

of others where these are available or the general acceptability of the starting point in the absence of such building blocks.

Acceptability as one of the terms of reference might strike a jarring note for anyone who expects all aspects of the pre-research activity to be just as pure as the research activity is sometimes purported to be. Denial of acceptability as a legitimate point of reference, however, would surely cut off some potentially significant departures from established avenues and methods of research. Not infrequently, it is the interstices between the established pathways that harbor the really creative yield.

Mutable Standards in a Complicated World

Another difficulty that can prove troublesome, not only in the early stages but throughout, is concern with just how original, just how significant, just how conclusive, just how generalizeable and just how much of an addition to knowledge everything has to be.

On these, let my own bias be clear, not because it is correct or better than others, but because it may be constructive and useful and because any researcher may be well advised to consider these with other perspectives before proceeding. Those who intend to incorporate inquiry as part of their ongoing commitment will regularly confront these questions and will need some resolutions with which they can live. My view is that the aforementioned standards are worth reaching for --- with some allowance to stop short of perfection --- especially provided that one knows what has been attained and what has not and how to keep others properly posted.

In the world of practical affairs, originality, significance (in the sense of adding to a body of knowledge and method for building knowledge), conclusiveness and generalizeability might not weigh so heavily as acceptability,