Some Guidance on Referencing
Cecile Fabre, Lincoln College, Oxford
August 2010

1. The point of good referencing.
- Good referencing is an essential component of any anti-plagiarism practice. Plagiarism consists in appropriating other people's as your own, and in failing to acknowledge their source. It is a form of intellectual theft, and will be treated without indulgence by the university. See the Faculty's policy at
http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/1482/Plagiarism.pdf
It will be assumed that you have read this, and have familiarised yourself with good referencing practices. There are, in the main, two broad ways of referencing your sources: the so-called Harvard system (or in-text citation/author-date), and the so-called Chicago system (footnote/endnote system.)

2. In-text citation (also called 'Name, date' or 'Harvard' system)
This is an increasingly common way of referencing material. It relies upon a comprehensive and accurate bibliography. The in-text reference *must* correspond to material listed in the bibliography. And because there is very little information about the source in the main text itself, you *must* provide a bibliography at the end. If you find it had to include internet citations in in-text references, you can put them in footnotes, but generally don't mix the two systems.

> In 1997, Roger Crisp published a comprehensive study of Mill's *Utilitarianism.* He begins by noting that '*Utilitarianism* is one of the most significant works in moral philosophy, ranking in importance alongside Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and Kant's *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*.' (Crisp, 1997, p.1).

The bibliography will then include a reference to:

> Crisp, R. 1997. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Mill On Utilitarianism.* London, Routledge.

In-text citations need to be short, but clear, so that the reader follows your argument. For another example, where there is a quotation in the middle of your own sentence:

> Crisp argues that 'there is something of an instability at the heart of Mill's project" (Crisp, 1997, p. 125), but one may wonder whether that is a decisive objection to Mill.

The reference is linked to the bibliography entry to Crisp's book.

Some people put the reference at the start of the sentence:

> **Example A** To quote Crisp (1997, p. 125) again, 'there is something of an instability at the heart of Mill's project".

I must admit that I find this version easier to read:

> **Example B** To quote Crisp (1997, p. 125) again, 'there is something of an instability at the heart of Mill's project".

If you cite more than one article published by an author in the same year, make clear which piece you are citing AND make sure you identify them in the bibliography as well.

> In a series of articles, Judith Jarvis Thompson examines possible solutions to the so-called *Trolley* problem (Thompson, 1986a, 1986b.)

In the bibliography, the items will be listed as follows:

> . Thomson, J. J. 1986a. 'The Trolley Problem'. In Parent, W. & Thomson, J. J. (Eds.) *Rights, restitution, and risk: essays in moral theory*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
> --- ----1986b. Killing, Letting Die and the Trolley Problem. In Thomson, J. J. & Parent, W. (Eds.) *Rights, restitution, and risk: essays in moral theory*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

3. Footnotes/endnotes (also referred to as the 'Numbering' system)

Footnotes guide readers easily to the information, without disrupting their thought process. Because the all the information is provided in the footnotes or endnotes, you do not need to include a bibliography at the end.

> . In 1997, Roger Crisp published a comprehensive study of Mill's *Utilitarianism.* He begins by noting that '*Utilitarianism* is one of the most significant works in moral philosophy, ranking in importance alongside Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and Kant's *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*.'[1]
>
> 1. R. Crisp, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Mill On Utilitarianism* (London, Routledge, 1997), p. 1.

Often you will refer to the same source several times. The old style for doing this used the Latin terms '*ibid*.' and '*op cit'*. This is now less common, because most of us don't know Latin. It is generally better and clearer to use a 'short form' for subsequent references. Short forms refer back to an article or book already cited in full. The subsequent references include the author's surname, a short form of the title or date, and the page number:

> [1] R. Crisp, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Mill On Utilitarianism* (London, Routledge, 1997), p. 1.
>
> Subsequent footnotes: Crisp, *Mill on Utilitarianism*, p. 36.

Footnotes may also be used to convey information which does not need to go in the main text. However, content footnotes should be used with restraint. If the information is not important enough to include in the text, it may not be necessary at all. Footnotes may also combine both information and citation:

> Main text: Whether or not utilitarianism can accommodate our feelings of loyalties towards our relatives and friends is a particularly thorny issue.[1]
>
> [1.] For good discussions of this issue, see, e.g., A. Oldenquist, 'Loyalties', *The Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982): 173-93. Oldenquist analyses different kinds of loyalties – to one's family, to one's country, and to mankind as a whole.

For Philosophy essays you are likely to cite, in the mains, books, journal articles, and book chapters. For a very useful guide as to which information to include for different kinds of sources, in both the Chicago and the Harvard style, see the *Chicago Manual of Style Online* at
http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html.