,
- 1 of the 4 procedural skills, and
- all 4 items related to specialised knowledge.

	Book publishing		Mass media		Technical editing		Academic editing	
Item	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
COPYEDITING								
Correcting for pre-set rules								
BA1	**1.20**	**.408**	**1.30**	**.657**	**1.17**	**.383**	**1.35**	**.487**
BA2	**1.16**	**.374**	**1.25**	**.550**	**1.17**	**.383**	**1.17**	**.491**
BA3	**1.24**	**.523**	**1.25**	**.444**	**1.33**	**.594**	**1.22**	**.422**
BA4	**1.28**	**.737**	**1.25**	**.550**	**1.33**	**.594**	**1.26**	**.541**
BA5	**1.84**	**.746**	**1.45**	**.686**	**1.44**	**.784**	**2.09**	**.733**
BA6	**2.16**	**.746**	**1.70**	**.733**	**1.94**	**.802**	**2.04**	**.706**
BA7	**2.16**	**1.028**	**1.70**	**.801**	**2.06**	**.938**	**2.17**	**.834**
BA8	2.68	.852	1.90	.912	2.11	.900	2.27	.827
BA9	3.04	.735	2.80	.894	3.24	.664	2.78	.902
BA10	**1.60**	**.957**	**1.75**	**.851**	**1.59**	**.870**	**1.52**	**.665**
BA11	**1.68**	**.988**	**2.10**	**.852**	**1.56**	**.856**	**1.45**	**.596**
BA12	2.08	1.077	2.60	1.095	1.83	.985	2.04	.767
BA13	2.28	1.021	2.45	1.191	2.72	.958	2.74	.964
BA14	2.44	.870	2.60	1.231	2.72	.895	2.78	.850
BA15	**1.52**	**.770**	**2.40**	**1.392**	**1.78**	**.943**	**1.48**	**.730**
BA26	**1.88**	**.726**	**1.90**	**.852**	**1.94**	**.938**	**1.65**	**.982**
BA28	**1.64**	**.860**	**1.70**	**1.031**	**1.94**	**.873**	**1.78**	**.795**
BA29	**1.96**	**.841**	**2.00**	**1.026**	**2.00**	**.767**	**2.04**	**.878**
BA31	***1.84***	***.943***	***2.55***	***1.356***	***2.44***	***.984***	***1.39***	***.783***
BA32	2.24	1.012	2.85	1.226	2.50	.924	1.61	.783
BA37	2.16	.987	1.95	1.146	2.56	1.247	2.87	.869
Correcting for consistency								
BA16	**1.08**	**.277**	**1.15**	**.366**	**1.11**	**.323**	**1.17**	**.388**
BA17	**1.08**	**.277**	**1.20**	**.523**	**1.22**	**.428**	**1.17**	**.388**
BA18	**1.12**	**.332**	**1.20**	**.410**	**1.33**	**.594**	**1.30**	**.703**
BA19	**1.32**	**.557**	**1.30**	**.571**	**1.39**	**.698**	**1.30**	**.703**
BA20	**1.32**	**.557**	**1.35**	**.587**	**1.28**	**.575**	**1.52**	**.846**
BA21	**1.72**	**.792**	**1.70**	**.979**	**1.69**	**.793**	**1.52**	**.898**
BA22	2.32	1.030	2.45	1.317	3.11	.900	2.26	1.137
BA23	**1.40**	**.816**	**1.90**	**1.071**	**1.39**	**.608**	**1.17**	**.491**
BA24	**1.54**	**.932**	**2.15**	**1.089**	**1.56**	**.705**	**1.27**	**.456**

BA25	**1.92**	**.909**	**2.20**	**1.196**	**2.17**	**.924**	**2.09**	**1.041**
BA33	1.88	.927	2.60	1.353	2.39	.916	1.39	.783
BA34	2.29	1.042	2.85	1.226	2.44	.856	1.87	1.014
Correlating parts								
BA27	**1.40**	**.764**	**2.45**	**1.432**	**2.00**	**.767**	**1.57**	**.788**
BA30	**1.60**	**.816**	**2.10**	**1.119**	**2.00**	**.970**	**2.00**	**.853**
BA35	2.08	1.187	2.85	1.424	2.56	1.042	1.70	.926
BA36	2.16	1.106	3.00	1.298	2.56	.984	1.74	.864
BA38	2.00	1.080	2.25	1.293	2.89	1.183	3.13	1.140
LISTIC EDITING								
Tailoring the language								
BB39	**1.72**	**.792**	**1.05**	**.224**	**1.56**	**.922**	**1.77**	**.922**
BB40	**1.88**	**.850**	**1.30**	**.657**	**1.78**	**.943**	**1.86**	**.910**
BB41	**2.08**	**.759**	**1.80**	**.768**	**2.11**	**1.079**	**1.95**	**1.024**
BB45	**1.72**	**.843**	**1.25**	**.639**	**1.67**	**.767**	**1.50**	**.859**
BB47	**1.60**	**.707**	**1.10**	**.308**	**1.56**	**.784**	**1.36**	**.790**
Smoothing the text								
BB42	**1.68**	**.748**	**1.20**	**.410**	**1.50**	**.857**	**1.36**	**.790**
BB43	**1.64**	**.810**	**1.05**	**.224**	**1.44**	**.705**	**1.41**	**.734**
BB44	**1.48**	**.586**	**1.05**	**.229**	**1.39**	**.698**	**1.32**	**.716**
BB46	**1.68**	**.802**	**1.35**	**.671**	**1.72**	**.752**	**1.41**	**.796**
STRUCTURAL EDITING								
Editing the physical structure								
BC50	**1.92**	**.954**	**1.60**	**.754**	**2.06**	**.802**	**1.74**	**.864**
BC51	**2.08**	**.862**	**1.55**	**.759**	**2.28**	**.895**	**2.00**	**.674**
BC52	**2.08**	**.909**	**1.50**	**.688**	**2.28**	**.575**	**2.04**	**.767**
BC53	**2.00**	**.957**	**2.05**	**1.050**	**2.06**	**.802**	**1.78**	**.795**
BC54	2.50	1.063	2.25	1.209	3.11	.676	2.48	1.082
BC58	2.96	.859	2.50	1.000	2.67	.686	2.39	.839
Editing the conceptual structure								
BC48	**2.36**	**.860**	**1.55**	**.686**	**2.00**	**1.085**	**2.00**	**.953**
BC49	**2.44**	**.821**	**2.20**	**.894**	**2.17**	**.985**	**2.17**	**.937**
BC55	**2.16**	**1.068**	**2.05**	**.911**	**1.94**	**.725**	**1.83**	**.984**
BC56	**2.24**	**.970**	**2.15**	**.933**	**2.39**	**.979**	**1.96**	**.878**
BC57	**2.24**	**1.012**	**2.30**	**.979**	**2.22**	**.943**	**1.96**	**.825**
CONTENT EDITING								
Micro-evel content editing								
BD59	***2.28***	***1.021***	***1.60***	***.754***	***2.00***	***.907***	***2.52***	***1.082***

