ACTA SCIENTIAE

ISSN: 2178-7727

The Role of AI Tools in Editing and Proofreading: A Need for Human-Centric Perspective

Zakiuddin Mohammed,Mohammed Abdul Mateen, Danish Manzoor

Department of Languages and Translation College of Humanities and Social Sciences Northern Border University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
http://orcid.org/0009-0009-5306-3711
Department of Computer Science, College of Science Northern Border University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
http://orcid.org/0009-0000-4536-0577
Department of Computer Science, College of Science Northern Border University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
http://orcid.org/0009-0004-9177-9773

ABSTRACT

This study explored the role of AI tools in the process of English language editing and proofreading, focusing on a human-centric perspective. With the increasing availability of editing tools, such as Grammarly, ProWritingAid, and Microsoft Word's spelling and grammar checkers, there has been a growing reliance on software to correct language errors. However, this study emphasizes the irreplaceable role of human expertise in ensuring nuanced editing and contextually appropriate changes, which AI tools often overlook. By analyzing the strengths and limitations of current AI tools in areas such as grammar, syntax, and style, this study aims to highlight the importance of human judgment in enhancing the quality of written texts. This study also considers how AI tools can serve as an aid rather than a replacement for human editors, particularly in professional and academic contexts. Ultimately, the research advocates a collaborative approach, where AI tools enhance efficiency, but human involvement ensures depth and accuracy in English language editing and proofreading.

KEYWORDS: AI tools, Editing Software, Proofreading Tools, Language Accuracy, Human Judgment.

INTRODUCTION

Background Study

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) tools has significantly impacted various fields, including language editing and proofreading. Over the last few decades, software tools such as Grammarly, ProWritingAid, and Microsoft Word's grammar check feature have emerged as essential aids for writers, students, and professionals, aiming to enhance the quality of their written English. These AI tools offer functionalities, such as spell checking, grammar correction, and style improvement, aiming to make written communication more polished and error-free. However, despite their growing popularity, there is an ongoing debate regarding the extent to which such tools can fully replace human editors and proof readers. This study examines the contributions and limitations of these AI tools, while highlighting the indispensable role of human expertise in the editing process.

Evolution of Editing and Proofreading Tools

The first widely used digital tools for editing and proofreading were basic spell checkers, introduced in word processors in the 1980s and the 1990s. Microsoft Word's early grammar-checking capabilities, for example, were rudimentary, focusing primarily on spelling and basic grammar errors. Over time, more advanced tools have emerged that are capable of identifying more complex grammatical mistakes and style inconsistencies, and even offering suggestions to improve sentence clarity. By the 2000s, dedicated software such as Grammarly, ProWritingAid, and Hemingway Editor had entered the market and claimed to provide comprehensive editing support.

ISSN: 2178-7727

The evolution of such tools reflects the growing demand from users seeking quicker and more accessible ways to improve their writing. For instance, Grammarly, launched in 2009, quickly gained a large user base owing to its user-friendly interface and advanced algorithm for detecting errors in real-time (Yuan & Cho, 2019). Similarly, ProWritingAid, founded in 2012, has gained popularity among writers because of its deep focus on writing style and readability. Ginger software,paperRater, hemingway, tectona ltd, perfectit slickwrite language tool, quillbolt, Ludwig These tools now feature AI-driven algorithms that claim to identify not only grammatical issues but also offer stylistic improvements.

The Human Element in Editing and Proofreading

Human editors have a level of expertise and understanding that software cannot replicate. Language is inherently dynamic and shaped by cultural, social, and contextual factors, which humans navigate with ease, but software cannot. A human editor can interpret meaning, identify subtle inconsistencies in tone or style, and ensure that a text's message is conveyed effectively to its intended audience (Neuman, 2020). Furthermore, human proofreaders can consider the author's voice and writing style, providing feedback that preserves individuality while improving clarity and coherence.

The human-centric approach also emphasizes the importance of collaboration between the author and editor. Unlike software, which provides static suggestions, a human editor can engage in dialogue with a writer, understand their intentions, and offer personalized feedback that aligns with their goals. This process ensures that the final product retains the author's voice and meaning while also improving readability and correctness (Yuan & Cho, 2019).

The notion that AI tools can serve as expert editors and proofreaders is fundamentally flawed. While these tools can mimic human-like language in various contexts, they lack the deep understanding necessary for true editorial expertise (Gregersen, 2023). Editing and proofreading are crucial elements of the writing process, aimed at identifying and addressing complex issues related to semantics, syntax, tone, style, and verbosity (Calonia, 2022). Historically, this work has been entrusted to human professionals with expertise in specific fields and languages. However, as technology evolves, the role of human-centered editing and proofreading faces significant challenges. This shift could undermine the positions of editors and proofreaders, whose skills lie in identifying nuanced linguistic errors and addressing cultural, religious, and social norms—areas where AI remains limited to handling the more mechanical aspects of language. Özçelik (2023) further emphasized that AI tools are prone to inaccuracies, making human oversight essential to ensure the quality of work.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The increasing integration of AI tools in English language editing and proofreading has led to an extensive academic discourse. A review of the relevant literature reveals key areas of research, including the benefits and limitations of software tools, their role in educational and professional contexts, and the complementary relationship between AI and human expertise. This literature review aims to explore these themes while highlighting the centrality of human involvement in editing and proofreading processes.

