

## Citing Internet Sources

**Note:** This is not a guideline for citation of all electronic sources. For citation of digital compact disks (CD-ROMs), documents on disk, programs and databases packaged with hard-copy books, and other similar electronic and computer-related sources not online, follow the reference and citation guidelines contained in the linked **References Cited**, which is a PDF document. Note that email messages are regarded as offline documents and are cited as personal communications, as explained in the linked guidelines.

### The Quick Version

Study the example given immediately below. Use no abbreviations; use normal capitalization and punctuation in everything except information enclosed within angle brackets and quotation marks, which follows original capitalization and punctuation. Write complete phrases or sentences as comments at the end when necessary. Use individual judgment in determining document authorship and in choosing a date for citation. This example consists of all six citation elements discussed in detail on the following pages:

Harnack, Andrew, and Eugene Kleppinger

1996 "Beyond the MLA Handbook: Documenting Electronic Sources on the Internet." <[http://falcon.eku.edu/honors/beyond-mla/#citing\\_sites](http://falcon.eku.edu/honors/beyond-mla/#citing_sites)> Document revised 25 November 1996; accessed 21 April 1997. <<http://www.smpcollege.com/online-4styles~help>> provided as a source of further information.

### The Detailed Version

Click on a heading in the Table of Contents to go directly to the corresponding designated section. Click on any in-text heading to return to this hyperlinked Table of Contents. External links are dark green and bolded.

### Table of Contents

Introduction .....	2
Just The Same Old Problems.....	2
Uncertain Authorship.....	2
Unknown, Uncertain, and Multiple Dates .....	3
Ephemeral Documents.....	4
Documents Subject to Revision.....	4
Limited Access .....	4
Standard Notation.....	5
Quotation Marks.....	6
Square Brackets.....	6
Angle Brackets .....	6
The Six Citation Elements.....	7
Authorship .....	7
References Cited Listing Date.....	7
Document Identification.....	7
Location and Access Information .....	7
The Date Statement .....	8
Comments.....	9
Further Considerations .....	10
Using Provided Citation Information.....	10
In-Text Citations.....	10
Online Sources to Cite In-Text Only .....	10
Examples and References Cited .....	10

## INTRODUCTION

Citation guides for electronic sources require authors and readers to know technical details about the many kinds of online sources possible, *and* they must know how to apply and interpret at least one of the many complex and highly variable formats given in electronic and internet citation guides. These formats are not intuitive and are not compatible with our traditional method of connecting a reference cited in text to the corresponding entry in the Reference Cited section.

For ease of use and for compatibility with traditional reference listing, authors should use the guidelines presented below for developing Internet bibliographies. The readers of our technical reports will not need to know any complex, evolving, or obscure formats in order to make use of the resulting information.

A reference citation system allows readers to make connections between in-text citations and the full references, and then between the references and the sources themselves. A *format* ideally helps the reader in this process, but reference formatting sometimes becomes an end in itself as well as a nuisance for authors and editors. The Midwest Archeological Center approach makes the necessary associations with a minimum of rules by combining standardization with a flexibility that allows for the many situations encountered online.

### ***Just The Same Old Problems***

Many believe that a new set of problems exists for citing information found on the Internet. Discussions about Internet reference formats and citation policies often focus on the contrast between traditional and Internet sources. These digressions usually suggest that Internet references pose fundamentally new problems that must somehow be communicated in the formatting of entries in a References Cited section.

It might seem at first glance that new problems have arisen. But, in fact, only relative quantities of old problems have changed to bring these problems to the forefront of discussion, which then leads to an illusion that there is a new set of problems. It is sometimes difficult to see that the problems in writing up electronic References Cited entries are old problems that have always existed, but at a lower frequency.

There have always been ephemeral, hard-to-find, soon-to-be-revised, poorly dated documents of uncertain authorship appearing in References Cited sections of reports in all disciplines. Style guides long ago recognized ways of presenting the necessary information when dealing with these problems. The responsibility for proper interpretation and application of the information contained in such sources has always rested with the author. For example, it has never been acceptable to gather one's data entirely from personal communications, unpublished draft documents, and other documents not generally available.