BD60	**2.00**	**.866**	**1.85**	**.933**	**2.11**	**.758**	**2.22**	**1.043**
BD61	2.40	.913	1.65	.671	2.00	.767	2.65	1.071
BD62	**2.32**	**.802**	**1.90**	**.852**	**2.17**	**.786**	**2.30**	**1.105**
BD63	**2.24**	**1.012**	**1.60**	**.598**	**1.56**	**.616**	**2.26**	**1.010**
BD64	**2.08**	**.812**	**1.60**	**.821**	**1.83**	**.618**	**2.13**	**.920**
BD65	**2.40**	**.913**	**1.80**	**.768**	**1.89**	**.900**	**2.39**	**.783**
BD66	**2.48**	**.872**	**2.00**	**.858**	**2.00**	**.767**	**2.35**	**.647**
BD67	2.52	.823	2.58	.902	3.06	.725	2.91	.949
BD68	2.28	.891	2.75	.967	3.11	.676	2.78	.998
BD69	2.28	.980	2.35	.988	2.78	.943	2.78	.795
BD70	2.60	.866	2.50	.946	2.89	.758	2.83	.717
Macro-level content editing								
BD71	3.00	1.000	2.85	1.089	3.33	.907	3.83	.388
BD72	3.20	.957	2.95	.999	3.33	1.029	3.78	.518
BD73	3.28	1.021	3.15	.875	3.44	.705	3.61	.783
BD74	3.08	.954	2.95	.945	2.83	.924	3.00	.905
BD75	3.08	1.115	2.05	1.146	3.56	.511	3.57	.843
BD76	2.44	1.083	2.30	.865	2.61	1.037	2.39	1.033
BD77	**2.40**	**1.041**	**1.80**	**.834**	**2.17**	**1.043**	**2.48**	**.994**
PROOFREADING								
Correcting errors in proofs or print-ready pages								
BE78	**1.48**	**.770**	**1.95**	**1.191**	**1.71**	**.849**	**2.48**	**1.275**
BE79	**1.56**	**.821**	**1.75**	**1.209**	**1.71**	**.849**	**2.45**	**1.262**
BE80	***1.80***	***.957***	***2.05***	***1.191***	***1.76***	***.831***	***2.59***	***1.182***
BE81	***1.56***	***.870***	***2.00***	***1.170***	***1.71***	***.772***	***2.55***	***1.184***
BE82	***1.60***	***.866***	***2.10***	***1.210***	***1.82***	***.809***	***2.50***	***1.225***
BE83	1.72	.891	2.30	1.261	1.94	.966	2.64	1.255
BE84	2.56	.917	2.40	1.273	2.41	1.064	3.18	.958
BE85	2.48	1.046	2.60	1.273	2.53	1.068	3.14	.834
BE86	2.24	1.052	2.63	1.212	2.47	1.125	3.14	.941
BE87	2.28	1.021	2.70	1.174	2.35	1.057	2.95	1.046
BE88	2.24	1.268	1.85	1.182	1.94	1.088	2.91	1.192
TECHNICAL SKILLS								
Project management								
CA1	**1.76**	**.831**	**2.10**	**.968**	**1.56**	**.856**	**2.23**	**1.193**
CA2	**1.68**	**.945**	**1.80**	**.951**	**1.78**	**1.003**	**2.22**	**1.166**
CA3	**2.16**	**.898**	**2.10**	**.852**	**2.11**	**.832**	**2.43**	**1.037**
Skills relating to technology								
CA4	**2.00**	**1.041**	**1.95**	**.759**	**1.83**	**.786**	**2.00**	**.853**

CA5	2.84	1.068	2.25	1.118	3.00	1.085	3.26	.752
CA6	***1.52***	***.918***	***2.50***	***.946***	***1.44***	***.984***	***1.61***	***.783***
CA7	**1.24**	**.663**	**2.20**	**1.105**	**1.89**	**1.079**	**1.91**	**1.276**
CA8	3.44	.917	3.15	.813	3.28	.958	3.57	.728
CA9	1.84	.898	3.15	.875	1.33	.840	1.87	.920
CA10	**1.48**	**.653**	**1.50**	**.889**	**1.17**	**.383**	**1.74**	**1.096**
PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS								
Personal traits								
CB11	**1.16**	**.374**	**1.00**	**.000**	**1.06**	**.236**	**1.04**	**.209**
CB12	**1.16**	**.374**	**1.05**	**.224**	**1.11**	**.471**	**1.04**	**.209**
CB13	**1.24**	**.436**	**1.35**	**.489**	**1.11**	**.323**	**1.17**	**.388**
CB14	**1.44**	**.651**	**1.45**	**.605**	**1.39**	**.778**	**1.65**	**.647**
CB15	**1.44**	**.768**	**1.50**	**.513**	**1.50**	**.707**	**1.43**	**.507**
CB16	**1.28**	**.542**	**1.25**	**.444**	**1.17**	**.514**	**1.09**	**.288**
CB17	**1.16**	**.374**	**1.30**	**.470**	**1.22**	**.428**	**1.26**	**.449**
CB18	**1.16**	**.473**	**1.30**	**.470**	**1.61**	**.698**	**1.65**	**.775**
CB19	**1.20**	**.500**	**1.50**	**.688**	**1.33**	**.686**	**1.30**	**.470**
PROCEDURAL SKILLS								
Project coordination and industry knowledge								
CC20	1.48	.510	1.80	.894	2.44	1.097	2.65	1.152
CC21	***1.52***	***.586***	***1.70***	***.865***	***2.28***	***.958***	***2.52***	***.994***
CC22	1.92	.862	2.60	1.046	2.67	1.085	2.87	1.014
CC23	1.92	.759	2.65	1.040	2.18	1.131	2.17	1.029
SPECIALISED KNOWLEDGE								
Expertise								
CD24	***2.58***	***1.100***	***2.45***	***1.050***	***2.17***	***1.098***	***2.13***	***1.014***
CD25	***2.12***	***.971***	***2.55***	***.999***	***1.72***	***.895***	***2.22***	***1.043***
CD26	***1.68***	***.748***	***2.25***	***.910***	***2.06***	***.938***	***2.52***	***1.201***
CD27	**1.88**	**.927**	**2.20**	**1.105**	**1.67**	**.907**	**1.83**	**.887**

