I won’t cite a paper as a reference unless I’ve read it first.

• This seems like an obvious rule. Am I ever tempted not to follow it?
  o I read a paper by Smith et al. that summarizes some aspect of another article by Jones et al. (which I have not read).
  o I trust Smith et al.
  o May I cite Jones et al. based upon what Smith et al. said?
    o NO!!

• This rule may not be universal??
I don’t have to read an entire paper in order to use it as a reference.

• How much do I have to read?
  o It depends, but the short answer is that I have to read enough of it to find what I need.
    ▪ For example, a 14 page paper contains a one paragraph procedure of use to me. This short procedure is all I’ve read and it is all that I need. I will cite the paper as the source of this procedure.
    ▪ I can lift a simple fact from an article and virtually read nothing else in the paper but cite that paper as the source.
Often, a critical reading of an article is required before I feel comfortable using it as a reference.

- If I refer to a conclusion or finding (i.e., a result) of an author’s work, I read enough of the paper to convince myself that the work is valid.
  - This is a courtesy to readers who trust me to cite only those findings or conclusions that I think are supported by the evidence.
  - Work that I find questionable I do not cite or
  - I discuss the shortcomings of that work for my readers.
  - This means that I would not use an abstract alone as the source of information regarding the conclusions or results of a paper.