Having and applying a format, whether simple or complex, for any type of information or source does not confer legitimacy upon the source or the way a particular author uses it. The degree to which an author relies on problematic sources may vary, but it has always been the author's responsibility to use such sources wisely. Each author is responsible for how a source is used and whether the resulting research is of value to others and can be used by others.

The main complaints directed at Internet sources include matters involving uncertain authorship, uncertain document dating, lack of permanency, ease of revision, and limited access. The following paragraphs address each of these in turn and compare the Internet situation to traditional circumstances that have long been recognized by style and reference authorities.

### **Uncertain Authorship**

The Society for American Archaeology is not unique in its recognition of reference categories referred to in its style guide as "Book or other item, no author" (SAA 2003:§3.9.6), "Article, group author" (§3.9.10), "Article in a magazine, no author" (§3.9.11), and "Item in a newspaper," nonauthored (§3.9.12). Likewise, corporate and group authorship (§3.4.8) and no specified authorship (§3.4.12) are nearly identical to each other and result in reference listings similar to the generalized "no author" reference type (§3.9.6).

Likewise, *The Chicago Manual of Style* specifies ways to indicate degrees of certainty and different amounts of information regarding authorship. The situations involve known but unstated authorship, unstated and surmised authorship, undetermined authorship, pseudonyms, and various organizational authorships (University of Chicago Press 1993:§15.90–15.96). These issues did not begin with online publishing. The fact that there are established categories for dealing with many unknown and ambiguous authorship situations indicates that they are old problems that are going online with everything else.

When “normal” authorship of an Internet document cannot be determined, there are many possibilities for group, corporate, and organizational authorships. Look for commercial company names, university names and departments, governmental agencies and bureaus, and similar organizational identities. These might be found by working up, or ‘backwards,’ through the directory structure given in the URL.

For example, <<http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/geosurvey/index.html>> is a hyperlinked index of online geological maps of Ohio, some of which bear an author’s name and others with no specific authorship. One map with no specific author is entitled “Glacial Map of Ohio,” which is a one-page PDF file and recently appeared in a Midwest Archeological Center report. By working up or backwards through the directory structure, one finds that the web site belongs to Ohio’s Department of Natural Resources, and that the maps are located within the web site’s folders for the Division of Geological Survey. The author, therefore, is listed in the References Cited as Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Geological Survey.

The absolutely last resort is the “anonymous” category; but avoid it as much as possible. There is much potential for overuse, and relying on it can become a bad habit as well as a disservice to your readers.

### **Unknown, Uncertain, and Multiple Dates**

A persistent concern over Internet documents is the matter of dating. The date of citation has most often and traditionally been associated with when a document, such as a book or a journal article, has become available to the scholarly community. There have *always* been exceptions to this, however, and these exceptions can also be found among Internet documents. The traditional ways of dealing with problematic dates can easily be applied to Internet documents for which citation dates are difficult to determine.

#### *No Date*

*Historical Archaeology* and *American Antiquity* do not allow “n.d.” (no date) as a substitute for a citation date (SHA 1999:132–133, §VII.B.36; SAA 2003:30, §3.9.21). Among traditional documents, a date can always be estimated, surmised, or otherwise attributed.

Like undated traditional documents, seemingly undated Internet documents often include indirect date information, which can be used as the basis for an approximate or general date placed into the References Cited entry following the formatting guidelines given below. Whether it is used as the citation date depends on several factors, as explained in *The Date Statement*.

When no date whatsoever can be determined for a document’s creation, posting, or any other aspect of its online history, there remains one date nobody can miss or misinterpret: the access date. Whether it is used as the citation date depends on several factors, as explained in *The Date Statement*. Generally, however, the access date should be used as the citation date when no other date is satisfactory and for documents subject to regular online revision.

#### *Multiple Dates*

An Internet document can have several dates to choose from: creation, posting, revision, and online publishing copyright. This is a good thing—it gives one flexibility in composing a References Cited entry. Although the times of creation or posting for some Internet documents are provided to the minute, this does not mean all documents must be so precisely dated, or that such details when known are of any use. According to the guidelines given below, you can include one, some, or all known dates that pertain to a document when composing a complete reference entry. Only one of these, however, is ultimately chosen as the citation date. Refer to the discussion under *The Date Statement*, which begins on page 8.

