GROUNDED THEORY REVIEW
An international journal

When is Grounded Theory (GT) Not Grounded Theory: Methodological Convergences and Divergences

Barry Chametzky, PhD

Abstract

The term grounded theory, in the vernacular sense, has a certain *je-ne-sais-quoi*; it sounds scholarly and is appealing to many researchers worldwide. Since its formal inception in 1967 with Glaser and Strauss the design has, for good or bad, undergone many modifications. However, the name has remained. To present the original design as grounded theory and modified versions of the design also as grounded theory seems awkward and confusing especially for students who are trying to learn the design. This confusion begs the question: When is grounded theory not grounded theory? In this paper, the author will present several methodological convergences and divergences in the design.

Keywords: grounded theory, technology usage, ChatGPT, qualitative data analysis, contradictory paths

Grounded theory is a research design researchers use to develop a theory from data (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2019; Glaser, 1998, 2009; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). At this point, no one would disagree with such a statement. However, as a way to start this discussion and perhaps fuel an ever-existing and divisive nature of what grounded theory is and is not, I will make what some scholars might view as a bold, brash, and perhaps contentious statement but please allow me to explain. There is only 1 version of grounded theory that exists: Classic (or Glaserian) grounded theory.

Beginning with the pointed commentaries that Barney Glaser wrote to his long-time friend and colleague Anselm Strauss about Strauss' 1990 book on qualitative analysis misidentified (Glaser, 1992) as grounded theory, Glaser's life-long belief was that there was only 1 type of grounded theory—the one he started to develop in 1965 with the Constant Comparison Method (Glaser, 1965) and subsequently became Classic (or Glaserian) Grounded Theory. Regarding Strauss' book, Glaser (1992) stated was it

> is not based on emergent relevance with categories that fit and work, and the product is not grounded theory. Again, it is preconceived, forced, conceptual description, which can be very significant in its own right, but again it is not emergent grounded theory. (p. 4)

Glaser (1992) explicitly stated to Strauss that what Strauss had created was something completely different from grounded theory. Indeed, Charmaz (2000) stated that Glaser and Strauss (along with his co-author Juliette Corbin) went in "conflicting directions" (p. 510). The implication is that while Glaser was ultra-conservative in his beliefs about defined grounded theory, Strauss and Corbin took a number of liberties and modified the original design; some of these changes will be discussed throughout this paper.

Kathy Charmaz went in a different direction from Glaser as well. Her constructivist version was considered by Glaser (2002) to be a type of qualitative data analysis (QDA) not grounded theory. In fact, he stated that to call what Charmaz developed grounded theory "is a misnomer" (Glaser, 2002, para. 1). One can understand, then, that my perhaps overly brash comment at the start of this research is not blatant bias but rather founded on documented information.

Yet, at this point, though, further clarity is vital. Glaser never stated that the Straussian design (by Strauss or by Corbin and Strauss) and the constructivist design (by Charmaz) are bad; in fact, he commented that one design is no better or worse than another (Glaser, 2010, 2011). Glaser's only contention was that those designs are not to be called grounded theory but rather QDA. Glaser (2010) went on to state that

> Grounded theory refers to a specific methodology on how to get from systematically collecting data to producing a multivariate conceptual theory. It is a total methodological package. . . . Now, all research is grounded in data in some way. It is implicit in the definition of research. Thus, research is grounded by definition, but research grounded in data is not grounded theory, although many jargonizers would have their work designated that way. (p. 1)

This subtle yet important distinction will provide a starting point for this research. With the belief that each design has its own merit (Glaser, 2010, 2011), the objective of this scholarship, then, is to compare various elements of Glaserian grounded theory with corresponding elements from the Straussian and Constructivist designs to understand in a perhaps more nuanced manner the "conflicting directions" (Charmaz, 2000, p. 510) that Strauss and Corbin, and Charmaz took from Glaser.

Though there are many incompatible paths (Charmaz, 2000) that could be presented, I will focus on (a) emergence and forcing data and (b) description and conceptualization. Then, there will be a brief discussion of some methodological convergences. Each section will be discussed in turn.