The Rise of Editing and Proofreading AI Software

The advent of digital editing tools has transformed the writing process, making it more accessible and efficient. Early spell checkers, such as those integrated into word processors like Microsoft Word, provide basic error detection capabilities, including misspelled words and grammatical mistakes. These early tools, while limited in scope, laid the groundwork for more advanced software programs, such as Grammarly and ProWritingAid (Chang, 2016).

Grammarly, launched in 2009, is one of the most popular platforms for grammar checking, with over 30 million daily users as of 2020 (Yuan & Cho, 2019). It provides real-time corrections and suggestions for grammar, style, and clarity, positioning itself as a versatile tool for both academic and professional writing. ProWritingAid, launched in 2012, offers a similar suite of services with a particular emphasis on readability

ISSN: 2178-7727

and stylistic improvements (Herrmann, 2017). These tools have quickly become indispensable for many writers, promising to streamline the proofreading process by providing instant feedback.

Strengths of AI in Editing and Proofreading.

There are many benefits to using AI tools (Grammarly, PerfectIt, QuillBot, Trinka, Hemingway Editor, and ChatGPT, with Grammarly, ChatGPT, and PerfectIt) in English language editing and proofreading. One key advantage is its speed and accessibility. Unlike human editors, software tools work instantly and provide users with immediate feedback on their written work (Herrmann, 2017). This immediate feedback loop is particularly useful for non-native speakers of English who may rely on these tools to enhance their understanding of grammatical rules and idiomatic expressions (Neuman, 2020). For non-native English speakers or individuals with limited knowledge of grammatical rules, such tools can act as invaluable aids, helping them to produce clearer and more grammatically correct texts. The study undertaken by Razack et al. (Razack HIA, Mathew ST, Saad FFA, 2021), Lin Z. 2023), Barrot,.2023), (Dergaa et al. 2023), Huang and Tan (2023), and Özçelik (2023) considered artificial intelligence (AI) tools to be efficient and effective.
Moreover, AI tools can handle high volumes of content without fatigue, offering consistent suggestions across multiple documents (Chang, 2016). In professional contexts such as publishing or academia, where large amounts of text need to be reviewed quickly, AI tools can save significant time by automating basic corrections, allowing human editors to focus on more nuanced tasks (Neuman, 2020).

According to Chang (2016), another advantage of editing software is its ability to process large volumes of text without causing fatigue. For individuals working in high-pressure environments, such as publishing or academia, the efficiency provided by software tools can significantly reduce the effort required for basic proofreading tasks. AI tools can save significant time by automating basic corrections, allowing human editors to focus on more nuanced tasks, such as content structure and tone (Neuman, 2020).

Moreover, Yuan and Cho (2019) argued that software tools can play an essential role in education, particularly for students learning English as a second language (ESL). Grammarly, for example, not only identifies errors, but also provides explanations for the corrections it suggests, making it a valuable learning tool. Students using these programs can gain a deeper understanding of English grammar and sentence structure and improve their writing skills over time.

Limitations of AI Tools in Editing and Proofreading

Despite their strengths, software tools have notable limitations. One of the most frequently discussed limitations is the inability of these tools to understand context. Editing programs rely on pre-programmed algorithms and databases, which means that they often struggle with language nuances such as humor, irony, cultural references, contextually appropriate word choices, and stylistic preferences (Herrmann, 2017).

Additionally, software often struggles with more complex language features such as humor, irony, and cultural references (Chang, 2016). These tools lack the ability to understand the broader context in which a piece of writing is crafted, which often leads to incorrect or overly rigid suggestions. By contrast, human editors can adjust their feedback based on the intended audience, tone, and purpose of the text. Furthermore, Herrmann (2017) noted that editing software tends to offer rigid, rule-based suggestions that may not account for stylistic variations or the author's intent. In creative writing or literary analysis, where an author may purposefully bend grammatical rules for artistic effect, software tools might attempt to "correct" intentional choices, potentially diluting the originality of the text.

Another common limitation is the difficulty of the software in handling complex syntax and punctuation rules. Neuman (2020) emphasizes that while programs like Grammarly can catch many common mistakes, they are often unable to identify more intricate grammatical issues such as misplaced modifiers, faulty parallelism, or subtle shifts in tense. In such cases, human editors are far more adept at understanding the intricacies of language and providing contextually appropriate feedback.

