One weekend after making the same type of straightforward grammatical correction literally dozens of times on several different theses, the inspiration for this checklist struck. It is intended to make sure you address some common deficiencies that you are perfectly capable of finding and fixing yourself before turning in your document, thereby sparing me the time required to point them out to you and freeing me to spend more time on substantive issues that you may not be able to identify on your own.

Each blank should be filled with either a checkmark indicating compliance, or (rarely!) a "N/A" indicating "not applicable", before you turn your document (or any part of it) in to me for review. The discovery of egregious violations will result in my returning the document to you for correction before I read any farther.

_____ I have reread your technical writing handout in its entirety, and have tried to follow its advice as much as possible.

_____ All references cited in this draft are included in the bibliography and submitted with this draft.

_____ Conversely, every reference in the bibliography has been cited somewhere in the text.

_____ I have used an officially accepted bibliographic style, not one I made up myself or borrowed from a non-authoritative source.

_____ When using the exact words of another author, I have enclosed them in quotation marks, and included the cited work's page number(s) on which the quote appears in my reference (e.g., Bacon, 1992, pp. 36-37). I do not enclose the reference within the quotes, but I do make it part of the sentence rather than standing alone. Example: "The buck stops here" (Truman, 1936, p. 12).

_____ Formatting and numbering of section headings, tables/figures themselves, their titles, and bibliographic references are consistent throughout. (I will not be picky about this one IF the document in question is your thesis or dissertation AND I am just a committee member, not the chair. But if it's a report, paper, or thesis for me, this applies!)

_____ Pages have been numbered.

_____ I have searched for all occurrences of the words "they" and "their", and have fixed any places where the plural pronoun was matched with a singular antecedent.

_____ I have searched for all occurrences of the words "its" and "it's", and determined whether an apostrophe was required or not.

_____ I have searched for all occurrences of the strings 's (apostrophe-s-blank) and s' (s-apostrophe-blank), and checked whether I was incorrectly using the possessive form
when a simple plural (-s) was required, or incorrectly using the singular possessive (-s') rather than the plural possessive (-s'), or conversely.

I have searched for all occurrences of the string "comprise", and have changed "is comprised of" to "comprises" or "is composed of".

I have correctly distinguished between percent and percentage points changes.

I have not begun a sentence with a numeral. Integers less than ten are spelled out as words, unless part of a table or figure or other title ("Part 3", "Model 4"), or a percent ("5% of the sample").

Tables and figures reporting empirical results include the sample size.

Discussions of other empirical studies (e.g. in a literature review) include, where available and appropriate, the following information:
< date and location data collected;
< sampling unit (adult, household, driver, elderly person, welfare recipient, adult resident of North Carolina, etc.);
< sample size;
< type of survey (e.g. stated response, travel diary);
< analysis methodology.
E.g., "the results were based on a sample of 1,523 retired residents of Innsbruck, Austria, who completed a 7-day activity diary in October 1998. Chi-squared and t-tests were used to examine significant differences in duration of different activity types by gender and employment status."

I have spell-checked this document after the last changes have been made.

I have let each section sit for at least a day and re-read it and edited it myself before handing it in.

(For revisions:) I have carefully reviewed each of your edits/comments. With respect to your substantive comments, I have either adopted them as is, made a different modification in response, or communicated with you (in person or by note) about it. I have double-checked that each of your substantive comments has been addressed in one of those ways.

[Note: Some of my routine edits (i.e. to the narrative style, as opposed to issues of substantive content) will be of grammatical errors that of course must be corrected. Others will be alternate suggestions that you are welcome to take or leave. Yet others are intended to establish a more professional tone to the document. How strongly I feel about those will depend on how "far out" the original language is, whether the document is a report or journal article with my name on it too (as opposed to your thesis), etc. Aside from the first category of routine edits (outright grammatical errors that must be corrected), you can use your judgment initially in whether to adopt routine edits in the second and third categories β if I feel strongly about something I'll keep making the same edit, and/or we can hash it out in person.]