Emergence and Forcing Data

The concepts of emergence and forcing of data can be studied in different ways with respect to the designs of Glaser, Strauss, and Charmaz. While emergence, and more broadly speaking, data collection and analysis, can be potentially a polemic topic, the objective here is not to be antagonistic but neutral where the reader can determine what is most appropriate for the research. Within this section, 2 subthemes will be presented: (a) coding with technology or by hand and (b) co-construction, axial coding, and natural emergence. Each subsection will be presented in turn.

Coding with Technology or by Hand

The discussion of coding with or without technology will start with a comment from Glaser (1998, 2009) that technology should not be used in coding. For Glaser, using technology poses several issues. Glaser spoke of recording interviews as a bad thing because of several reasons. First, creativity is greatly restricted. Second, recording interviews "superficializes the data" (Glaser, 1998, p. 112). Additionally, taping becomes a "psychological crutch" (Glaser, 2001, p. 54) which does not allow the brain to make important subconscious (Glaser, 2001). Tangentially, with recording would come transcription and overly detailed information and what Glaser (2012) described as "worrisome accuracy" (p. 119). Finally, and perhaps most importantly, with Glaserian grounded theory, tools are not used because of the great potential to force data into pre-determined codes. Glaser (1978, 2012) believed that emergence will happen

in due course, by hand. For Glaser, then, coding and interviewing are two aspects of grounded theory that must be done by hand. Glaser (2017) used the term "natural coding" (p. 25). By extension, one may describe coding done by hand as naturally emerging.

Given the ubiquitous reliance on technology in the 3rd decade of the 21st century, very few people, if any, would argue that technology is not beneficial or even vital in their lives and research. After all, consider the fact that I am using technology to create this article. Imagine writing and editing it solely by hand. It would not be hyperbolic to state that in the 3rd decade of the 21st century, the most innovative technology is artificial intelligence (AI). One type of AI is ChatGPT, a tool that uses

> an AI language model developed by OpenAI. It can understand and generate human-like text, making it useful for a variety of applications, such as answering questions, providing explanations, assisting with creative writing, and more. It uses machine learning to generate responses based on the input it receives, aiming to provide helpful and relevant information in conversation. (OpenAI, 2024)

In 2022, Chametzky published a paper on coding and presented a mock interview with the resulting 10 codes that were obtained through line-by-line analysis by hand. Here are those 10 codes:

> (a) Being unsure and reaching out; Testing one's viewpoint; (b) Opening to suggestions and evaluating alternatives; (c) Self-reflecting; (d) Struggling to find a path; Feeling frustration; (e) Developing a plan; Remaining optimistic; (f) Determining a plan; Confronting unrealistic expectation; (g) Overcoming obstacles; (h) Reasoning out the plan; (i) Seeking information; and, (j) Raising self esteem [sic]; Experiencing self-efficacy. (Chametzky, 2022, Section 5)

If one were to use ChatGPT to find codes in the aforementioned text, one would discover these in-vivo codes: (a) aha moment, (b) wear 2 hats, and (c) respectfully disagree, and these thematic codes: (a) struggle and frustration, (b) mentorship and guidance, (c) autonomy in learning, (d) integration of knowledge, and (e) reflexivity. There is now value in discussing, albeit briefly, the resulting codes. While the in-vivo codes might be valuable in a discussion, most probably, they would add little insights into what is taking place in the data (Chametzky, 2022). Additionally, they are too descriptive rather than conceptual. And in Glaserian grounded theory, the use of description is rather localized so that data are not abstract of "time, place, and people" (Glaser, 2009, p. 24). There is value in taking a brief detour to explain this quote of Glaser from 2009.

The objective of Glaserian grounded theory is that the theory needs to be relatable to many different groups of people, not just those in the substantive area. A good example is a study done by Chametzky in 2017. In that study, he explained about how online students dealt with the anxiety of taking online foreign language classes. When stressed, the behaviors they exhibited—screaming, crying, isolating, ranting to other people, praying, giving up, etc.—are exactly some of the behaviors that each of us may experience during stressful times in our lives. Thus, the theory presented Chametzky in 2017 is said to be broader than the substantive area because it demonstrates universality rather than being limited to specific people at a certain time and place (Glaser, 2009).