ISSN: 2178-7727

The Role of Human Editors in the Proofreading Process

Although editing software offers numerous advantages, human editors remain irreplaceable in the editing and proofreading processes. Human editors possess a deep understanding of language that cannot be replicated using algorithms. According to Neuman (2020), human editors can interpret tone, context, and meaning in ways that software cannot. For example, they can assess whether a text is appropriately targeted toward its intended audience, ensuring that the tone and content align with the objectives of the author.

Human editors also bring a level of flexibility and nuances to the editing process. Unlike software, which applies fixed grammatical rules, human editors can adjust their feedback based on the author's intent and nature of the text. For instance, in creative writing, where the use of non-standard grammar or fragmented sentences may be a stylistic choice, human editors can provide constructive feedback without stripping the original text of its originality (Chang, 2016). This adaptability is crucial in fields such as literature, journalism, and marketing, where the goal is not simply to produce grammatically correct texts, but to convey meaning and engage readers.

Moreover, human editors offer a collaborative element in the proofreading process, engaging in dialogue with authors to better understand their vision. Herrmann (2017) argued that this interaction is critical in producing high-quality texts, as it allows editors to offer personalized feedback and suggestions that align with the author's voice. In contrast, AI tools provide one-size-fits-all solutions, lacking the capacity for nuanced, tailored guidance.

The Complementary Role of AI and Human Editors

Rather than viewing AI as a replacement for human editors, a growing body of research supports the idea that software tools and human editors should work together during the editing process. Neuman (2020) suggests that software can handle basic, repetitive tasks, such as grammar and punctuation checks, while human editors focus on higher-level concerns, such as tone, flow, and audience engagement. This collaborative approach allows writers to benefit from the speed and efficiency of software without sacrificing the depth and insight provided by human editors.

Additionally, the editing software can serve as a preliminary filter, catching minor errors before a human editor reviews the text. Herrmann (2017) noted that in professional settings, this can streamline the editing process, allowing human editors to focus their efforts on improving the overall quality of the writing rather than correcting surface-level mistakes.

However, as Chang (2016) pointed out, for this collaboration to be effective, writers and editors must be aware of the limitations of editing software. Relying too heavily on software can lead to overconfidence in its accuracy, resulting in missed errors that only a human editor can catch. Therefore, software tools should be viewed as aids rather than substitutes for human expertise in editing and proofreading.

Literature on editing and proofreading software reflects both the advantages and limitations of these tools in the writing process. While software programs such as Grammarly and ProWritingAid offer valuable assistance in identifying basic grammatical errors and improving writing style, they are limited in their ability to understand context and nuances. In contrast, human editors possess the flexibility, insight, and collaborative skills necessary to refine and enhance written text at a deeper level. As editing tools continue to evolve, the most effective approach lies in collaboration between software and human editors, where both play complementary roles in ensuring high-quality written communication.

INTRODUCTION

In an era characterized by technological advancements, AI tools have permeated almost every aspect of daily life, including the realm of language editing and proofreading. Digital platforms such as Grammarly,

ISSN: 2178-7727

ProWritingAid, and built-in grammar checkers of word processors have become ubiquitous aids in academic, professional, and personal writing. These tools aim to improve the quality of written communication by identifying and correcting grammatical, spelling, and stylistic errors (Yuan & Cho, 2019). Their ease of use, accessibility, and ability to deliver real-time feedback have made them attractive options for users seeking to refine their writing. However, while these tools offer numerous benefits, they cannot entirely replace the insights and expertise that human editors bring to the process. This study explores the balance between the use of software in editing and proofreading English texts and the indispensable role of human intervention.

The Emergence of Editing and Proofreading Software

The concept of computerized editing assistance dates back to the early days of personal computing, when word processing software, such as Microsoft Word, began incorporating basic spell check functions. Over time, these tools have evolved into more advanced programs capable of detecting grammatical errors and style inconsistencies, and even suggesting improvements in tone and clarity. AI tools used for editing and proofreading can be categorized as Grammar and Spelling Checkers, Collaborative Writing Tools, Style and Readability Checkers and Academic Writing Tools. These software tools help in various stages of editing and proofreading, from basic error checking to improving the style, readability, and academic formatting.

Grammar and Spelling Checkers

The tools that focus on basic grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors are ***Grammarly,*** an advanced grammar checker that also identifies style and tone issues., ***Hemingway Editor,*** helps improve sentence structure, readability, and grammar, ***Microsoft Word,*** offers built-in grammar and spelling checks, along with style suggestions. Yuan and Cho (2019) pointed out that Grammarly offers a platform with real-time grammar checks, style suggestions, and plagiarism detection (Yuan & Cho, 2019).