## Ephemeral Documents

Everyone recognizes the great potential for some aspect of an Internet document's identification or location to change quickly; it might disappear altogether without notice. Web sites come and go, messages posted to discussion groups and newsgroups are eventually removed and not always archived, and online documents are sometimes renamed. Even when document authorship, title, and date remain constant, the URL will change during migration when a web site is restructured or turned over to a different entity for management or connected through a new ISP or whatever.

It is quite reasonable to ask, "If I cite this document, will anyone find it in two years, or even next year? Could my References Cited entry become outdated before my report or article is published? If you are haunted by such questions, then ask yourself several more questions:

Have I ever cited an unpublished conference paper using one of the twenty photocopies passed out by the author at the conference or that I obtained by writing to the author?

Have I ever seen a conference paper cited in someone else's report that was several years old by the time by the time I encountered the citation?

Have I ever seen "manuscript in the possession of the author"<sup>†</sup> or "draft manuscript on file" given as part of an entry in a References Cited?

Has my opinion of another author's scholarship or of a report's reliability diminished because of the citation of one or more of the above-mentioned types of documents?

The real concern should be *how* such documents are used in a report, not *whether* they are used. Simply apply the same principles of responsible scholarship to Internet documents that you apply to traditional and other non-Internet documents. Everything else remains the same.

## Documents Subject to Revision

Perhaps someday a colleague will tell you, "The version I have isn't exactly the same as the version you have." If this is a concern, then cite the article by the access date, and state the access time and date as precisely as possible in the References Cited entry, as discussed under *The Date Statement*.

Some online documents are meant to be revised regularly. In fact, this is sometimes mentioned as an advantage that Internet documents have over traditional documents. Such documents will usually include a prominent series of revision dates or dates and times. Include the most recent revision specification and your access date and time when writing a date statement for a reference. As explained below, it will not matter which of these you choose as the citation date, but consistency will be important if you are citing several similar documents.

## Limited Access

Some Internet documents might be available to a limited set of users, even when such documents have some permanency. Usually, however, the issue of limited access is compounded by problems of limited online lifespan. For example, not all Internet Service Providers make available all NNTP newsgroups, and not everyone has or uses a newsreader, which uses software different from a web browser's software, though the two may be bundled. And, newsgroup postings tend to be quite ephemeral.

You might well think, "Even if I keep a copy for myself, chances are few others, if any, will ever be able to locate it." This problem is not fundamentally different from that of *Ephemeral Documents*, discussed above. If limited access is a significant concern, then be especially careful about the role that document plays in your report as a whole, or don't cite it.

---

<sup>†</sup> Citations of documents as "manuscript in possession of the author" can be found in older issues of *American Antiquity*, but it is now unacceptable in Society for American Archaeology publications (SAA 2003:§3.9.21).

### *Misunderstanding Email*

The most limited electronic document, often mistaken for a true Internet document, is the personal email message. Some journal style guides, such as *Historical Archaeology* (SHA 1999), and some widely used Internet citation formats, such as that recommended by the National Library of Medicine (Patrias 2001), argue that personal email is fundamentally different from other forms of personal communication and that special procedures and formats are necessary for citing such messages.

Consider three situations:

A colleague composes a letter to you on his computer that includes usable research information. He prints it out, puts it into an envelope, and mails it to you. Upon receipt, you open it, read it, and file it with other important documents. You decide to cite the information in your in-progress report. Following established academic and scholarly tradition, you cite the information in your report as a personal communication from that colleague.

A colleague composes a letter to you on his computer that includes usable research information. He prints it out, puts it on his fax machine, and transmits it electronically to you. Upon receipt, your fax machine automatically prints the letter as hard copy. You read it and file it with other important documents. You decide to cite the information in your in-progress report. Following established academic and scholarly tradition, you cite the information in your report as a personal communication from that colleague.