Returning to the discussion about codes, from another perspective, while these codes are generally very good, there are some subtle differences between what ChatGPT presented and what a human has presented. First, the number of codes that ChatGPT produced is half of what was done by hand. That reduction can potentially create issues during the memo writing and analysis phases. Additionally, mentorship and guidance are not adequately reflected in the

participant's experiences as much as it is an external influence on the participant. Such a different perspective causes the focus of the analysis to change and potentially veer off path. Similarly, the codes of integration of knowledge and reflexivity, while connected to the aforementioned human-produced codes, do not reflect the progression of learning that is manifested in the mock interview text. And this progression is what led to the aha moment. So, while the ChatGPT-generated codes are generally good, they lack the subtle details and the required finesse that humans have (Chametzky, 2022).

While ChatGPT isn't at the required level now, given how fast the technology is developing, there is reason to believe that within a few years, the tool may be at the same level or better than human analysis. At that point, then, one may wonder whether Glaserian grounded theorists could indeed use technology and discover codes which are as valuable as ones derived by hand. Glaser (1998) was certainly not opposed to technology (see page 185), though at that time, there were insurmountable caveats placed on technology. But those caveats are slowly evaporating as ChatGPT gets better.

For the Charmazian design, on the other hand, Charmaz (2014) explained that codes are constructed during the active naming process. There is no mention of computers associated with Charmaz (Stern, 2010) so one presumes that the construction is done manually. This presumption is quite plausible because, since the researcher is to make note of any unspoken elements during the interview (like "non-verbal cues" [Charmaz, 2014, p. 68]), recording interviews would make sense and be deemed acceptable, even necessary so that the researcher may pay full attention to the participant and their ideas.

However, according to Soca-Díaz and Valverde-Berrocosco (2022), "Strauss adds new instruments of analysis, such as the interpretive description of data, axial coding, diagrams, the

matrix, or the use of computer programs" (Section 1). Strauss even commented that the researcher is to tape the interviews (Strauss, 1990) with the resulting transcriptions to be analyzed. Further, technology could potentially aid the researcher during the coding and analysis process. In a later edition of Strauss' 1990 work, Corbin explained how a tool like MAXQDA could be valuable during coding and memo storage.

For Corbin and Strauss (2008), a "computer program [like MaxQDA] is an option, a tool, [that is] meant to facilitate and not distract from the [p. xii] analysis process" (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, xi-xii). In terms of keeping track of codes or memo storage, computers are ideal (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The human component is still needed, to think and reflect on the data, though (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Yet, with ChatGPT though, it might be possible, in the very near future, to provide some questions along with codes to get potentially appropriate and meaningful memos. Right now, though, computers cannot reflect, code, and write the required memos (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

But, given the state of technology in the 21st century and where tools like ChatGPT seem to be going, there may be a real concern about the erosion of Glaserian grounded theory (Boychuk Duchscher & Morgan, 2004; Glaser, 2002; Rieger, 2018) and the further development of the other research designs. Slowly the design is changing—for good or bad—and calving much like an iceberg. Whether the elimination of calving is possible or not with Glaserian grounded theory remains to be seen. Additionally, how much change in the other designs because of technology remains to be seen. Attention and focus can now be turned to the concepts of axial coding and co-construction as compared with natural emergence.

Co-construction, Axial Coding, and Natural Emergence

A discussion in this section will focus first on interviews and then on coding. In Glaserian (or Classic) grounded theory, during interviews, researchers are to set aside, to the extent possible, any preconceived ideas about what they might previously know about the data being heard or read (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). During interviews, listening and perhaps only broad inquiries (Glaser, 2001) like “What do you mean by XYZ?” or “Would you explain XYZ further?” may be asked. In this instance, the researcher is passive and takes the data as accurate without modifying it. Glaser (2002) believed that "in-depth interviews where mutuality can grow based on forcing type [sic] interview guides (Charmaz, 2000)" (p. 2) is imprecise. Glaser (2002) believed that "GT interviewing is a very passive listening" (para. 5) experience. The researcher has no right, according to Glaser (2002) to offer another way to view the data given the experience is so individualized and personal. Stated a bit differently, a researcher employing Glaserian grounded theory needs to adhere to Max Weber’s notion of *verstehen*, “whereby the investigator understands a group’s behavior by viewing their action through their eyes” (Glaser, 1996 Gerund, p. 47).