Table 5.8: Comparison of sector descriptives

In the copyediting category 25 items scored acceptable or borderline means across the sectors. These items are the following (the item in italics is a borderline item):

Correcting for pre-set rules

- correcting spelling errors,
- correcting punctuation errors,
- correcting errors of grammar,
- correcting errors of syntax (sentence structure),

- ensuring correctness of terminology usage,
- querying correctness of terminology usage,
- ensuring correctness of numbers, units and measurements,
- ensuring correctness of headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc),
- ensuring correctness in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are correctly formatted, that the content is accurate and correctly punctuated),
- ensuring correctness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries),
- clarifying unexplained acronyms and abbreviations,
- ensuring that the text is in line with design specifications (such as layout, formatting, paragraph indentation),
- querying irregularities with design specifications (such as the layout, formatting, paragraph indentation), and
- *ensuring correctness of reference style of in-text references and reference lists.*

Correcting for consistency

- ensuring consistency of spelling,
- ensuring consistency of punctuation,
- ensuring consistency of grammar,
- ensuring consistency of syntax (sentence structure),
- ensuring consistency of terminology usage,
- ensuring consistency in the use of numbers, units and measurements,
- ensuring consistency in headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc),
- ensuring consistency in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are consistently formatted and punctuated, and that information is presented clearly), and
- ensuring consistency of illustrations (in terms of the presentation of their content, formatting).

Correlating parts

- ensuring completeness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries), and
- correlating parts of the text (such as checking cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, table of contents).

There seems to be consensus among the sectors that most micro-level copyediting tasks form part of their work. Specifically, correcting for pre-set rules such as spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax, terminology usage and the treatment of numbers, units and measurements is part of most editors' work. In addition, the sectors agreed that ensuring the correctness of headings, tabulated material and lists is important. Some macro-level tasks, such as ensuring the correctness of preliminary pages and end matter, and ensuring that the text is in line with design specifications, are also important for all four sectors.

With regard to disagreement across sectors on the items under correcting for pre-set rules, the sectors were unanimous in indicating that they do not ensure the correct use of foreign languages, suggesting that this is neither a shared task nor a core task. However, the book-publishing, mass-media and academic-editing sectors did agree that they would ensure the consistent use of foreign languages, although each of the means for these sectors is close to 2.50, suggesting that this is not an altogether frequently performed task. The items referring to correcting or querying errors in illustrations also did not score acceptable means across all four sectors. The book-publishing and mass-media sectors did, however, indicate that they do correct errors in illustrations, but the mean for this item in each of these sectors is close to 2.50, indicating that this is not a task that is carried out frequently.

Respondents from the mass-media and technical-editing sectors differed from respondents in the other two sectors and indicated that they do not regularly perform functions that relate to querying the correctness of reference style and reference lists. However, the means for the items related to ensuring the correctness of reference style show that the book-publishing and academic-editing sectors frequently perform tasks related to ensuring the correctness of reference styles and lists. The means for this item in the mass-media and technical-editing sectors are quite high (2.55 and 2.44 respectively) indicating that some editors do perform this task, but less frequently than the editors working in the book-publishing and academic-editing sectors. Nevertheless, the means for this item do fall within the (borderline) parameter for inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills. The means for the technical- and academic-editing sectors showed that editors from these sectors do not approve an author's and proofreader's changes for a text. This is in line with findings for the proofreading category, where academic editors indicated that they do not often correct or work with proofs or print-ready pages.

In terms of tasks related to correcting for consistency, there is consensus among the sectors that most of these tasks are relevant. However, as is the case for tasks to do with correcting for pre-set rules, editors in the mass-media sector indicated that no task related to ensuring consistency in reference style or lists forms part of their everyday work. Editors from this sector are therefore consistent in indicating the irrelevance of these tasks for their work.

With regard to correlating the parts of a text, there is agreement across the sectors that editors correlate parts of the text (such as the table of contents, cross-references and internal page references), and also ensure the completeness of preliminary matter. However, the mass-media and technical-editing sectors again indicated that any function related to reference lists does not form part of their work, while the collation of changes are not relevant to the everyday work of technical editors and academic editors.

All sectors indicated that all the stylistic-editing tasks are central to their editorial work. The items in the stylistic-editing category include:

Tailoring the language

- ensuring appropriate use of vocabulary for the readership,
- ensuring an appropriate register is used in the text, based on the type of text and the readership,
- querying instances of inappropriate register in the text, based on the type of text and the readership,
- removing or correcting instances of verbosity, and
- removing or correcting repetition and redundancies.

Smoothing the text

- tailoring sentences for the readers of the text and the use they will make of it by ensuring that the sentences are well structured and concise (for example, by ensuring that the appropriate sentence structure is used (such as active/passive or complex/simple), that appropriate inter-sentence connections are used, and that the sentence is focused),
- ensuring an appropriate level of readability in the text (for example, ensuring that the text is cohesive by ensuring that the text is well-structured, contains clearly related sentences and paragraphs, and that discourse markers are used appropriately),
- ensuring an appropriate level of clarity within the text (for example, ensuring that the text is coherent by ensuring that the message of the text does not contain any slips in logic, such as self-contradictory statements, wrong organisation of events), and
- removing or correcting ambiguities.

All of the items in the stylistic-editing category, with the exception of one, calculated a mean lower than 2.00 for the various sectors, suggesting that stylistic editing is central to the editor's role, regardless of sector. The item referring to querying instances of inappropriate register in the text calculated a mean of more than 2.00 for the book-publishing and technical-editing sectors, suggesting that these sectors perform this task somewhat less frequently than the mass-media

and academic-editing sectors do. However, all sectors did indicate that they frequently correct instances of inappropriate register. Notably, the mass-media sector demonstrated a higher degree of favourability on all the stylistic-editing tasks compared to the other sectors. In fact, stylistic-editing tasks scored the lowest means overall in the mass-media sector. This suggests that mass-media editors place a great deal of emphasis on the readership.

Nine items from the structural-editing category computed acceptable means across all four sectors. These items are:

Editing the physical structure

- ensuring logic of headings (for example, that a heading accurately reflects the content that follows, and that headings are arranged in a logical order),
- ensuring logical sequence divisions,
- ensuring logical order of sections, and
- ensuring logic in the relationship between text, tables and graphics.

Editing the conceptual structure

- ensuring optimal structure of the argument or discussion (for example, by rearranging sentences, paragraphs or sections of material),
- querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion,
- correcting missing markers (such as the incorrect or inconsistent use of *firstly, secondly* and *thirdly*),
- correcting or removing unfulfilled announcements (for example, correcting or removing instances where a writer has indicated that something specific will be discussed in a later section, and then does not do so), and
- correcting problems with backward and forward references (for example, correcting or removing instances where reference is made to previous or subsequent information that does not appear).

