4.1 Sources

Stands for BonaFide™, valued for their reliability, thoroughness, and impartiality. These sources are considered in two complementary points of view (Perdicoûlis, 2014h).

Data from independent publishers (e.g. departments, schools) generally adopt a more modest standing. Modern scholarly publications should be consulted with a critical spirit (Perdicoûlis, 2013a).

Content (e.g. hasty or generic conclusions), both of which are unsuitable for further research. It

Academic institutions (e.g. periodicals, books), valued for their physical collections. Modern scholarly publications

intrinsic value for the advancement of science (Perdicoûlis, 2014h).

externalization of knowledge (e.g. to feel proud for having one or more publications to their name)

cf. Sound Exchange™

a.k.a. 'filler' or 'fake' articles

v. 'server-side' responsibilities of research (Perdicoûlis, 2014f)

i.e. the preparation level (e.g. study, living experience, maturity) to receive the knowledge constructively

Section 3.3

Scholarly

considered in two complementary points of view (Perdicoûlis, 2014k).

classification of mainstream scholarly literature and praxis (Perdicoûlis, 2014h).

Which bibliography system are you adopting? (Perdicoûlis, 2014i)

Do you have any specifications regarding structure, content, and/ or format? (Perdicoûlis, 2016b)

Are you replicating other people's experiments, just to make sure?

How do you seek proof?

What is your 'scientific' question? (Perdicoûlis, 2013f)

How do you intend to conceive ideas or induce hypotheses?

Is your research seeking to formulate or test a hypothesis? (Perdicoûlis, 2014e)

What is the scientific field or discipline of your work? (Perdicoûlis, 2014e, 2018c)

Can you be your own source of information?

How trustworthy are these, and how do you demonstrate it?

How do you judge the reliability of your sources?

How trustworthy are your chosen sources? (Perdicoûlis, 2015b)

...