Given how simple emergence of important ideas from interviews can be, one might describe the process as a natural emergence as opposed to the possibly more formulaic emergence common in the Charmazian or Straussian designs. Charmaz believed that emergence is an interactive process (Charmaz, 2007, 2024; Glaser, 2002) where the researcher and participant co-construct (Charmaz, 2024; Charmaz & Belgrave, 2019) the information during an interview as the “"interview is contextual and negotiated" (Charmaz, 2007, p. 27). According to Charmaz (2007), "an interview is contextual and negotiated" (p. 27) where the researcher describes what he or she thinks is taking place in the data (Charmaz, 2014). Having some

predetermined ideas, called “sensitizing concepts” (p. 117), are needed to help a researcher code the data (Charmaz, 2014). A symbiotic relationship exists with the research and the data collection in the Charmazian design.

With the Straussian design, interviews are often structured (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Jones & Alony, 2011) to help the researcher focus on the topic and know where to begin. Additionally, Strauss (1990) believed that researchers need to have an idea and turn it into a hypothesis and assess whether it would or would not work. While Glaser (1998) believed that hypotheses are possible, they do not occur at the beginning of a research study to gain data or topic sensitivity. Thus, a point of convergence between Straussian and Glaserian designs exists. However, for Glaser, such structure and imposition of information constitutes preconception and violates the basic tenet of Glaserian grounded theory. Only through natural emergence, coding, and memoing will a researcher become sensitized to the data. And becoming sensitized to the data takes time and objectivity.

The idea of being sensitized to the data takes a different perspective with the design of Charmaz compared to Glaserian grounded theory where imposing previous ideas on data constitutes preconception (Glaser, 2001, 2014). The idea of interactive emergence (Charmaz, 2024; Glaser, 2002) for Charmaz is fundamental to the design.

There is now some value in viewing researcher interaction (Charmaz, 2007; Glaser, 2002) during the interview process from a different perspective. Researcher interaction is a common and foundational principle in the three designs, and the researchers have attempted to explain that grounded theory is a way to explain emergent data (Charmaz, 2008; Glaser, 1992; Strauss, 1990). However, how the interaction takes place points to a vital distinction that distinguishes Glaserian grounded theory from the other two research designs. The paradigmatic

difference (Mohajan & Mohajan, 2023) in the interviewing process deals with subjectivity versus objectivity.

From a Glaserian perspective, the researcher takes a passive, objectivist role in the interviewing process and does not add any interpretation (Rakhmawati, 2019). The role is that of an outsider—an etic perspective. The researcher accepts what is heard during the interview because the information is true for the participant.

In the designs of Corbin and Strauss, and Charmaz, the role of the researcher is different and contrary to the objective perspective of Glaserian grounded theory. In the designs of Corbin and Strauss and Charmaz, the researcher takes a more active and constructive (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Weiner, 2010) role during the interview process where the researcher interprets and constructs (as well as co-constructs) the information (Rakhmawati, 2019). For these researchers, interpretation and context (Thai et al., 2012) are vital. Charmaz (2014) was clear when she wrote that "Your grounded theory journey relies on *interaction*–emanating from your world-view, standpoints, and situations, arising in the research sites, developing between you and your data, emerging with your ideas . . . (p. 321). This perspective of interaction stems from symbolic interactionism in which "human behavior is a product of meanings constructed through social interaction" (Simmons, 2022, p. xxi) and how the researcher tries to understand the reality of the participants where "subjective meanings are co-constructed and interpreted" (Lindqvist & Forsberg, 2023, para. 2) by the researcher.

The focus can now shift to coding. Each of the researchers believed in close, line-by-line or idea-by-idea reading of the text. Glaser believed that codes are developed from the data without predetermined patterns like axial coding that Corbin and Strauss proposed. While the idea of axial coding—coding around a given axis or point or a "coding paradigm" (Strauss, 1990,

p. 423)—and the concept in Glaserian grounded theory of selective coding are similar, the important distinction is that with Corbin and Strauss (2008) the patters are predetermined whereas with Glaser they are not; the researcher does not know *a priori* what the "properties, dimensions, and such" (Simmons, 2022, p. xxi) of the core variable or category might be. For Charmaz, coding, like interviewing, is interactive requiring a connection between the researcher and the data as well as the participant.