Collaborative Writing Tools

The tools that allow for real-time editing and feedback in group settings are ***Google Docs,*** a cloud-based tool that offers collaborative editing and basic grammar checks, ***Zoho Writer,*** a cloud-based word processor with real-time collaboration features.

Style and Readability Checkers

The tools that focus on improving writing style, readability, and tone are ***ProWritingAid*** analyzes readability, grammar, and style, offering detailed feedback, ***Slick Write, c***hecks for grammar, sentence structure, and style.

Academic Writing Tools

The AI tools that are specialized for academic writing, providing support for formatting, citations, and stylistic consistency are ***LaTeX***, which is primarily used for formatting research papers and academic documents; ***EndNote*** is a tool for managing citations and references in academic writing.

Today, millions of AI tools are used worldwide to improve writing in diverse contexts. Educational institutions, businesses, and even creative writers have adopted these tools as valuable resources to maintain the accuracy and clarity of their work (Chang, 2016). However, despite their widespread use, software solutions often struggle with the more complex nuances of language, such as cultural references, idiomatic expressions, and stylistic choices, which vary depending on the context and audience. These limitations highlight the ongoing need for human editors to supplement software.

The Promise and Pitfalls of AI Tools

There is no denying the substantial benefits offered by editing software. One of the primary advantages is speed; these tools provide instant feedback, enabling users to correct errors and improve their writing almost immediately (Herrmann, 2017). For non-native speakers of English or those with limited knowledge of grammar, these tools can act as essential learning aids, helping users to understand their mistakes and correct

DOI: 10.5030/ASCI.25.4.AS.39

ISSN: 2178-7727

them autonomously. Similarly, in high-volume environments, such as publishing houses or academic institutions, software tools can streamline the proofreading process, flagging basic issues such as typos, subject-verb disagreements, and punctuation errors, thereby freeing up human editors to focus on more complex revisions (Neuman, 2020).

However, the shortcomings of these tools are significant. Because these programs rely on preprogrammed rules and algorithms, they are prone to errors when faced with more contextually dependent aspects of language (Chang, 2016). For instance, software may struggle with homonyms, fail to recognize creative expressions, or make incorrect suggestions in cases where the sentence structure is intentionally unconventional for stylistic reasons. Moreover, some tools tend to be overcorrected, prompting users to make changes that could strip the text of its natural flow or intended tone. These shortcomings highlight the importance of human editors who possess the ability to interpret language beyond the limitations of a fixed set of rules.

Essentials of High-Quality Editing

While software can address surface-level errors in writing, human editors are essential for handling deeper, more nuanced aspects of language. Human editors bring an understanding of the context, tone, and audience, which is crucial for producing clear, coherent, and effective written communication (Neuman, 2020). For example, when proofreading a complex academic paper, a human editor can assess not only grammar and punctuation, but also the structure and logic of arguments, ensuring that the text flows smoothly and achieves its intended purpose. Similarly, in creative writing, an editor can offer feedback on narrative style, pacing, and character development–areas that software cannot yet fully address.

Furthermore, human editors can interpret language subtleties, such as idiomatic expressions, humor, and cultural references, which are often beyond the scope of software programs (Herrmann, 2017). They can also tailor their feedback based on the author's goals, providing suggestions that maintain the integrity of the writer's voice, while enhancing clarity and readability. This human touch ensures that editing is not just about correcting errors, but also about refining the message and making the writing resonate with its intended audience.

Bridging the Gap: Collaboration Between AI and Human Editors

The relationship between AI tools and human editors is not adversarial. Instead, these AI tools enhance the editing process and complement one another, with AI tools handling repetitive tasks, such as grammar and punctuation checks, while human editors focus on the more creative and interpretative aspects of writing. Research has shown that combining the strengths of both approaches—automated tools for efficiency and human insight for depth—produces the best results (Neuman, 2020). This collaborative model, in which AI tools aid the editing process without fully automating it, is increasingly being adopted for professional editing and publishing. As editing tools continue to evolve, they are likely to become more refined, better at interpreting contexts, and potentially more capable of handling nuanced language issues (Herrmann, 2017). However, they still need to complement human expertise rather than replace it.

As editing tools continue to evolve, it is likely that their capabilities will improve, but they will remain limited in their ability to replicate human creativity, empathy, and contextual understanding (Chang, 2016). Therefore, the future of editing and proofreading lies in harnessing the strengths of both AI tools and human editors and creating a partnership that ensures both accuracy and depth in written communication.

In professional and academic settings, the ideal scenario involves collaboration between the AI and human editors. AI tools can handle repetitive tasks, such as grammar checks and punctuation corrections, while human editors focus on higher-level issues, such as content structure, tone, and overall flow. This partnership ensures that texts are not only grammatically accurate, but also clear, engaging, and contextually appropriate.