A colleague composes a letter to you on his computer that includes usable research information. He copies it into his email program and transmits it electronically to you across the same telephone connection he uses to send a fax. Upon receipt, you read the letter on the computer's monitor, print a copy, and file it with other important documents. You decide to cite the information in your in-progress report. Following the recommendation of *The Council of Science Editors*, you apply the electronic mail citation guideline found among the National Library of Medicine formats for Internet sources (Patrias 2001:69–71) and create a References Cited entry consisting of six required elements and four of the seven optional elements. You spend 45 minutes making all ten elements complete and in the correct order. You spend another 15 minutes reviewing the guideline several times while correcting the punctuation in your References Cited entry. Your correction process includes deleting two of the optional elements. Finally, you put together a little package consisting of stamps and envelopes and mail it to your colleague with instructions to use them for all further correspondence.

### *Common Sense*

By applying a little common sense, authors can extend traditional ways of citing information sources to the seemingly new situations created by ever-changing transmission and data access technology. In comparing the above three hypothetical situations with each other, it becomes obvious that personal email is fundamentally no different from pre-Internet personal correspondence. In all three situations described above, a computer is used to create the correspondence. As illustrated in the second situation, the mere electronic transmission by fax of personal correspondence does not transform that personal communication into a new category requiring a special citation format.

What, exactly, makes the third situation *so* different that the source material must be treated in an entirely different way? There is no logical answer to this question, and there is no rational basis for believing the third situation is substantially different from the first two. Authors should treat a personal email message the same way they would treat any personal message transmitted by any means, regardless whether the method of transmission involves an electronic device or not.

### *Standard Notation*

The Midwest Archeological Center format uses three types of punctuation to identify three kinds of short text strings. In the Midwest Archeological Center format, punctuation types have the standard and traditional uses with which nearly everyone attempting any kind of reference formatting should already be familiar. The consistent use of commonly recognized elements of punctuation increases the ability of

those not familiar with the format to understand a References Cited entry upon first encounter. It should also be easy for new users of the format to create an entry without having to look up the format each time.

### **Quotation Marks**

Although there are several standard and accepted uses of quotation marks, the most common and familiar use is what the name indicates. When someone transcribes something that somebody else has said or written, known as a direct quotation, the quoted material is enclosed within a pair of quotation marks. In the Midwest Archeological Center format, anything that an author has transcribed from an online document appears in quotation marks in a References Cited entry, e.g., document title, subtitle, journal name. Quotation marks are used only for document identification, as explained in greater detail below.

Anyone reading a References Cited entry should recognize that any and all words and numbers appearing within quotation marks have been extracted from a document exactly as written and are not paraphrasings or interpretations. Similarly, the words and numbers not within quotation marks will be information paraphrased or composed by the author regardless of where and how the information was obtained.

### **Square Brackets**

As is the case for most elements of punctuation, square brackets have a variety of uses and meanings. The most common use in academic and technical writing is to identify writers' and editors' words that have been inserted into a body of text, often quoted material. There are several contexts for such insertions, but the guidelines adapted for our citation format are summarized in *The Chicago Manual of Style* (14th edition, § 5.128 and §10.65) and excerpted immediately below.

Brackets (sometimes called square brackets) are used to enclose editorial interpolations, corrections..., explanations, translations, or comments in quoted material ...

Insertions may be made in quoted material to clarify an ambiguity, to provide missing words or letters, or to give the original foreign word or phrase where an English translation does not convey the exact sense. Any such interpolations are enclosed in brackets (not parentheses).

The following excerpt from *Suggestions to Authors of the Reports of the United States Geological Survey* (7th edition, by Wallace R. Hansen, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1991, page 139) summarizes the specific use of brackets followed in the Midwest Archeological Center format. The last sentence of this excerpt is particularly relevant to the use of brackets in Internet document citations.

One primary function of brackets is to indicate information added to the work of another writer. This information is generally added in either of two places: in quotations or in references. ... In references, brackets are used to indicate additional information that is not available on the title page of the publication.

Note that in all the situations covered by these excerpted guidelines, square brackets are used to identify an author's or editor's clarifications and augmentations of the associated text. While there may be other legitimate uses of square brackets, the Midwest Archeological Center format uses them in references only to identify inserted clarifications and augmentations.