The issue for the researcher, then, is whether pre-determined codes and, more broadly, structured questions (Jones & Alony, 2011) by Strauss or co-construction of ideas by Charmaz—are justifiable with the chosen research design. A clear divergence exists between Glaserian grounded theory on one hand, and the designs by Strauss and Charmaz on the other. The debate comes down to one rather straightforward point. Though one design is no better or worse than another (Glaser, 2011), the basic issue is whether the researcher feels justified in actively interacting with and modify the data (Boychuk Duchscher & Morgan, 2004).

Description and Conceptualization

The final section of this research deals with description and conceptualization—two often diametrically opposed elements. As a way to start this discussion, a brief explanation of the terms will be offered along with a practical example from research that Chametzky did in 2020. In his research, Chametzky (2020) wrote about how doctoral students become candidates and then doctors thereby progressing from consumer to creator of knowledge. One of the ideas is particularly apt in this discussion: the difficulty of doctoral learners (students and candidates) to balance or juggle time between teaching, working full time, having a family, and other responsibilities was challenging. This idea is an excellent description as it explains or depicts a given situation at a given time by a certain person.

Conceptualization is different because it is broader than description. In the aforementioned descriptive idea, if one were to conceptualize it, one might use the code of prioritizing because each task needs to be prioritized in terms of importance to know which task will get done and when it will get done. With such a conceptualized code, the limitation that some doctoral learners might experience is broadened to be applicable to a different population, time, and location (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Glaser, 2009). With this broadened perspective and wider audience, generalizability (Chametzky, 2022) is increased. As Glaser (2001, 2007, 2009) stated, conceptualizations are not connected to a specific location, time, or people. With the code of prioritizing, then, one could see how it connects to doctoral students,but could equally apply to office workers doing multiple tasks at once or doctors in the emergency room conducting a triage on several patients.

With Glaserian grounded theory, descriptions and conceptualizations pose potentially two interrelated issues. First, students find conceptualization difficult. Such a statement may be completely understandable given that "descriptions run the world" (Glaser, 2002, p. 24) and everyone describes all the time (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Everyone likes descriptions with numerous examples—Glaser (1998) referred to this as "incident tripping" (p. 153)—because they think that more details are better and valuable. And in some instances (as with the research designs by Charmaz and Corbin and Strauss), they may be, but not in Glaserian grounded theory. "Conceptualization must come from a series of interchangeable indicators showing a pattern to conceptually name" (Glaser, 2009, p. 48). Thus, it takes time to develop such finesse.

The concept of interchangeable indicators is potentially confusing and bears a brief explanation here. As a researcher is analyzing the data, several codes may point to a particular category. The researcher will need to compare each of those codes one with the other and write

memos on those comparisons. The process of comparing each code with another within a given potential category is what is meant by interchangeability of indicators (Simmons, 2022).

The second reason that conceptualization is perhaps a challenge for some researchers using Glaserian grounded theory is that, in general, for other research designs like case study, phenomenology, ethnography, etc., descriptions are vital to understanding the data. Thus, Glaserian grounded theory "stands out" in its requirements when compared with some other (qualitative) research designs.

At this point, attention can now be turned to Charmaz and see how she handled the concepts of description and conceptualization in her design. Though Charmaz had studied under Glaser and had known Glaserian grounded theory well, she was also quite knowledgeable in the Chicago school of thought from Strauss (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2019; Charmaz, 2005; Konecki, 2021). Charmaz had even commented that theory, like data, are constructed rather than discovered (Konecki, 2021). Thus, with this school of thought, also referred to as symbolic interactionism, descriptions of each person's reality are needed to understand more fully the perspectives of the participants. Thus, for Charmaz, "intensive interviews" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 55) with "rich [and] detailed data" (Charmaz, 1996, p. 33) mandated "thick description (Charmaz, 1996, p. 34). Scholars who follow the constructivist design proposed by Charmaz need and "want to show the complexity of individual worlds, views, actions, and experiences" (Konecki, 2021, p. 104). As Konecki (2021) stated, "Charmaz comes close to ethnographic descriptions" (p. 102). One can understand, then, the level of description required in this design. Anything other than such detail would be inadequate and unacceptable.