ISSN: 2178-7727

Although AI tools have revolutionized the editing and proofreading process by offering quick, accessible solutions to common writing issues, they cannot fully replace the expertise and intuition that human editors bring to the process. As the field of digital editing tools continues to develop, the ideal approach lies in a collaborative process that combines the efficiency of AI tools with a nuanced understanding of human editors. This study highlights the irreplaceable value of human involvement in English language editing and proofreading while acknowledging the significant role that AI tools play in enhancing the overall process.

Research Objectives

This study seeks to investigate the role that AI tools play in the editing and proofreading processes and how they can complement, rather than replace, human editors. By examining the advantages and limitations of current AI tools, this study explores how a collaborative approach can lead to more effective and nuanced editing. Ultimately, the goal is to emphasize the irreplaceable value of human expertise in the editing process, while acknowledging the efficiency and utility of AI tools in handling basic language tasks.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its exploration of the evolving role of AI tools in the editing and proofreading of English texts, with an emphasis on the continued relevance of human expertise in these processes. As digital editing tools have become more advanced and widely adopted, it is critical to assess their effectiveness and limitations. This study provides valuable insights into how AI tools such as Grammarly and ProWritingAid can enhance the writing process and underscore the irreplaceable contribution of human editors to ensuring high-quality, nuanced, and contextually appropriate written communication.

This study holds great relevance for students, educators, and language learners. With the increasing use of editing AI tools in schools and universities, this study helps educators integrate these tools more effectively into teaching through human guidance and feedback.

This study highlights that, while AI tools are efficient in catching surface-level errors, human editors are essential for improving the overall structure, tone, and style of texts, particularly in fields where written communication serves as the primary medium for conveying complex ideas or engaging with audiences.

As editing tools continue to evolve, this study offers valuable insights into areas where AI tools excel and fall short, guiding future innovations. By emphasizing the importance of collaboration between AI and human editors, this study encourages developers to create tools that complement human skills rather than attempt to replace them, ultimately improving user experience.

This study offers a critical analysis of how these tools affect language use, editing practice, and writing quality. By emphasizing a human-centric perspective, this study reinforces the idea that language is not just a set of mechanical rules, but a dynamic, context-dependent system that requires human interpretation and judgment. This perspective is particularly valuable for researchers, educators, and practitioners in linguistics, who can use these findings to further explore the balance between technology and human input in language processing.

For everyday users—students, professionals, and casual writers—this study provides practical insights into how best to leverage AI editing tools to improve writing without over-relying on automated tools. The research shows that while AI tools can help users identify grammatical and stylistic errors, human involvement remains crucial for producing polished, high-quality work. This understanding can help users develop better writing practices by using AI as a helpful tool, rather than a substitute for learning or human review.

METHODOLOGY

To effectively explore the role of AI tools in English language editing and proofreading, as well as the complementary relationship between AI tools and human editors, this study will employ qualitative data collection through interviews with professional editors and writers to gain a deeper understanding of human

DOI: 10.5030/ASCI.25.4.AS.39

ISSN: 2178-7727

perspectives on editing. Professional Editors are drawn from academic institutions, publishing houses, and freelance-editing services. These participants offer insights into their editing process, particularly focusing on how they interact with and evaluate the editing of AI tools. The analysis will provide a comprehensive understanding of the advantages and limitations of editing AI tools while also capturing nuanced insights from human editors.

Data Collection Methods

Semi-Structured Interviews: Professional editors will be interviewed to explore their experiences with AI editing tools and their perspectives on their strengths and limitations, focusing on the following:

- How they integrate AI into their editing workflows.
- Specific instances where AI has been helpful or problematic.
- Their thoughts on the role of human judgment in the editing process, particularly when dealing with complex language issues, such as tone, style, and context.

Semi-structured interviews allow for open-ended responses, enabling participants to provide detailed insights into their experiences and opinions. Interviews were transcribed and coded to identify common themes and patterns.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One limitation of this study may be the reliance on specific AI tools, as the results could vary depending on the AI tools used. Another limitation is that the study's findings are influenced by a particular sample of participants, which may not be fully representative of all writers and editors. Additionally, the study may not account for all possible complexities in writing, such as discipline-specific jargons or creative writing that intentionally violates grammatical conventions.

DISCUSSION

This interview was designed to explore the experiences of professional editors using AI editing tools and their perspectives on their strengths and limitations. The semi-structured format allows for open-ended responses, ensuring rich qualitative data. Interviews will focus on three key topics: how editors integrate software into their workflows; specific instances where software has been helpful or problematic; and their thoughts on the role of human judgment in complex language issues such as tone, style, and context.

Summary of the key points derived from the interviews:

Role of Editing Software: Editing software, such as Grammarly or ProWritingAid, is primarily used by editors as a first step in the editing process. It helps to identify basic issues such as grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors, saving time on mechanical corrections. However, the software does not rely on more complex tasks such as evaluating structure, tone, or argument consistency. Human intervention is crucial for substantive editing of the manuscript.