In terms of editing the physical structure of a text, four of the initial six items remained. All four sectors indicated that ensuring logic in the use of headings, the use of sequence divisions, the order of sections and the relationship between text, tables and graphics, is important. The two items that did not score acceptable means across all four sectors (and are therefore not included in the list of core tasks and skills) are ensuring the logical use of verbal signposts, and checking and imposing the correct physical structure for a text. With regard to ensuring the logical use of verbal signposts, means below 2.50 (but above 2.25) were computed only for the mass-media and academic-editing sectors. Overall the means on this item were therefore relatively high, suggesting that even if editors in some sectors do perform this task, it is not done very

frequently.[4] Only the academic-editing sector indicated that they do sometimes check the physical structure of a text, while the other sectors agreed that this does not form part of their work. Overall the means on this item are very high, suggesting that it is not a frequent task in any of the sectors.

All of the items related to editing the conceptual structure of the text calculated an acceptable mean, and are therefore included in the list of core tasks and skills. However, it is noteworthy that the book-publishing sector scored relatively high means for each item, suggesting that while book editors do perform tasks related to editing conceptual structure, this type of editing is not done as frequently in this sector as it is in the others. This may be a consequence of the type of texts with which book editors typically work. For example, book editors need to more respectful to the text and the author, and so their degree of editorial intervention on the conceptual level may not be as comprehensive as is the case for mass-media or technical editors, who focus more on the reader.

In total, seven items under micro-level content editing and one item under macro-level content editing scored acceptable or borderline means in all four sectors. These items are (the item in italics is a borderline item):

Micro-level content editing

- *correcting content for completeness,*
- querying incomplete content,
- querying inappropriate content,
- correcting content for accuracy,
- querying inaccurate content,
- correcting content for logic, and
- querying illogical content.

Macro-level content editing

- writing or rewriting sections of the text.

With regard to micro-level content editing, there seems to be general consensus that correcting content for accuracy and logic are important editorial tasks. In addition, the sectors agreed that querying incomplete, inappropriate, inaccurate and illogical content is important. With regard to

[4] The contention on this item may also be as a result of the way in which the item and its examples were formulated in the questionnaire. In the questionnaire, the item read "Ensuring logical use of verbal signposts (such as the positioning of standfirsts, page turns)". The examples given for this item might not have been explicit or representative enough and confused respondents.

correcting content for completeness, the academic-editing sector scored a mean of 2.52 for this task, suggesting that this task is somewhat less relevant to the work of academic editors. However, since this item scored a mean of 2.52 for this sector, and means below 2.50 in all the other sectors, it is included as a borderline item. Three sectors agreed that checking and querying content for legal issues and checking and querying the appropriateness of illustrations do not form part of their work – the exception being the book-publishing sector.

Therefore, the micro-level content-editing tasks that form part of the work of all editors include correcting and querying content for completeness, accuracy and logic; and querying inappropriate content. It is striking that the means for each item for both the mass-media and technical-editing sectors are significantly lower than the means for the book-publishing and academic-editing sectors. This suggests that editors from the mass-media and technical-editing sectors perform micro-level content-editing tasks more often than editors who work in the book-publishing and academic sectors. This difference might be explained by the significant legal consequences of errors that remain in texts published by these sectors (for example, if a newspaper article incorrectly names a company as involved in a fraud investigation, or if an instruction manual inaccurately describes how to wire a piece of machinery, which ultimately leads to an injury).

Overall, the means for the macro-level content-editing tasks are very high (most means are above 3.00), suggesting that editors, in general, do not perform macro-level content-editing tasks frequently. Only one item scored acceptable means across all sectors: writing or rewriting sections of text. This suggests that all editors, regardless of sector, do some rewriting as part of their editorial work. However, book editors, mass-media editors and academic editors did indicate that they would also suggest rewrites for sections of text (although less frequently than actually rewriting portions of text), while editors in the technical-editing sector indicated that they do not suggest rewrites. As far as the items that are not included in the list of core tasks and skills are concerned, the mass-media sector indicated that copyfitting text for publication is frequently done in this sector; however, this item demonstrated very high means in the remaining three sectors. Furthermore, the three items dealing with selecting, cropping and editing illustrations and graphics for the text scored very high means in all four sectors, indicate strong agreement across sectors on the irrelevance of these tasks.

In the proofreading category, only five items scored acceptable or borderline means across all four sectors. There is a strikingly high rate of borderline items in this category (three of the five items are borderline cases). The items included in the list of core tasks and skills are the following (items in italics are borderline items):

Proofreading

- correcting spelling errors in proofs or print-ready pages,
- correcting inconsistent spelling in proofs or print-ready pages,
- *correcting grammatical errors in proofs or print-ready pages,*
- *correcting punctuation errors and inconsistent punctuation use (for example, in abbreviations) in proofs or print-ready pages,* and
- *correcting inconsistent punctuation use in proofs or print-ready pages.*

There seems to be overall agreement among the four sectors that basic proofreading tasks form part of the editor's role. The book-publishing and technical-editing sectors returned very low means on the basic proofreading tasks listed above, while the mass-media and academic-editing sectors returned relatively high means, by comparison. This suggests that book editors and technical editors perform basic proofreading tasks more frequently than their counterparts working in the mass-media and academic-editing sectors. In fact, the academic editing sector returned the highest means on these five items.

It is notable that in the proofreading category most of the items considered for inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills are borderline items. With the exception of correcting spelling errors and inconsistencies, the remaining three items (dealing with correcting grammar and punctuation errors, and inconsistent punctuation) scored means above 2.50 (but below 2.59) in the academic-editing sector, and acceptable means in the remaining three sectors, suggesting that academic editors perceive proofreading tasks as less central to editorial work than editors in other sectors do.

The sectors did not agree on the relevance of six proofreading tasks. These tasks include correcting errors in word breaks, facts, type specification and format and layout, and collating the editor's and author's changes. Notably, the means for the book-publishing sector demonstrate that these editors do perform all proofreading tasks specified, with the exception of correcting errors of fact. In contrast, academic editors indicated strongly that they did not perform these tasks at all – with most means for this sector close to or above 3.00. In the mass-media and technical-editing sectors means for these items are more or less in the middle (with most means ranging from 2.40 to 2.70), indicating a degree of ambivalence about the relevance of the tasks.

