

fit general expectations with regard to scientific procedure and some might reflect (with no apology but so stated) quite personal choice. Investigators necessarily have differing interests and capacities and operate within personal as well as topical limitations.

The point here is that the multiple decisions throughout might be partly objective and partly subjective, in part taken consciously and in part taken without full awareness. They might be partly recalled and partly forgotten. The latter might be especially the case in the earliest stages if someone else's non-articulated assumptions are unwittingly incorporated into the choices made. With experience, of course, one learns to keep systematic note of these things and therefore to reduce the possibility of later feeling traumatized by any sense of confusion.

The constant need for decisions, the criteria governing decisions, the processes involved and the likelihood that all three are subject to learning and correction as projects move along may not always be self-evident. Though it may seem self-evident once said, it is not always pointed out that the ground and the ground rules may change as learning progresses.

Further, it may not be self-evident that the decisions, the choice of governing criteria and the processes involved are not always as sequential as simple descriptions of scientific method or later published research reports might suggest. Counsel to state the purpose or problem at the start and to follow four or five steps does not prepare one for an experience that may seem more nebulous, ill-structured, mercurial and non-linear than expected. These considerations alone should make it clear why staking out the initial point of departure is so important whatever the impatience, the frustration and the difficulty may seem to be at the time. Salvage later is considerably more devastating.