### **Angle Brackets**

Also known as angular parentheses, angle brackets have several uses and meanings, no one of which can yet be called traditional or standard in comparison to the status of quotation marks and square brackets. However, one use of angle brackets is becoming increasingly familiar and standardized in the world of computer-based communications. Specifically, email addresses and URLs are usually enclosed within angle brackets. In fact, angle brackets are the Internet standard for URL delimitation (Berners-Lee et al. 1994; Harnack and Kleppinger 1996:section 1).

In the Midwest Archeological Center format, all Internet and email addresses are enclosed within angle brackets. Similarly, angle brackets enclose alternative information when a URL is not appropriate to the reference. This includes the non-URL command sequences, directory paths, and/or menu selections that might be used to access documents at Gopher, Telnet, and anonymous FTP sites. In these cases, exact-character location and access information is placed within the angle brackets. Thus, in all cases, angle

brackets enclose the exact information specific to the Internet that users must have in order to locate a particular document listed in the References Cited. Furthermore, as (Harnack and Kleppinger 1996:section 1) point out, “The adoption of angle-bracket delimiters for URLs helps to reduce ambiguity. These difficulties should disappear when URLs become the sole standard for citation practice.”

## THE SIX CITATION ELEMENTS

1. Authorship
2. References Cited listing date
3. Document identification by “Title” or [description] or both
4. <URL or other location and access information>
5. Date statement.
6. Comments.

### ***Authorship***

The authorship element may consist of a person’s name, several co-authors’ names, an organization or institution name, anonymous, an electronic magazine or journal name, a web site or product name, and possibly part of a URL (uniform resource locator). The author will, of course, attempt to assign authorship to a person or institution, but there are so many possibilities and different amounts of information supplied with online documents that undoubtedly situations will arise when we will assign authorship to a less-traditional entity.

### ***References Cited Listing Date***

The citation or listing date comes from the date statement, discussed below. Write the date statement and the authorship line before finalizing this element.

### ***Document Identification***

Enclose all transcribed words serving as a document title within quotation marks. The document title may include both an article title and a journal or other publication series name, with volume and issue numbers. Place square brackets around *your* words that describe the document in lieu of a formal title. There will be some situations for which you will want to include both. The title portion of the citation includes only descriptive information for document identification. This is not a place for supplementary information or comments.

### ***Location and Access Information***

Use angle brackets to enclose an Internet address. Reproduce uppercase and lowercase, punctuation, and any special characters such as /, @, #, and \_\_ exactly as they occur in the original. An exception is the space, which sometimes occurs as discussed below. A reader might use the URL information to gain access to the source you cite. Only the author is able to render this information correctly. There is no way that editing can detect and correct any but the most obvious errors, like httppt instead of http.

Protocols such as Gopher, Telnet, and anonymous FTP have addresses that may be rendered as URLs and that are often translated into workable URLs. Spaces may occur as significant characters in location information strings for non-URL formats such as Gopher, Telnet, and anonymous FTP, whereas URLs prohibit spaces. The percent symbol is often used to designate a space so that the location information can be represented by an unbroken string of visible, printed characters. If the location information (sometimes referred to as “command-pathway” data) cannot be rendered as a URL equivalent, then transcribe it using % for spaces. In either case, provide complete information so that the reader will know what kind of site you are citing and add clarification in the Comments section if necessary.

Sometimes there is no address or method to retrieve messages from an electronic mailing list or an email discussion list. But when a message is archived and retrievable, the correspondence might have two possible addresses: the message-author address and the archive retrieval address. When this applies, place the message-author address in angle brackets followed by “via” followed by the list’s archive address in angle brackets. Harnack and Kleppinger (1996:section 2) propose this convention to solve the problem of documents that have one address for publication and another for retrieval. This will be the only case of an apparent two-address entry. Further clarification of the author’s email address can be placed in the comments section. The following example comes from Harnack and Kleppinger (1996:section 2, last example) and has been modified according to these guidelines:

Seabrook, Richard H. C.

1994 “Community and Progress.” <cybermind@jefferson.village.virginia.edu> via <listserv@jefferson.village.virginia.edu> Document posted 22 January 1994; accessed 22 January 1994. Author’s email address is provided as <seabrook@clark.net>.