In the technical-skills category, seven items scored acceptable or borderline means across the four sectors. These items are the following (italics indicate a borderline item):

Project management

- the ability to plan projects (conventionally or online) effectively,
- the ability to manage projects (conventionally or online) efficiently and within budgetary and time constraints, and
- sound business and management skills.

Skills relating to technology

- expertise in the latest word-processing software,
- *expertise in correctly using* track changes *during electronic editing,*
- expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript, and
- the ability to source information effectively (for example, reference guides, reliable information on specific topics, or previous articles/texts).

All four sectors agreed that all the project-management skills are important for editors. This suggests that editors, in general, are responsible for much more than simply editing a text, and are involved in various stages of a project. Editors therefore require skills that relate to planning and management, as well as business skills. While all the items scored means below 2.50, the means for the academic-editing sector are generally higher for these tasks than in the other three sectors. Nevertheless, project-management skills are clearly relevant for all editors (whether they work in-house or on a freelance basis), regardless of sector.

The relevance of technological skills for all sectors appears to be more contentious, with only three of the seven items listed in this section scoring acceptable means and one item scoring means that classify it as a borderline case. These items are related to expertise in word-processing software, correctly marking changes on hardcopy and electronic manuscript and the ability to source information effectively. With regard to correctly using the *track changes* function when editing, very low means were computed for this item in the book-publishing, technical-editing and academic-editing sectors, while a borderline mean of 2.50 was scored for this item in the mass-media sector. This suggests that mass-media editors make use of *track changes* less frequently than the other sectors. In addition to this, the item dealing with expertise in the various methods of querying scored very low means in the book-publishing, technical- and academic-editing sectors and a very high mean in the mass-media sector. This indicates that mass-media editors place less emphasis on querying errors than editors in the other sectors, in all likelihood because of the type of texts these editors typically edit, and because of time constraints typical of the sector (see Section 5.4.2.3). The highest means for this category were scored on the item dealing with expertise in website design, management and maintenance (the means for all sectors were above 3.00), suggesting that in South Africa editors are not responsible for this.

With regard to personal and interpersonal skills, the sectors agreed that all items in this section are relevant. The items are:

Personal and interpersonal skills

- highly developed reading skills,
- intuitive language skills,
- dedication,
- a good general knowledge and an interest in world news and events,
- a desire to constantly learn,
- a strong personal code of ethics and good judgement skills,
- the ability to work under pressure and for long hours,
- the ability to develop and maintain good working relationships with and among the various industry role-players (for example, journalists, authors, typesetters, designers, proofreaders), and
- the ability to sensitively and diplomatically bring any issues and problems to an author's or client's attention.

All of the items had low means across industry sectors, indicating the respondents' opinion that all editors should possess the characteristics listed. This is a predictable result, since editors are essentially evaluating their own personal traits. All of the items listed in this section are also reported as vital personal qualities and skills for editors in the sources consulted during the literature review, and they should therefore evidently be included in a list of core tasks and skills.

Only one item under procedural skills scored means that warrant considering it for inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills, and the item does fall into the borderline category. This item deals with an awareness of the function of the various role-players in the publishing environment, which scored means below 2.50 in three sectors, and a mean of 2.52 in the academic-editing sector. In general the means for the items in the procedural-skills category demonstrate that there was very little agreement among the sectors regarding the relevance of any of the tasks. The means from the book-publishing sector show that editors working in this sector of the industry do require all the skills listed here, and that they are quite important. In fact, no single item in this group scored a mean of higher than 1.92 in the book-publishing sector. Respondents from the mass-media sector, while in agreement that editors do need some knowledge of the publishing process and familiarity with the functions of the various role-players, did not agree on the relevance of knowledge of the costs associated with production, and skills in general administration. The means calculated for the technical-editing sector show that technical editors also feel that they do not need knowledge of the costs associated with

production. Lastly, the academic-editing sector felt that all the skills, excluding general administration skills, were unimportant. There seems to be very little agreement among the sectors as to what procedural skills and knowledge editors need, although the items related to knowledge of the publishing process and function of the various role-players did score acceptable means in the book-publishing, mass-media and technical-editing sectors – which are generally associated with more formal publishing and corporate environments. There may be a number of reasons for this disagreement; however, it is in all likelihood largely due to differences in procedures and work environments among the sectors, but also because of divergent requirements for in-house and freelance working contexts.

In terms of expertise, the responses across the four sectors suggested the relevance of all four items, although three of the four items were categorised as borderline items. The four items are the following (borderline items are indicated by italics):

Expertise

- *knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines,*
- *knowledge of the various text types and structures and their purposes (for example, knowing how an instruction manual will be read and used, and then understanding how the information needs to be presented for optimal understanding),*
- *knowledge of design (for example, the use of colour and contrast in texts) and layout principles (such as formatting, paragraph indentation, heading levels),* and
- knowledge of specialised subject matter (for example, knowledge of the Revised National Curriculum Statement if editing educational textbooks, or knowledge of South African civil affairs if editing a government policy document).

There is much variance among the sectors regarding the relevance of these skills. The item dealing with knowledge of linguistic principles and sub-disciplines scored relatively high means in all sectors with all means above 2.00. The technical- and academic-editing sectors felt that this item was generally relevant to their work; however, the book-publishing and mass-media sectors disagreed, as evidenced by the means close to and above 2.50 in these two sectors. The technical-editing sector felt that knowledge of various text types and structures and their purposes was very important, while the remaining three sectors felt that this was slightly less important, with the mass-media sector returning a borderline mean of 2.55 on this item. The book-publishing sector indicated that knowledge of design was very important, while the other three sectors indicated that this was less important for their editorial work, and the academic-editing sector returning a mean of 2.52 on this item. All the sectors did, however, agree that knowledge of specialised subject matter was important, suggesting that editors in general should be knowledgeable about the subject matter of the texts they edit.

As discussed earlier, the development of standards needs to be based on a comprehensive list of skills that apply to all sectors of the industry, not just to some. The analysis of means and standard deviations revealed that there are many tasks associated with the role of the editor that are essentially sector specific. Nevertheless, a comparative analysis of the means shows that certain editorial tasks are shared and could form the basis of a core set of standards relevant to all editors in South Africa. However, in order to further refine and validate the findings of the comparative descriptive analysis, one needs to be sure that generalisations can be made to the rest of the population. Significance tests are used to determine at what level of confidence it may be assumed that a task's mean is representative of the entire population.

5.5 SIGNIFICANCE TESTS

In order to determine whether the results of the descriptive analysis can be extrapolated to the general population of editors, a statistical test must be conducted. This test is a significance test and is used to determine the level of confidence at which it may be inferred that the data from the sample is representative of the population.

