as on other items, technique, which is important for the credibility of the whole, may triumph over other considerations --- which it should not.

The important point above, therefore, is that the geometric increase in possible ways of solving problems, getting answers and testing hypotheses, itself may help to obscure the lesser preoccupation with finding problems, framing questions and generating hypotheses in the first place.

Choosing Appropriate Research Strategies

Another baffling item at the outset is that one eventually encounters the categorization of diverse research strategies. This refers to descriptive, analytical, experimental, exploratory, evaluative, survey, comparative, field, laboratory, normative and so on.

The positive aspect is that it might be critically important, productive and saving in time and emotional energy to appreciate a range of possibilities. That is to learn which may be appropriate for given projects as well as the strengths, the limitations and the subsequent problems that accompany each.

For example, experimental and laboratory research may be internally valid for that experiment but not externally valid when transferred to a non-laboratory situation. Field and survey work may have more external credibility in the population from which the data were derived but provide for less control of the variables, less possibility of inferring cause and effect and less certainty in knowing why findings fell as they did. Exploratory studies suggest insufficient knowledge to formulate testable hypotheses at the start and therefore the promise of providing them at the close. Too often chosen without a sense of the rigor entailed, exploratory work ideally should be pursued only by those who can build in the rigor necessary for subsequent effort. For evaluative research of any character, the choice of criteria is likely to loom as a central issue. For analytical work, the continuing