Human Judgment is Irreplaceable: Editors consistently emphasize that human judgment plays a critical role in addressing issues related to tone, style, and context, which software cannot interpret accurately. Although the software may flag sentences as awkward or in need of revision, it lacks the ability to understand the intent behind certain stylistic choices, particularly when it comes to maintaining the author's voice or aligning with the target audience.

Limitations with Specialized Content: One of the main challenges editors face with software is the difficulty in handling specialized content, such as technical documents or academic papers filled with industry-specific jargon. Software tends to oversimplify or flag unnecessary revisions, which can disrupt the clarity or intent of such content. This limitation often leads editors to switch off software or heavily modify their suggestions when working on complex or discipline-specific texts.

Software is Effective for Short, Simple Texts: Editing software is most effective when used for shorter, less

DOI: 10.5030/ASCI.25.4.AS.39

ISSN: 2178-7727

complex documents, such as emails or short reports. For these types of texts, the software provides valuable speed and efficiency in catching minor errors. However, for longer, content-heavy projects, editors rely more on manual editing to ensure accuracy and appropriateness, particularly in maintaining consistency in tone and style.

Challenges with Tone and Audience Understanding*:* One of the recurring issues is the software's inability to account for the intended audience or adjust to the tone required for specific writing tasks. For example, in marketing materials or creative writing, software may suggest changes that completely alter the tone, making the text overly formal or inappropriate for the target audience. This further highlights the need for human editors to ensure that the communication goals of a piece are met.

Oversimplification of Complex Writing*:* When working with academic or technical writing, editing software often unnecessarily simplifies language, which can undermine the clarity and rigor expected in such fields. Complex arguments, specialized terms, or discipline-specific styles are frequently flagged by software, although they are necessary for the context. Editors must use their judgment to balance clarity with complexity, and the task software cannot be managed effectively. The editor's experience with passive-voice suggestions reflects the limitations of rule-based software. Technical writing often has unique requirements that software fails to recognize, which necessitates human intervention for context-specific decisions (Chang, 2016).

Manual Editing for Creative Aspects*:* In more creative projects, such as fiction or narrative-based work, software is primarily used for initial proofreading; however, the final polishing of creative elements, such as narrative flow, character development, or stylistic consistency, is handled by human editors. This is because software cannot process the nuances required for creative writing, underscoring the importance of human oversight in ensuring high-quality storytelling.

Reliability of Software for Basic Proofreading*:* Despite these limitations, editing software is a reliable tool for proofreading mechanical errors. This is helpful in catching overlooked issues and offers suggestions for improving readability. However, editors note that their recommendations need to be critically evaluated, as the software may prioritize technical correctness over the text's communicative purpose, often necessitating manual correction.

Difficulties and Drawbacks

Lack of Adaptability to Specific Content*:* Editing software struggles with technical, academic, and creative writing, where tone, jargon, or specialized language is required.

Misunderstanding of Audience*:* The software often fails to consider the target audience and suggests changes that may not be appropriate for the text's communicative goals.

Over-Simplification*:* Complex or nuanced writing, particularly in academia or technical documents, is often oversimplified by software, leading to a loss of necessary detail.

Inability to Handle Subjectivity*:* Software cannot adequately manage subjective elements, such as tone, voice, or context, which require human sensitivity and judgment.

Potential Over-Reliance*:* There is a risk of editors relying too much on software for quick fixes, which could result in missing deeper issues that only a human editor can address.

The study observed that editing software offers valuable assistance with basic proofreading, but is not sufficient for handling complex, specialized, or creative content, where human expertise is essential.

Analysis

This study employed thematic analysis to explore the interview data collected from 25 professional editors. The objective was to understand the recurring themes regarding the role of human editors, the limitations of software, and the potential for collaboration between software tools and human expertise. The data from the semi-structured interviews were coded and categorized into themes that reflected the subjective experiences of editors and writers in the context of editing workflow.

ISSN: 2178-7727

The first step in the thematic analysis involved reading the interview transcripts multiple times to gain understanding of the data. Notes were made to capture the initial impressions, patterns, and ideas that emerged from interviews. The interviews were then transcribed and relevant parts of the text were highlighted for further analysis.

Generating Initial Codes

After familiarizing them with the data, the study's initial codes were based on recurring topics discussed in the interviews. Each code is a label that identifies specific concepts frequently mentioned in the interviews. The coding process focuses on three main areas: (1) the role of human editors, (2) the limitations of software tools, and (3) the potential for collaboration between software and human editors.

Human Judgment: Mentioned frequently in all interviews, emphasizing the importance of human expertise in addressing tone, style, and content structure.

