REFERENCING 2: FOUR DIFFERENT STYLES

by Paul Sandringham

A brief introduction to four different styles of referencing in academic papers.

SPOILT FOR CHOICE

We have a saying in English, that one can be "spoilt for choice". I guess the closest German equivalent is "*die Qual der Wahl*". Some students like to be told, "this is how referencing is done" and just have one set of rules. But that's for secondary school, not for university. You may not always be able to choose, but you at least have to be familiar with a few different schemes.

It may be that your supervisor (either company or university) has a preference, in which case you should do what you are told! But if not, you are free to choose. Or forced to choose. And there are enough different styles out there, that it's not just "*zwischen Pest und Cholera*".

I'm going to present four styles here. After a brief introduction, I will point you to external sources that demonstrate the systems in use and provide more details. The systems I have chosen are called Chicago (footnote), APA, MLA and IEEE.

THINGS TO REMEMBER

What all these systems have in common is that they allow you to clearly and consistently document your referencing.

Each system has its own method for references in the text, and for creating the list of references at the end of your document – the *Quellenverzeichnis*. It is very important to obey the rules for the system completely. You should not use Chicago notes and create a Harvard *Quellenverzeichnis*, for example. This might seem like a small thing, but it can cost you points in grading, and it can stop you having your work published. We might not always understand the reasoning, but each system is internally consistent, and whichever one you use, you have to use it properly.

What does not change is the fact that you MUST indicate your references appropriately.

If you quote directly, word for word, you have to use quotation marks. This also applies if you have provided a translation. If you indirectly reference somebody's argument or ideas, you still have to indicate the reference, and you have to indicate it where it happened. It is not enough to write a whole paragraph and then include lots of references at the end. Wherever the reference occurs, you have to indicate it immediately. If a whole section is based on somebody else's work, you have to make that clear with a footnote.

And if you don't understand what I just said, the examples on the next pages should help.

At the end of this document there is a simple text with references in each of the four styles, so that you can compare them.

ABBREVIATIONS

There are several abbreviations commonly used in referencing. Some of them are only used in Chicago style, and you are not forced to use them. But it is good to know what they mean for when you read them. Most European languages have the same abbreviations – but German does not. So you will need to learn them in both languages, or at least to understand them. I will list a few most common English ones here, with the German version in italics. The "English" mostly come from Latin, which is why most European languages use the same forms.

Note that in German, there is a space between the letters when they represent separate words (e.g. "s. d.") but in English there is no space (e.g. "q.v.").

p.   *S.*
"page" / "*Seite*". This is obvious. But there is a difference in English usage, as the next entry will show you.

pp.   *S.*
"pages" / "*Seiten*". In English, we double it if we are referring to more than one page.

f.   *f.*
"and following" / "*und folgende*". You use it to say "and the next page, too". Personally, I find it confusing and silly. Why write "p. 14f" instead of "pp. 14-15"?

ff.   *ff.*
"and following -plural" / "*und folgenden*". Some say "*fortfolgend*" for German. This is more useful, if you don't want to say exactly where the argument stops in the source. But it is still better to say "pp. 14-20" than "p. 14ff". Only use it if you really can't decide whether to say, for example "14-17" or "14-20", so you leave it up to the reader to decide when to stop.

et al.   *u. a.*
"and others" / "*und andere*". This is used when a book or article has so many authors or editors that it makes no sense to list them all. Be warned: each system has a different number that of names before you can use this!

Cf.   *Vgl.*
"compare" / "*vergleichen*". You use it to refer to another part of your own document or, more commonly, to another source where things are expressed differently.

q.v.   *s. d.*
"see there" / "*siehe dort*". Similar to "Cf." but you are not asking for a comparison, just mentioning another source or location. The German versions "*s.o.*" and "*s.u.*" are not common in English. We either use "q.v." or write out in full, "see above" and "see below".

ibid.   *ebd.*
"in the same place" / "*ebenda*". You use in a reference, when the reference **immediately** before this one was to the same source. If the reference is identical, then "ibid." or "*ebd.*" Is enough. If the page numbers are different, you add the new page number. It is a convenient abbreviation, but can cause big problems if you are not careful when you make changes. Adding or removing a reference can make "ibid." incorrect, and if you don't correct it, you may find yourself committing accidental plagiarism. Also, if there is a big gap of several pages between references, it makes life hard for the reader. My advice: never use it manually. If you use referencing software as an add-on to Word (or whatever text editor you work with), then allow the system to put "ibid." in for you if it wants to!

op.cit.   *a.a.o.*
"in the work cited" / "*am angegebenen Ort*". This is like "ibid." / "*ebd.*" But with a difference. You use it when the reference is **not** immediately before this one. It is, however, the most recent reference with the same author. It has the same problems as "ibid." / "ebd.", but perhaps even more so Some English authors also use "loc.cit." if the reference is identical, with the same page number as well. That makes life even harder – don't do it!

