Chicago/Turabian Formatting Checklist

Today we are checking each other's documentation drafts for correct formatting and documentation. This is a difficult process because, despite there being entire books on the subject, there's still a lot of ambiguity about particular situations—it seems no matter how hard we try, some part of any paper will be an exception to the rules. Thus, it is important for you to be wide awake as you do this, to be strict and fair and flexible in deciding what is and is not acceptable. Please consult your handbook, your peers, and me as you run into questions while completing the following steps.

Step 1: General Formatting

First, check that the paper gets the following formatting guidelines correct. Mark any errors or inconsistencies you see. Note: Chicago doesn't specify these things, but Turabian offers the following suggestions beginning on page 371.

Margins:	One-inch all the way around.
Text Formatting:	Readable typeface, 10- or 12-point size. Double-spaced.
Title Page:	Title centered 1/3 down page; name, course, date several lines below.
Page Numbers:	Turabian gives 4 options: top venter, top right, bottom center, or bottom right.

Step 2: Quotations and In-text Citations

Now read through the paper slowly, pausing every time there is some quoted or paraphrased material. For each of these, do the following:

- Highlight or underline the quoted or paraphrased material.

- If a quote, is it long enough to be a block quote (see Chicago 13.10 or Turabian 7.5 and 25.2.2), and if so is it formatted correctly (double indented, no quotation marks, citation *after* the final period)?

- Does the quote use ellipses correctly (see Chicago 13.50 or Turabian 7.5 and 25.3.2.1)?

- For *both* quotes and paraphrases, is the citation correct (for author-date system, see Chicago 15.7 or Turabian 18.3. For notes and bibliography system, see Chicago 14.19 or Turabian 16)?

- Look up the citation for this source in the bibliography or references list. Put a tally mark in the left margin next to the source cited so we can keep track of how many times each gets cited in the paper.

Step 3: References List or Bibliography Formatting

Now flip to the references list (for author-date system) or bibliography (for footnotes/endnotes) and check to see that it gets the following formatting guidelines correct. Mark any errors or inconsistencies you see.

Placement of List:	References list is called "References" (Turabian 18.2). Bibliography is called "Bibliography" (Chicago 14.64, Turabian 16.2.1).
Spacing:	Each entry has a hanging indent (Chicago 1.63, fig. 14.8Turabian 16.1.7 and 18.1.7).
Arrangement:	Entries are in alphabetical order (Chicago 14.62, Turabian 16.2.2 and 18.2.1).

Consistency: Look at the tally marks you put next to the sources. Are there any cited sources that were never actually used in the paper? Is one source used lots of times and all the others used only once or twice?

Step 4: References Entries or Footnotes/Endnotes and Bibliography

Now comes the really hard part. Go through each entry in the References list or each footnote/endnote and its corresponding bibliography entry and try to determine whether they are all cited correctly. Remember that without the actual source in front of you it may be impossible to determine whether the citation is 100% correct, and there can be multiple correct ways to cite a source. Still, you can figure out whether the necessary elements are there, whether they are in the right order, whether authors' names, dates, and publishers are correctly arranged and/or abbreviated, etc.

Make notes to the paper's author about what could be wrong or could use clarification.

Step 5: Source Integration

If you still have time, go back and consider the way each source is integrated into the paper (you highlighted them before, so they should be easy to find). Look at the following things and make suggestions to the author about how they can be improved if at all:

- **Attributive Tags:** How is each source introduced? Are things like the source's credentials, a study's time or location of completion, and other details provided? Should they be?

- **Clarity:** Do attributive tags or other indicators make it clear what information comes from a source and what is the addition of the paper's author? If there is ambiguity about this, how can the author make it more clear?

- **Summary:** Is the summary objective and coherent? Is the level of detail appropriate, or does the reader require more (or fewer) details? Was a summary the right choice for this source in this spot, or would a paraphrase or quotation work better?

- **Paraphrase:** Is the paraphrase objective and coherent? Is it clear where the paraphrased material begins and ends and where the author's own ideas or commentary begin and end? Was a paraphrase the right choice for this source in this spot, or would a summary or quotation work better?

- **Quotation:** Is the quotation well chosen and apt? Is the quotation longer than it needs to be, or could the author get the same effect by quoting fewer words of the original and embedding them within a paraphrase? Was a quotation the right choice for this source in this spot, or would a summary or paraphrase work better?