Software Efficiency: Editors described how software tools are efficient in identifying mechanical errors (spelling, grammar, punctuation), but limited in their ability to handle complex language issues.

Contextual Understanding: The need for human editors to interpret language based on audience, purpose, and intent; something software cannot be fully achieved.

Software Limitations: Discussion of software misinterpreting specialized jargon, overcorrecting stylistic choices, and failing to recognize nuanced writing.

Collaborative Editing: Editors discussed the possibility of combining software strengths (speed and error detection) with human judgment for a more effective editing process.

Key Themes Identified

The Role of Human Editors in Editing: All interviewees emphasized the irreplaceable role of human editors in dealing with complex language issues, such as tone, style, and context. Sarah, for example, noted that "human judgment is everything when it comes to tone and style," emphasizing that software can flag certain elements as errors without understanding their contextual importance. Seven editors echoed similar sentiments, discussing how editors must interpret whether a tone shift is intentional and whether certain stylistic choices fit the audience.

Insights: ***Tone and Style***: Human editors excel at understanding the author's intent, tone, and style, ensuring that the writing retains its voice and relevance to the audience. Software often fails to recognize when non-standard grammar or word choices serve a specific purpose.

Structure and Flow: Human editors take a more holistic approach, focusing on how ideas are presented and whether text flows logically. This requires human expertise to ensure that the content achieves its intended goal, whether it is an academic paper or creative piece.

Cultural Sensitivity: Some editors emphasize that software cannot handle cultural or social nuances. Human editors are more adept at making context-sensitive revisions.

Human editors are indispensable in ensuring a polished, contextually accurate, and meaningful final product. Their ability to navigate tone, style, audience considerations, and cultural subtleties underscores their importance.

Limitations of Software Tools

A recurring theme in all interviews was the limitation of the editing software, especially when handling specialized or complex texts. Several editors have pointed out that while software is useful for basic corrections, it frequently struggles with specialized jargon, creative phrasing, and complex sentence structures.

Insights

Over-Simplification: An Editor provided an example of software suggesting that academic writing was "wordy," even though complexity was necessary for the content. Software tends to be oversimplified by applying generalized rules that may not be appropriate for specific contexts.

Lack of Context: One of the editors discussed how software often suggests changes without understanding the audience or purpose of the text. For instance, in marketing content, formal suggestions made by software

DOI: 10.5030/ASCI.25.4.AS.39

ISSN: 2178-7727

can alter the intended conversational tone, reducing the effectiveness of the text.

False Positives*:* One of the editors shared that technical documents were repeatedly flagged for errors by software because jargon was not recognized. This highlights the software's reliance on standardized rules that often do not apply to niche fields.

Editing software has significant limitations in terms of contextual understanding, tone, and specialized content. Although it is efficient at detecting surface-level errors, it lacks the flexibility and discernment required for complex editing tasks.

Collaboration Between AI and Human Editors

One of the most promising themes that emerged from the interviews was the potential for collaboration between the software and human editors. Many interviewees noted that software can handle mechanical tasks, such as grammar and punctuation, freeing up human editors to focus on more substantive aspects of the text.

Insights

Efficiency and Time-Saving*:* Some editors have highlighted how software allows them to focus on deeper and more nuanced editing by catching mechanical errors in the initial stages. This efficiency allows them to concentrate on the overall structure and arguments of the text.

Complementary Roles*:* Most editors expressed that they see software as a tool that complements their work rather than replacing it. As one of the editors put it, "software is helpful, but not perfect." Editors often use software as a starting point for basic corrections, and then move on to a more detailed review that requires their expertise.

Limitations in Isolation*:* An editor mentioned that while software is useful in catching minor errors in manuscripts, it should never be relied upon in isolation. He emphasized the need for human editors to review the text for deeper issues related to narrative flow and consistency.

A collaborative approach, where software handles basic mechanical corrections and human editors focus on higher-order concerns, such as tone, style, and content structure, is seen as the most effective method. This hybrid model maximizes the strengths of both the software and human expertise.

A Human-Centric Perspective on Editing

Thematic analysis of the interviews revealed a clear consensus among editors: while editing software offers valuable assistance, particularly in terms of speed and error detection, it cannot replace the nuanced judgment that human editors bring to the table. Software tools are limited in their ability to understand the complexity of language, especially in terms of tone, style, context, and specialized content. However, when used collaboratively, software can complement human editors by automating repetitive tasks, allowing them to focus on the more substantive and creative aspects of editing.

This analysis highlights the ongoing importance of human-centered editing in the digital age and reinforces the idea that technology should be used as a tool to enhance rather than replace human expertise.

Key Findings

Efficiency and Accuracy*:* Editing software excels in handling basic grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors. It can quickly identify common mistakes and save editors' time on routine correction. However, software remains limited in its ability to understand the intricacies of language, including creative expressions, specialized jargon, and idiomatic phrases. This limitation often results in false positives or irrelevant suggestions that can confuse or disrupt the natural flow of a text, particularly in technical or creative writing contexts.