With respect to coding, after open coding, Charmaz (1996) proposed "focused coding" (p. 40) where there is more conceptualization. Yet, even as codes are "raised to a category [there

is some description as to] its consequences" (Charmaz, 1996, p. 41). Even here, Charmaz has not fully escaped the need to describe, which offers some additional validation to Glaser's (2002) comment that "descriptions run the world" (p. 24).

Given his educational background, Strauss, and later Corbin and Strauss developed the research design through the lens of symbolic interactionism (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Mohajan & Mohajan, 2022). As with Charmaz, Corbin and Strauss believed that "moving from the descriptive story (or sentences) to the theoretical explanation" (Cullen & Brennan, 2021, Section 2.2) was valuable. Only through descriptions can a researcher, according to Charmaz, develop a comprehensive and rich picture of the data.

For Corbin and Strauss, intense and highly detailed explanations and descriptions of data (Charmaz & Thornberg, 2021) were required to understand the perspectives of the participants and to understand the resultant data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Through a highly myopic perspective during the open coding process, Strauss (1990) believed the researcher could give the reader the impression "that probably nothing of great importance has been left out of the theory" (p. 31). Such a perspective may be valuable, too, in the development of the theory and for "verification and qualification of the theory" (Strauss, 1990, p. 31). As the researcher develops the theory, the "conclusions drawn in the course of the research can vary greatly by level of abstraction" (Strauss, 1990, p. 4). Therefore, description and some conceptualization (Cullen & Brennan, 2021) work together in the research design.

Some Methodological Convergences

Though the 3 designs by Glaser, Charmaz, and Strauss (later Corbin and Strauss) come from different ontological perspectives (Mohajan & Mohajan, 2022), they share similar roots and

have several elements in common. With rather detailed discussions in the aforementioned sections, there is now value to discuss briefly two commonalities that all the designs share.

The first element is coding. Regardless of how it is done, coding is one of the intermediate steps between the raw data and a well-developed theory. Delving a bit deeper, one sees coding falling broadly into two or three levels or types depending on the research design in question. Broadly and conceptually speaking, the levels can be seen as primary, secondary, and, if present, tertiary where in each of the steps, the focus becomes increasingly narrower. Each of the types or levels of codes is shown in Figure 1. For Charmaz, only two levels of coding are generally required: initial and focused coding (Charmaz, 2014).

Figure 1

Coding in the Three Research Designs

Name	First level/type	Second level/type	Third level/type
Glaser	Open	Selective	(Theoretical if used)
Corbin and Strauss	Open	Axial	Selective
Charmaz	Initial or Open	Focused	--

The second element is memoing. Regardless of how coding is done, the researcher needs to find a way to get from those isolated words or ideas to a fully-developed theory; memos address that absolute need in the process of developing, understanding, and presenting the newly-discovered theory (Strauss, 1990). Glaser, Corbin and Strauss, and Charmaz did not state a required length to the memos as that is highly specific to the individual researcher. Additionally, there is no one right way to write a memo (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser, 2014). What is common among the researchers, though, is that memos must be created to get from the raw data to the theory.

The final convergent element concerns the simultaneous process of collecting and analyzing data (Charmaz, 1996, 2024). Regardless of whether a researcher is following Glaserian

grounded theory or the research designs by Charmaz or Corbin and Strauss, there is a cyclical interplay between data collection and analysis. As Stough and Lee (2021) explained, all 3 designs share the processes of data gathering, analyzing, conceptualizing (Stough & Lee, 2021)

Conclusion

Given the great interest in grounded theory (Glaser, 2011), one can see how it is the buzz-word in [some] academic circles" (Glaser, 2009, p. 1). One downside to this buzz, though, is that the terminology "continually regenerates the GT vocabulary wrongly" (Glaser, 2009, p. 1). Indeed, as Corley (2015) stated, with the extant variations, "it is no longer possible to tell precisely what researchers have done methodologically when they say they used 'grounded theory methods'" (p. 601). Corbin and Strauss (2008) commented that "throughout the years, what was initially grounded theory has evolved into many different approaches to building theory grounded in data" (p. viii). The result is that "a researcher ends up—as a number of them—claiming to have used a grounded theory approach, when indeed they have used only some of its procedures or have used them incorrectly" (Strauss, 1990, p. 419).