### ***The Date Statement***

The date statement has two parts separated by a semicolon. The first part gives the document creation, posting, and/or revision date. The second part gives the date that the author accessed the source document containing the information cited.

If more than one of the creation, posting, online publishing, or revision dates are known, then the author must pick at least one that is useful to the reader and most appropriate for the situation. The degree of specificity is open and requires judgement on the author’s part. Each reference might be handled differently. There are no constraints, except that *something* —even ‘undetermined’— must be provided for this element of the citation. There might be situations when it will be desirable to give both a creation and a revision date in the date statement, and the Midwest Archeological Center format allows for this, as shown below.

The first part of the date statement may state a year; month and year; day, month, and year; time, day, month, and year; undetermined; unknown; or not applicable. One may insert a (?) after a date or place “or” between two possible years, if there is justification and if it would be of help to the reader. An important feature of this element is how it contrasts with the second part of the date statement.

The second part of the date statement, the access date, should never be a problem. It is simply the date that the author found the information cited, regardless of whether it was read on screen at that time, saved as a file, or printed as hard copy to be used later. Complete date statements look like this:

Document revised 01 December 2001; accessed 02 December 2001.

Document created February 1999; accessed 10:32 am CST, 15 May 2002.

Document creation and revision dates undetermined; accessed November 2002.

There are advantages to entries similar to the third example above. It avoids the problem of spending a lot of time researching a creation and/or revision date when it is not provided or is otherwise in doubt. Also, a date undetermined avoids the possibility of an author providing an incorrect date. The important feature of a date statement is that any reader will find a clear contrast between the date of access and the date, or lack of date, of document creation, posting, or revision. Supply more information if you have it and if you feel it is helpful. *For example:* Document created 1984, last revised 23 August 1996; accessed 7 July 1997. Each case might be different, but each case will be clear.

The author must pick a year from the date statement to be used as the References Cited listing date. Keep in mind that this is *only* for the purpose of correlating an in-text citation with the corresponding entry in the References Cited. This date is neither a comment on, nor judgment about, any age characteristics of the document. It is for internal identification purposes only. The necessary or practical information on document dating available and appropriate for the situation is given in the date statement.

In most cases there will be an obvious citation listing date. Many documents list and identify all the various dates that apply (creation, revision, posting or publication, further revisions) and some even have instructions as to which date to cite. In a few cases, you will have only your access date to cite, but at least it can be used to associate the in-text citation with the correct References Cited entry. If you have a choice, consider picking a date that is most significant for the context in which the citation is made.

Portable Document Format (PDF) files have embedded document creation and revision dates. These often do not correspond to the file date, which might be a posting date or your download date. When the document is open in Acrobat Reader, press CTRL+D to show the document properties summary.

Keep in mind that the date statement indicates something about the document's online history. It should not summarize the document's archival or research history. For example, consider a hypothetical situation in which a map of your survey area was drawn in 1832. Someone made corrections and amendments in 1875. It was accessioned in 1950 by the History Museum. It was scanned and placed on the museum's web site in 1998. The museum's webmaster updated the web site in 1999, renamed folders and files, and adjusted the contrast of the map's image file. In 2001, you find it online and print out a copy for your research files. For reference citation purposes, the document creation date is 1998, not 1832. The document revision date is 1999, not 1875. You would probably pick 1999 as the References Cited listing date (by choosing the latest revision date), although 2001, the document access date, is a possibility if there were some doubts or other difficulties with the other dates.

If you wish to provide the reader with the map's pre-1998 details, then the history of the original map as an item in use, as an archival holding, and as an object of research should be presented in the text and not in the Reference Citation date statement or comments section. Your documentation of the map's archival history might consist of sources other than the map itself, although these other sources might also be online at the museum's web site. Or, the discussion of the map's origin and history might consist of traditional forms of documentation, such as a journal article or a letter from the curator. In any case, when dealing with archival materials, be sure to distinguish historical origins and repository history from an item's development and use as an online document.