Two separate criteria for the inclusion of an item into the list of core tasks and skills were set. As discussed in Section 5.4.2.6, the first criterion is that the item must score a mean lower than 2.50 in each sector, or means lower than 2.50 in three sectors and a mean between 2.50 and 2.59 in one sector. The second criterion is that the item must be statistically significant and score a P-value lower than 0.05 (P-values are determined through a significance test). In order to arrive at the final list of core tasks and skills, the P-value for all items that meet the first criterion will be determined (since the other items are immediately disqualified from inclusion in the list because they do not meet the first criterion). Only those items that score acceptable P-values will be considered for inclusion in the list of core tasks and skills. Therefore, only those items fulfilling both criteria will be included in the final list of core tasks and skills.

A significance test using means was applied to the data sets for the entire sample. A one-tailed t-test was used, with the parameter of interest defined as sample means lower than 2.50. To facilitate the significance tests the following null (*Ho*) and alternative (*Ha*) hypothesis were formulated:

Ho: Item will score a mean of 2.50 or more.
Ha: Item will score a mean lower than 2.50.

With u denoting the mean for the editorial task, the hypotheses formulated translate to the following statistical alternatives:

Ho: $u \geq 2.50$

Ha: $u < 2.50$

The significance level was set at the conventional 5 percent ($a = 0.05$), with the decision rule being:

If P-value $\geq a$, conclude Ho.

If P-value $< a$, conclude Ha.

Table 5.9 presents the means, standard errors, t-scores and related P-values for the items.

Item	Mean	Std. error	t-score	P-value
PYEDITING				
BA1	1.29	.055	-22.045	.000*
BA2	1.23	.052	-24.693	.000*
BA3	1.29	.057	-21.216	.000*
BA4	1.33	.068	-17.375	.000*
BA5	1.76	.081	-9.141	.000*
BA6	2.02	.079	-6.071	.000*
BA7	2.08	.096	-4.436	.000*
BA10	1.63	.087	-10.098	.000*
BA11	1.74	.090	-8.529	.000*
BA15	1.77	.105	-6.939	.000*
BA16	1.17	.045	-29.242	.000*
BA17	1.22	.051	-25.221	.000*
BA18	1.28	.061	-20.119	.000*
BA19	1.38	.072	-15.499	.000*
BA20	1.43	.073	-14.593	.000*
BA21	1.72	.094	-8.317	.000*
BA23	1.47	.084	-12.311	.000*
BA24	1.68	.095	-8.693	.000*
BA25	2.10	.106	-3.793	.000*
BA26	1.87	.093	-6.778	.000*
BA27	1.83	.109	-6.190	.000*
BA28	1.76	.091	-8.157	.000*
BA29	1.99	.089	-5.711	.000*
BA30	1.97	.102	-5.228	.000*
BA31	2.07	.118	-3.700	.000*
STYLISTIC EDITING				
BB39	1.55	.085	-11.244	.000*
BB40	1.73	.091	-8.414	.000*
BB41	2.01	.094	-5.193	.000*
BB42	1.47	.079	-13.061	.000*
BB43	1.46	.079	-13.210	.000*
BB44	1.37	.066	-17.170	.000*
BB45	1.57	.084	-11.007	.000*
BB46	1.58	.081	-11.287	.000*
BB47	1.44	.074	-14.400	.000*
STRUCTURAL EDITING				
BC48	2.02	.095	-5.021	.000*
BC49	2.29	.093	-2.211	.030*
BC50	1.87	.090	-6.973	.000*
BC51	2.02	.087	-5.472	.000*
BC52	2.01	.084	-5.827	.000*
BC53	2.01	.095	-5.168	.000*
BC55	2.03	.098	-4.758	.000*
BC56	2.22	.099	-2.862	.005*
BC57	2.22	.098	-2.897	.005*
CONTENT EDITING				
BD59	2.17	.104	-3.124	.002*
BD60	2.11	.097	-4.030	.000*
BD62	2.24	.094	-2.761	.007*
BD63	2.01	.096	-5.101	.000*
BD64	1.97	.088	-6.049	.000*
BD65	2.18	.091	-3.451	.001*
BD66	2.26	.085	-2.768	.007*
BD77	2.25	.103	-2.421	.017*
PROOFREADING				
BE78	1.90	.114	-5.262	.000*
BE79	1.88	.115	-5.418	.000*
BE80	2.07	.114	-3.810	.000*
BE81	1.96	.112	-4.877	.000*
BE82	2.00	.113	-4.431	.000*
TECHNICAL SKILLS				
CA1	1.90	.104	-5.774	.000*
CA2	1.87	.108	-5.814	.000*
CA3	2.17	.095	-3.440	.001*

CA4	1.91	.090	-6.546	.000*
CA6	1.74	.100	-7.608	.000*
CA7	1.76	.111	-6.672	.000*
CA10	1.48	.084	-12.176	.000*
PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS				
CB11	1.07	.026	-55.433	.000*
CB12	1.12	.040	-34.144	.000*
CB13	1.23	.044	-28.905	.000*
CB14	1.48	.068	-14.978	.000*
CB15	1.45	.064	-16.370	.000*
CB16	1.18	.046	-28.477	.000*
CB17	1.23	.044	-28.905	.000*
CB18	1.43	.068	-15.686	.000*
CB19	1.32	.060	-19.839	.000*
PROCEDURAL SKILLS				
CC21	2.00	.098	-5.115	.000*
SPECIALISED KNOWLEDGE				
CD24	2.34	.113	-1.411	.162
CD25	2.17	.103	-3.159	.002*
CD26	2.10	.103	-3.920	.000*
CD27	1.89	.102	-5.974	.000*

* Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$

Bold items conclude *Ha* ($u < 2.50$) with P-values < 0.05.

Table 5.9: Significance tests using means

Table 5.9 reflects that 76 of the 77 items that fulfilled the first criterion for inclusion are statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. For these items, the null hypothesis (*Ho*) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (*Ha*) tentatively concluded because their P-values lend support to *Ha*. These 76 items therefore fulfil both criteria for inclusion in the final list of core tasks and skills. The 76 items are distributed among the categories as follows: twenty-five copyediting tasks, all nine stylistic-editing tasks, nine structural-editing tasks, eight content-editing tasks, five proofreading-tasks, seven technical-skills, all nine personal and interpersonal skills, one procedural skill and three items under specialised knowledge.

The remaining item (CD24), which deals with knowledge of linguistic principles and linguistic sub-disciplines, is not statistically significant because $p > 0.05$, despite the fact that its mean is below 2.50 in three sectors and between 2.50 and 2.59 in the third sector. Therefore the item cannot be considered for inclusion in the final list of core tasks and skills.