CHICAGO A (FOOTNOTE) REFERENCING

There are several referencing systems that use footnotes. And Chicago referencing can be done in two ways. But the Chicago footnote system is very common and a good example. It is also called "Chicago A".

We call them footnotes, but they can also be used as endnotes. The difference is that a footnote comes at the bottom of the page, and an endnote comes at the end of the document. I find footnotes far more useful in an academic paper, and endnotes are rare except for books in the humanities (*Geisteswissenschaften*) nowadays.

Every reference receives a number, in superscript, and there is a note at the bottom of the page corresponding to that reference. The note contains ALL the information you need to locate the source: author, title, publisher, etc. This information is then included again, in a slightly different format, in the list of references (*Quellenverzeichnis*) at the end of your document.

The best possible definition of Chicago A is the official one, found at
https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html.

The University of Zürich has a good brief description in German (you need page 2):
https://stud.phzh.ch/globalassets/stud.phzh.ch/dienstleistungen/schreibzentrum/chicago-style_infoblatt.pdf.

For a longer description, see the University of Oldenburg resource:
https://openjournal.uni-oldenburg.de/downloads_forsch/forsch-journal_zitation_chicago.pdf.

Another useful German summary of "Deutsche Zitierweise" is online at:
https://www.lingarts.com/richtig-zitieren-die-harvard-und-die-deutsche-zitierweise/.

APA REFERENCING

APA is one of many referencing systems that uses an "author-date" concept. This means that the author's name, and the year of publication, are included in brackets the text, rather than in a footnote. Harvard is another famous author-date system. With author-date systems, the publication information is only included in the reference list.

It is possible to leave the author's name(s) out of the brackets if they are already mentioned in the sentence.

It must be possible to uniquely identify each source. So if you have two sources with the same author and year, you have to "number" them, for example "2018a", "2018b". This can be a problem with editing: if you add a source, you may need to change all existing references to the work by that author because of this rule.

The system is very popular today. Personally, I do not like it because I find it disturbs me when I am reading, but other people prefer it for various reasons. It is a matter of taste, as well as subject: in history and literature, my main areas of research, we like to use footnotes!

A good simple introduction to Harvard is on the site of Mendeley, the referencing software company:
https://www.mendeley.com/guides/apa-citation-guide.

Purdue University has useful information, starting with this page (and then follow the menu on the left):
https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/in_text_citations_the_basics.html.

For more details, try the official APA tutorial:
https://apastyle.apa.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.

Or, a German reference:
https://openjournal.uni-oldenburg.de/downloads_forsch/forsch-journal_zitation_apa.pdf.

MLA REFERENCING

MLA is very similar to APA, but it does not use the date. It is not common in computing, so you may never need it, but it doesn't hurt to understand it. The author's name is used, assuming you only have one source from that author. If you have more than one source with the same author, you use a short version of the title to differentiate between them. This has the same problem as with Harvard. The system is perhaps easier to read than APA or Harvard, but does not have the benefit of showing how new or old ideas are, because you only find the date in the reference list at the end. The reference list (*Literaturverzeichnis*) is called "Works Cited" in English with MLA.

Again, Mendeley provides a good introduction:
https://www.mendeley.com/guides/mla-citation-guide.

Another good explanation is at Purdue University's site:
https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/mla_style/mla_formatting_and_style_guide/mla_in_text_citations_the_basics.html.

One of the best German explanations I have found online is at:
https://www.lektorat-masterarbeit.de/zitieren-im-mla-stil/.

IEEE REFERENCING

Finally, we will look at something totally different, the IEEE referencing system. This is used primarily in engineering and computer science – so you are sure to come across it. It is extremely popular in these fields. You may find it very useful.

At first glance, it may look like a footnote system, because references are just a set of numbers, and the first reference is numbered [1]. But it is not like footnotes at all.

With IEEE, each source has a number, and that number is used every time you refer to that source. The first source is numbered [1], the second source is numbered [2], and so on. If you refer to that source again later, you still use the same number. The numbers are put in square brackets. The reference list is not alphabetical, but ordered numerically.

IEEE does not require page numbers, which I personally find quite disturbing, as it makes it harder to find and verify arguments. For engineering and IT, however, where we more often work with journal articles and short papers rather than books, and where it is the total argument or development that matters, this is perhaps not so bad. But for this reason, IEEE is unlikely to ever become established in other subjects. You *can* use page numbers, but they are often left out.

The University of Pittsburgh has a good explanation of IEEE:
https://pitt.libguides.com/citationhelp/ieee.

Purdue University's site at least includes the page numbers:
https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/ieee_style/in-text_citation.html and
https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/ieee_style/reference_list.html.