There cannot be a "no date" or "n.d." entry. There will be at least one year in the date statement, the year of access. Follow the usual a, b, c distinctions for more than one work by one author in the same year. Please remember that the listing year you pick is *only* for the purpose of linking the in-text citation with an entry in the References Cited. It is for internal identification purposes only. Clarification is provided in the full entry.

### ***Comments***

This section is optional, and many entries will not have comments. If included, this section should contain any supplementary information or clarification specific to the entry that the author feels will help the reader of the report find the source or otherwise disambiguate a confusing situation. The kinds of information that might be included in the comments section include: a clear description of the type of item (e.g., bulletin board message, listserver posting, published hard copy details, online database); the document author's email address; a "command pathway" statement; an alternate address for the same document; or a home page address for the organization publishing the document electronically.

Do not start the comments with "Comments: " Write complete or nearly complete sentences and do not use abbreviations. Include URLs and email addresses within angle brackets. Extensive commentary can be placed in the text. Reserve the reference comments for details pertaining to the nature or location of the electronic citation, and use the text for a discussion of the quality or history of the information it contains.

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### *Using Provided Citation Information*

Sometimes an online document includes citation instructions. For example, an electronic journal article might have a statement under the Abstract such as, “Cite this article using the following format ...” followed by a complete, formatted References Cited entry. This can be a convenient and authoritative source of information to put into the References Cited entry. Much of the information provided in such cases will go into the document identification (title) portion of the References Cited entry. Authorship and listing date will be clearly identifiable.

Do not use the *format* provided, but use the information as effectively as possible. Reorganize the information to fit the Midwest Archeological Center format given here. There might be some information in a provided citation that is not used at all. Each case will be different, and the author must use some judgement to modify the provided information for the situation at hand.

### *In-Text Citations*

Citing individual page numbers in a long online document might be a problem in some cases. Many documents lack internally assigned page numbers, and the page numbers assigned by one browser may not match the pagination given by another browser or displayed on a different monitor. Note also that the pagination on your monitor will not necessarily match the pagination on the hard copy that you print during the same access event.

Some guidelines recommend counting paragraphs and citing them by number even if they aren't numbered in the original document. Alternatively, one might use phrases such as “near the end” or “about in the middle” or “first text block after the second map” when other forms of specificity won't work. Otherwise, the same rules apply to in-text citations as for traditional publications.

An example of a specific but pageless in-text citation occurs in this document in the middle of page 8. The document by Harnack and Kleppinger has four numbered sections and several unnumbered ones. A reader checking the source will find the Seabrook reference example at the end of the only section numbered 2 and immediately before the only section numbered 3. There might have been some difficulty if the specific detail cited appeared in one of the unnumbered sections, but that didn't happen in this case.

### *Online Sources to Cite In-Text Only*

Do not create a References Cited entry for a directory, a search engine, or a web site with no specific document identified. Instead, cite these entirely in text using the rules of in-text citation given in the Midwest Archeological Center standard reference and citation guidelines (**References Cited**, p. 6).

### *Examples and References Cited*

Berners-Lee, Tim and the Universal Resource Identifiers Working Group (URI-WG)

1994 “Uniform Resource Locators (URL)” [also known as RFC 1738 and is headed by a note that 1738 is updated by 2368] <ftp://ds.internic.net/rfc.rfc1738.txt> Document created and posted December 1994; accessed 1 October 1998. The URI-WG email address is provided as <uri@bunyip.com>.

Bower, Bob

1998 “Banquets in the Ruins: Archaeologists Hunger for a Better Understanding of Feasts. *Science News Online*, May 23, 1998” <http://sciencenews.org/sn\_arc98/5\_23\_98/bob1.htm> Document created and posted 1998; accessed 01 July 1998. Article includes a cross reference to the hard copy: *Science News* 153(21):331.

Harnack, Andrew, and Eugene Kleppinger

1996 "Beyond the MLA Handbook: Documenting Electronic Sources on the Internet" <[http://falcon.eku.edu/honors/beyond-mla/#citing\\_sites](http://falcon.eku.edu/honors/beyond-mla/#citing_sites)> Document revised 25 November 1996; accessed 21 April 1997. The document provides <<http://www.smpcollege.com/online-4styles~help>> as a source of further information.