Following the discussion above, and after fulfilling both criteria, it may be concluded at a 95 percent confidence interval that core tasks and skills for editors include the following textual tasks and extra-textual skills:

TEXTUAL TASKS	
COPYEDITING	
Correcting for pre-set rules	
BA1	Correcting spelling errors
BA2	Correcting punctuation errors
BA3	Correcting errors of grammar
BA4	Correcting errors of syntax (sentence structure)
BA5	Ensuring correctness of terminology usage
BA6	Querying correctness of terminology usage
BA7	Ensuring correctness of numbers, units and measurements
BA10	Ensuring correctness of headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.)
BA11	Ensuring correctness in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are correctly formatted, that the content is accurate and correctly punctuated)
BA15	Ensuring correctness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)
BA26	Clarifying unexplained acronyms and abbreviations
BA28	Ensuring that the text is in line with design specifications (such as layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)
BA29	Querying irregularities with design specifications (such as the layout, formatting, paragraph indentation)

BA31	Ensuring correctness of reference style of in-text references and reference lists
Correcting for consistency	
BA16	Ensuring consistency of spelling
BA17	Ensuring consistency of punctuation
BA18	Ensuring consistency of grammar
BA19	Ensuring consistency of syntax (sentence structure)
BA20	Ensuring consistency of terminology usage
BA21	Ensuring consistency in the use of numbers, units and measurements
BA23	Ensuring consistency in headings (particularly in numbering, levels, positions, etc.).
BA24	Ensuring consistency in tables and lists (for example, ensuring that tables and lists are consistently formatted and punctuated, and that information is presented consistently)
BA25	Ensuring consistency of illustrations (in terms of the presentation of their content, formatting)
Correlating parts	
BA27	Ensuring completeness of preliminary pages (such as contents lists, preface, acknowledgements, title page) and end matter (such as indexes, appendices, glossaries)
BA30	Correlating parts of the text (such as checking cross-references, internal page references, footnote/endnote numbers and text, table of contents)
STYLISTIC EDITING	
Tailoring the language	
BB39	Ensuring appropriate use of vocabulary for the readership
BB40	Ensuring an appropriate register is used in the text, based on the type of text and the readership
BB41	Querying instances of inappropriate register in the text, based on the type of text and the readership
BB45	Removing or correcting instances of verbosity
BB47	Removing or correcting repetition and redundancies
Smoothing the text	
BB42	Tailoring sentences for the readers of the text and the use they will make of it by ensuring that the sentences are well structured and concise (for example, by ensuring that the appropriate sentence structure is used (such as active/passive or complex/simple), appropriate inter-sentence connections are used, and that the sentence is focused)
BB43	Ensuring an appropriate level of readability in the text (for example, ensuring that the text is cohesive by ensuring that the text is well-structured, contains clearly related sentences and paragraphs, and that discourse markers are used appropriately)
BB44	Ensuring an appropriate level of clarity within the text (for example, ensuring that the text is coherent by ensuring that the message of the text does not contain any slips in logic, such as self-contradictory statements, wrong organisation of events)
BB46	Removing or correcting ambiguities

STRUCTURAL EDITING	
Editing the physical structure	
BC50	Ensuring logic of headings (for example, that a heading accurately reflects the content that follows, and that headings are arranged in a logical order)
BC51	Ensuring logical sequence divisions
BC52	Ensuring logical order of sections
BC53	Ensuring logic in the relationships between text, tables and graphics
Editing the conceptual structure	
BC48	Ensuring optimal structure of the argument or discussion (for example, by rearranging sentences, paragraphs or sections of material)
BC49	Querying the less-than-optimal structure of an argument or discussion
BC55	Correcting missing markers (such as the incorrect or inconsistent use of *firstly, secondly, thirdly*)
BC56	Correcting or removing unfulfilled announcements (for example, correcting or removing instances where a writer has indicated that something specific will be discussed in a later section, and then does not do so)
BC57	Correcting problems with backward and forward references (for example, correcting or removing instances where reference is made to previous or subsequent information that does not appear)
CONTENT EDITING	
Micro-level content editing	
BD59	Correcting content for completeness
BD60	Querying incomplete content
BD62	Querying inappropriate content
BD63	Correcting content for accuracy
BD64	Querying inaccurate content
BD65	Correcting content for logic
BD66	Querying illogical content
Macro-level content editing	
BD77	Writing/rewriting sections of the text
PROOFREADING	
Correcting errors in proofs or print-ready pages	
BE78	Correcting spelling errors in proofs or print-ready pages
BE79	Correcting inconsistent spelling in proofs or print-ready pages
BE80	Correcting grammatical errors in proofs or print-ready pages
BE81	Correcting punctuation errors and inconsistent punctuation use (for example, in abbreviations) in proofs or print-ready pages

BE82	Correcting inconsistent punctuation use in proofs and print-ready pages
EXTRA-TEXTUAL SKILLS	
TECHNICAL SKILLS	
Project management	
CA1	The ability to plan projects (conventional or online) effectively
CA2	The ability to manage projects (conventional or online) efficiently within budgetary and time constraints
CA3	Sound business and management skills
Skills relating to technology	
CA4	Expertise in the latest word-processing software
CA6	Expertise in correctly using *track changes* during electronic editing
CA7	Expertise in correctly marking changes on hardcopy manuscript
CA10	The ability to source information effectively (for example, reference guides, reliable information on specific topics, or previous articles/texts)
PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	
Personal traits	
CB11	Highly developed reading skills
CB12	Intuitive language skills
CB13	Dedication
CB14	A good general knowledge and an interest in world news and events
CB15	A desire to constantly learn
CB16	A strong personal code of ethics and good judgement skills
CB17	The ability to work under pressure and for long hours
CB18	The ability to develop and maintain good working relationships with and between the various industry role-players (for example, journalists, authors, typesetters, designers, proofreaders)
CB19	The ability to sensitively and diplomatically bring any issues and problems to an author's or client's attention
PROCEDURAL SKILLS	
Project coordination and industry knowledge	
CC21	An awareness of the function of the various role-players in the publishing process
SPECIALISED KNOWLEDGE	
Expertise	
CD25	Knowledge of the various text types and structures and their purposes (for example knowing how an instruction manual will be read and used, and then understanding how the information needs to be presented for optimal understanding)
CD26	Knowledge of design (for example, the use of colour and contrast in texts) and layout principles (such as formatting, paragraph indentation, heading levels)

CD27	Knowledge of specialised subject matter (for example, knowledge of the Revised National Curriculum Statement if editing educational textbooks, or knowledge of South African civil affairs if editing a governmental policy document)

Table 5.10: Core tasks and skills for South African editors

The tasks and skills identified above were used to draft a list of core standards for South African editors. The standard documents from EAC of Canada and IPEd of Australia (see Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2) were used as exemplars for the formulation and presentation of the core standards identified for South African editors (see Appendix H). The draft list of core standards included an introduction explaining the purpose and use of the standards, while the following two sections outlined the various standards: Section 1 outlined the textual tasks associated with editing, while Section 2 listed the extra-textual skills required of editors. However, prior to the finalisation of the list of core standards, it was deemed necessary to ensure that the list of core standards is formulated in such a way that it is accessible and appropriately formulated for the South African editing industry. The decision was therefore taken to subject the list of core standards to a semi-Delphi study.