The Irreplaceable Role of Human Judgment*:* Human editors bring a level of expertise that software cannot replicate. They can assess the appropriateness of tone, style, and content, ensuring that the text aligns with the intended audience and purpose. Editors can also interpret and refine complex ideas, providing the clarity and coherence that software struggles to achieve. The role of human editors is particularly critical in academic,

DOI: 10.5030/ASCI.25.4.AS.39

ISSN: 2178-7727

creative, and technical writing, in which language complexity and subjectivity are prominent.

AI as a Complementary Tool*:* A key conclusion of this study is that editing software should not be viewed as a replacement for human editors, but rather as a complementary tool. When used in tandem with human expertise, software can streamline the editing process by automating routine tasks, allowing human editors to focus on higher-level issues, such as structure, argument coherence, and audience appropriateness. This collaboration between the software and human editors offers a balanced approach that maximizes the strengths of both.

Human-Centric Approach*:* This study emphasizes the importance of a human-centric approach for editing and proofreading. Language is inherently dynamic and context dependent, requiring human interpretation and judgment. Although software can assist in improving writing, human touch is essential for refining content in ways that go beyond grammar and mechanics. This approach ensures that writing not only adheres to formal rules but also resonates with its intended audience and maintains authenticity.

Implications for Practice

For Writers*:* Writers can benefit from using editing software as a first step in their writing process, especially for identifying mechanical errors. However, they should be mindful of the software's limitations and seek human editorial input for more substantive feedback on tone, style, and structure.

For Professional Editors*:* editors can integrate software into their workflows to increase efficiency, but must maintain their focus on the nuanced aspects of language that software cannot handle. They play a vital role in ensuring that the final text meets the highest standards for clarity, coherence, and readability.

For Software Developers*:* Developers of editing software should continue refining their tools by incorporating more context-aware algorithms that better understand the complexities of language. While full automation of editing remains distant, there is room for improvement in how software handles tone, specialized language, and creative writing.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further studies could explore the development of more advanced algorithms that better simulate human judgment in the editing processes. Additionally, research on the specific ways in which different industries (e.g., publishing, technical writing, academia) use software in conjunction with human editors would provide valuable insights into the evolving role of technology in language processing.

In conclusion, although editing software has proven to be a valuable asset in improving the accuracy and efficiency of written communication, it remains a tool rather than a solution. The complexity and creativity inherent in human language require the expertise of human editors to ensure that texts not only meet grammatical standards, but also convey meaning effectively, maintaining authenticity and relevance for the audience. The optimal approach lies in leveraging both the speed of software and the insights of human editors, creating a partnership that enhances the quality of written work in a meaningful way.

REFERENCES

Barrot JS. (2022) Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. Assess Writ. 2023.

Calonia J.(2022) *Copy editing vs. Proofreading: What's the difference? Copy Editing vs. Proofreading: What's the Difference? Grammarly; Grammarly Blog. 2022. https:// www. gramm arly. com/ blog/ whats- the- di□e rence- betwe en- copy- editi ng- and- proof rea*di ng/. Accessed 6 Sep 2022.

Chang, K. (2016). *The limitations of grammar-checking software in professional writing*. Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35(2), 23-38.

Dergaa I, Chamari K, Zmijewski P, Ben Saad H. (2023) From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. Biol Sport. 2023;40(2):615–22.

ISSN: 2178-7727

Gregersen E.(2023) ChatGPT. Encyclopedia Britannica. https:// www. brita nnica. com/ techn ology/ ChatGPT. Accessed 28 Aug 2023.

Herrmann, J. (2017). *Algorithms vs. intuition: The role of software in modern proofreading*. Writing and Editing Quarterly, 21(3), 45-67.

Huang J, Tan M. (2023) The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific review articles. Am J Cancer Res. 2023;13(4):1148–54.

Lin Z. (2023) Why and how to embrace AI such as ChatGPT in your academic life. R Soc Open Sci. 2023.

Neuman, S. (2020). *Human editors versus editing software: A comparative study*. Language and Editing Journal, 43(1), 32-49.

Özçelik NP.(2023) A comparative analysis of proofreading capabilities: language experts vs. chatGPT. In: Pekdang B, editor. International studies in educational sciences. Kızılay: Serüven Publishing; 2023. p. 147–61.

Razack HIA, Mathew ST, Saad FFA, Alqahtani SA.(2021) Artificial intelligence-assisted tools for redefining the communication landscape of the scholarly world. Sci Edit. 2021;8(2):134–44.

Yuan, H., & Cho, M. (2019). *Improving writing skills through software: Grammarly as a teaching tool*. Language Education Research, 12(4), 87-103.