Hunt, William J., Jr., compiler

1997 "Embossed Medicine Bottle Labels: An Electronic Finding Aid for the Identification of Archeological Specimens" <[http://www.mwac.nps.gov/bottle\\_glass/](http://www.mwac.nps.gov/bottle_glass/)> Document created 1995, revised August 1997; accessed July 1998.

Lockyear, K., T. J. T. Sly, and V. Mihailescu-Birliba, editors

2000 *Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology 1996*. BAR International Series 845. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford.

Lynott, Mark L.

1998 "Geophysical Surveys in the Mid-Continent: John Weymouth and the Midwest Archeological Center. *Hopewell Archeology*, July 1998, Vol. 3, No. 1" <<http://www.mwac.nps.gov/hopewell/v3n1/index.html>> Document created March 1998, revised July 1998; accessed August 1998.

Millett, M., Queiroga, F., Strutt, K., Taylor, J. and Willis, S.

2000 "The Ave Valley, Northern Portugal: An Archaeological Survey of Iron Age and Roman Settlement. *Internet Archaeology 9*" <[http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue9/millett\\_index.html](http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue9/millett_index.html)> Document published online 2000; accessed 2002.

Munoz, René

1998 "The Piedras Negras Archaeological Project" <[http://www.discoverarchaeology.com/da\\_more.htm](http://www.discoverarchaeology.com/da_more.htm)> Document created 1998; accessed 01 July 1998. Described on <[http://www.discoverarchaeology.com/da\\_main.htm](http://www.discoverarchaeology.com/da_main.htm)> as one of "a few samples coming in the first few issues."

Patrias, Karen

2001 *National Library of Medicine Recommended Formats for Bibliographic Citation, Supplement: Internet Formats*. Reference Section, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda Maryland. An Acrobat PDF copy is available at <<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/formats/internet.pdf>>. Document revised July 2001; accessed November 2002. Author provides email address as <[patrias@nlm.nih.gov](mailto:patrias@nlm.nih.gov)>.

Polfer, Michel, and Jos Thiel

1997 "The Gallo-Roman Cremation Cemeteries of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg: Initial Findings of Current Research; *Internet Archaeology 4*" <[http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue4/polfer\\_index.html](http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue4/polfer_index.html)> Document published online December 1997; accessed 01 July 1998.

Powell, Corey S.

1997 [review of *Virtual Archaeology: Re-Creating Ancient Worlds*, edited by M. Forte and A. Silotti, in the Briefly Noted section of *Scientific American*, August 1997] <<http://www.sciam.com/issue/0897review2.html>> Document created 1997; accessed 01 July 1998.

Seabrook, Richard H. C.

1994 "Community and Progress." <[cybermind@jefferson.village.virginia.edu](mailto:cybermind@jefferson.village.virginia.edu)> via <[listserv@jefferson.village.virginia.edu](mailto:listserv@jefferson.village.virginia.edu)> Document posted 22 January 1994; accessed 22 January 1994. Author's email address provided as <[seabrook@clark.net](mailto:seabrook@clark.net)> .

Society for American Archaeology (SAA)

2003 "Editorial Policy, Information for Authors, and Style Guide for American Antiquity and Latin American Antiquity" [PDF downloaded and printed locally]. <<http://www.saa.org/Publications/StyleGuide/saaguide.pdf>> Document revised 21 January 2003; accessed 05 February 2003.

Strutt, Kristian

2001 "Geophysical Prospection in the Tiber Valley: An Overview. *AIAC News* No. 27/24" <[http://www.aiac.org/aiacnews/27\\_12\\_00.html](http://www.aiac.org/aiacnews/27_12_00.html)> Document dated December 27, 2000, published online 2001; accessed December 5, 2002.

Thomas, Julian

1994 "Neolithic Houses in Mainland Britain: A Sceptical View" [first article in *Online Archaeology*, Experimental Issue, no volume designation] <<http://avebury.arch.soton.ac.uk/Journal/Thomas/neohouse.html>> Document created August 1994; accessed 01 July 1998. Author's email address is provided as <[jst@soton.ac.uk](mailto:jst@soton.ac.uk)>.