5.6 SEMI-DELPHI STUDY

The semi-Delphi technique was applied to the draft document outlining the core standards. Four participants were selected to participate in the semi-Delphi study based on their involvement in regulatory bodies for editors in South Africa, and/or their involvement in the training of editors. Two of the participants play prominent roles in the two regulatory bodies for editors in South Africa, while the remaining two participants are well-recognised researchers and academics in language practice at two leading tertiary institutions in South Africa.

The participants were contacted telephonically to solicit their consent to participate in the study. The draft standards document was then sent to each participant via e-mail with a short message explaining the purpose of the study as well as information detailing what was expected of their participation in the semi-Delphi study. The participants were informed that the aim of the semi-Delphi study was not to determine the acceptability of the standards listed in the document (as this was established by means of various statistical analyses and tests), but rather to ascertain whether the structuring and layout of the standards, the grouping of items, the clarity of item formulation, and the overall presentation were appropriate. The aim was to ensure that the final standards document would be optimally structured and formulated to ensure clarity and ease of use.

Each subsequent draft of the standards document was based on the responses from the preceding round, and this process was repeated until consensus was reached. The semi-Delphi study comprised two rounds before consensus was reached.

The first round of the semi-Delphi study was sent out at the end of March 2010, and the participants were asked to return their comments and suggestions in the first week of April 2010. In the first round of the semi-Delphi study, the comments and corrections from the respondents included the addition of further explanatory material in the introduction to the core standards, and various other editorial changes (such as the reformulation of some standards, correcting ambiguities, correcting spelling mistakes, and various other micro-level copyediting changes). In some instances, the participants suggested various changes for the same item. This problem was addressed by finding an alternative that would meet the recommendations of all the participants who suggested changes for the particular item. The participants' suggested changes were subsequently made, and the amended document was sent to the participants for the second round of the semi-Delphi study in mid-April 2010.

During the second round of the semi-Delphi study, the participants were again asked to comment on the structuring and layout of the standards, the logical grouping of items, the clarity of item formulation, and the overall presentation of the list of standards. The participants were asked to return their comments in the second-last week of April 2010. During the second round, all participants indicated that they were satisfied with the overall presentation, layout and formulation of the standards, and therefore reached consensus.

The final standards document reflecting core standards for South African editors is presented in Appendix I.

5.7 CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to present and discuss the empirical findings of the study, and ultimately to identify which items in the survey should form part of the list of core tasks and skills forming the basis of the list of core standards for South African editors. The discussion in this chapter has culminated in the identification of a standards document reflecting core standards for South African editors based on the opinions of editors from all sectors of the industry.

The reliability of the research instrument used in this study was established (see Section 5.3), and was tested by means of the internal-consistency method utilising the Cronbach alpha coefficient. For this analysis, groups of similar skills were identified and their inter-item

correlation and Cronbach alpha coefficient calculated. Overall, the research instrument was deemed reliable.

The sample of editors that participated in this study and contributed greatly to the identification of the core list of standards is representative of the broader population of editors in South Africa, as evidenced by the discussion in Section 5.4.1. This discussion found that the sample adequately represented all four sectors of the industry, various levels of working experience, and in-house and freelance working contexts. Respondents work mostly in English; however, this was deemed acceptable in view of the fact that the publishing industry in South Africa is dominated by English. Therefore, the data collected from the sample may be deemed representative of the demographic profile of South African editors and represent the opinions of practising editors.

The data collected from the research instrument served an integral part in the identification of core standards. Section 5.4.2 discussed the findings of the descriptive analysis for this data. The data were analysed in various ways, and included an analysis of the entire sample's descriptives (see Section 5.4.2.1), followed by an analysis of each sector's descriptives (see Sections 5.4.2.2 to 5.4.2.5), which led to the comparison of the descriptives for the four sectors (see Section 5.4.2.6). Following these analyses it was decided that the means for the entire sample's responses could not be used as a criterion for determining which items are core tasks and skills relevant to all sectors. Therefore, the comparative analysis (see Section 5.4.2.6) was used to identify the list of core tasks and skills.

Based on this, the first criterion for the consideration of an item for the core list of standards was formulated in a more specific way, requiring that an item scored a mean of less than 2.50 in all four sectors (indicating strong agreement on the importance of the item), or a mean lower than 2.50 in three sectors and a mean between 2.50 and 2.59 in the remaining sector. The latter items were classified as borderline items. Utilising this criterion, the comparative analysis found that the sectors differed on the importance of many tasks, but agreed on the importance of 77 of the initial 115 items. This finding suggested that the initial analysis of the entire sample's responses (which found that 93 of the items scored acceptable means) was inappropriate in determining core tasks and skills. Therefore the decision was taken to extrapolate core tasks and skills based on a comparative analysis of all four sectors, using the first criterion to separate core tasks and skills from sector-specific tasks (see Section 5.4.2.6).

This stage of the analysis is important, because the aim of this study is to identify core tasks and skills of South African editors. In addition, this analysis proves that editors perform different

functions in different contexts, foregrounding the fact that the editing industry is diversified, and that the training, accreditation and regulation of editors should reflect these diversities.

Once the list of core tasks and skills had been established, it became necessary to determine the level of confidence for which these findings could be extrapolated to the population. The significance test was regarded as the second criterion for inclusion. An item had to be statistically significant with a P-value of lower than 0.05, in addition to having scored acceptable or borderline means. The significance test found that in total, 76 of the initial 115 items fulfilled both criteria, indicating that the 76 items are core tasks and skills for South African editors (see Section 5.5).

The 76 items identified as core tasks and skills were then used to draft a list of core standards for South African editors. While care was taken to ensure that the list of standards is accessible, the decision was made to subject the list to a semi-Delphi study in order to verify the accessibility and appropriateness of its formulation, layout and structuring. The semi-Delphi study proved useful in ensuring that the final list of standards is clear and accessible (see Section 5.6).

The next chapter makes recommendations for the dissemination of these standards and future research and also presents concluding remarks on the study.