A good German introduction can be found at:
https://thesius.de/blog/articles/zitieren-biologie-life-sciences-ieee/.

ONE LAST TIP

A word of advice if you decide to use IEEE referencing: use a reference management tool. Do not do it manually. There are two reasons:

- It is very difficult to manually change the numbering if you add or delete a source, or rearrange paragraphs. But if you don't correct things, you will end up committing accidental plagiarism.
- It is possible to convert other references to IEEE, but it is not possible to convert from IEEE to any of the other systems we have looked at. Why? Because IEEE references often do not include the page numbers, which the other systems all need. So if you ever need to check or revise your work, or perhaps send it to a journal in a different format, you will have to search to find the page numbers. This is painful, and it is a mistake you never make twice. But it is better not to ever make the mistake.

That rule is good advice, actually, no matter what system you use. We have the technology, so use it! Do your referencing with a reference management tool, and then just choose the system you want to use at the end to create your final document.

So, you are probably getting very excited now at the thought of seeing all these things in action! No?

THE CHOICE IS YOURS – AND ANOTHER CHOICE, TOO

These four systems are shown on the coming pages. I have taken the same short text and shown how it can be presented with each of the four systems. You can choose for yourself which you prefer. And maybe, just maybe, your supervisors will allow you to choose which one you use.

The other choice you have is very simple. In order to get practice with the systems, take any scholarly article, and convert it to use two of the other referencing systems here. It doesn't have to be the whole article, but make sure there are enough references for it to be a good exercise. You should do two conversions to different systems. Upload the original and the conversion on Moodle – this is your assessment task for the semester.

THE EXAMPLE...

I wrote this text myself, simply to provide an example. It has no scholarly value. The references are completely fictional. I have not included reference lists. You could set yourself the task of producing them yourself, based on the Chicago footnotes, and sending them to me for checking.

... IN CHICAGO STYLE

Some of the biggest problems facing data mining today are the lack of unified standards and protocols,[1] uncertainty on the part of practitioners about data protection regulations,[2] public fear of an Orwellian, private-enterprise "big brother corporation"[3] and corporate-sponsored agitation against a supposed "nanny state".[4] This latter problem, according to Smith,[5] has the potential to counteract public fears. Miller, however, does not consider this possible.[6]

... IN APA STYLE

Some of the biggest problems facing data mining today are the lack of unified standards and protocols (Jones, 2018a, p.43), uncertainty on the part of practitioners about data protection regulations (Jones, 2018b, p.125; Miller, 2017, pp.12-15), public fear of an Orwellian, private-enterprise "big brother corporation" (Smith, 2018, p.11; cf. Miller, 2019, p. 74) and corporate-sponsored agitation against a supposed "nanny state" (Smith, 2018, p.12). This latter problem, according to Smith (2018, p. 16), has the potential to counteract public fears. Miller, however, does not consider this possible (2019, p.78).

... IN MLA STYLE

Some of the biggest problems facing data mining today are the lack of unified standards and protocols (Jones, "Diversity" 43), uncertainty on the part of practitioners about data protection regulations (Jones, "Clarity" 125; Miller, *Government* 12-15), public fear of an Orwellian, private-enterprise "big brother corporation" (Smith 11; cf. Miller, "Fortune 500" 74)and corporate-sponsored agitation against a supposed "nanny state" (Smith 12). This latter problem, according to Smith (16), has the potential to counteract public fears. Miller, however, does not consider this possible (*Government* 78).

... IN IEEE STYLE

Some of the biggest problems facing data mining today are the lack of unified standards and protocols [1, p. 43], uncertainty on the part of practitioners about data protection regulations [2, p. 125],[3], public fear of an Orwellian, private-enterprise "big brother corporation" [4],[5, p. 74] and corporate-sponsored agitation against a supposed "nanny state" [4]. This latter problem, according to Smith [4], has the potential to counteract public fears. Miller, however, does not consider this possible [5, p. 78].

---

[1] Andrea Jones, "Diversity is the problem," *Data Mining Journal* 13, no. 2 (February 2018): 43.

[2] Andrea Jones, "Clarity would help," *Data Mining Journal* 13, no. 4 (April 2018): 125; Jack Miller, *Government and Data: a plea for active inaction* (London: DMBooks, 2017), 12-15.

[3] Ann Smith, "Orwell or Honeywell?", *Data Mining Journal* 13, no. 2 (February 2018): 11; cf. Jack Miller, "Fortune 500 and Big Brother," *Data and Progress* 36, no. 1 (January 2019): 74

[4] Ann Smith, *op.cit.*:12.

[5] *Ibid.*:16.

[6] Jack Miller, *Government and Data: a plea for active inaction*, p.78.