One is reminded that a "multi-version view of GT, based on jargonizing, is unstoppable" (Glaser, 2022, p. 2). The reason for this inability to stop is easy to see: grounded theory has great grab (Glaser, 2010, 2022). "People are latching onto it and feeling confident about producing something; they are feeling creative, original, and meaningfully relevant" (Glaser, 2022, p. 5). Such a statement may explain the *je-ne-sais-quoi* comment that was made earlier in this research. Yet, through this modification with other research designs and practices, the pure, orthodox form of grounded theory gets "totally contaminated" (Glaser, 2022, p. 3).

As a final comment, the 3 designs (by Glaser, Charmaz, and Corbin and Strauss) are, in their own ways, complicated for novice researchers; if a researcher attempts to use any of these

designs without the experiential knowledge may result is procedural disorder (Glaser, 2005) because if the researcher might inadvertently pick and choose from different designs thereby causing further erosion of the designs since not all the precepts had carefully been followed. It is recommended, therefore, that the researcher carefully stick to one design based on the needs of the research and use whatever design best fits the study as one design is as acceptable as another (Glaser, 2010, 2011). Additionally, so as not to experience the unfortunate methodological confusion that Corley (2015) discussed where the term "grounded theory" can refer to a mixture of different designs, the researcher advises readers to use the term "grounded theory" to refer solely to Glaserian grounded theory.

References

Boychuk Duchscher, J., & Morgan. (2004). Grounded theory: Reflections on the emergence vs. forcing debate. *Journal of Advanced Nursing 48*(6), 605-612.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

Charmaz, K. & Belgrave, L. L. (2019). Thinking about data with grounded theory. *Qualitative Inquiry, 25*(8), 743-753. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418809455

Charmaz, K., & Thornberg, R. (2021). The pursuit of quality in grounded theory. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 305-327. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1780357

Charmaz, K. (1996). The search for meanings—grounded theory. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré, & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-49). Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook for qualitative research* 2nd ed., Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2003). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. Holstein and J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 311-330). Sage. http://books.google.com/books?id=erLspquhd5MC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century: A qualitative method for advancing social justice research. Prepared for publication in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* 3rd ed. Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2007). *Constructing grounded theory*. SAGE.

Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory as an emergent method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber and P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 155-172), The Guilford Press. http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=vbyxBkkjFeYC&oi=fnd&pg=PA155&dq=charmaz+%22Constructivist+grounded+theory%22&ots=cM-rTHxi8j&sig=9wBNN8ODEGn8IRQvEPlv6ermyag#v=onepage&q=charmaz%20%22Constructivist%20grounded%20theory%22&f=false

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. 2nd ed. Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2024). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (pp. 81-110). Sage.

Chametzky, B. (2017). Offsetting the affective filter. *Grounded Theory Review, 16*(1). http://groundedtheoryreview.com

Chametzky, B. (2020). Becoming an expert: A classic grounded theory study of doctoral learners. *Grounded Theory Review, 19*(2), 20-35. https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/issue/view/38/35

Chametzky, B. (2022). Coding in classic grounded theory: I've done an interview; Now what? *The Grounded Theory Journal, 21*(2), 22-32. Reprinted from *Sociology Mind, 6*(4), 163-172.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons and evaluative criteria. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 19*(6), 418-427.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research*. 3rd edition. Sage.

Corley, K. (2015). A commentary on "what grounded theory is . . .": Engaging a phenomenon from the perspective of those living it. *Organizational Research Methods, 18*(4), 600-605. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115574747

Cullen, M. M. & Brennan, N. M. (2021). Grounded theory: Description, divergences and application. *Accounting, Finance & Governance Review, 27*. https://doi.org/10.52399/001c.22173

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems, 13*(4), 46-445. http://www.jstor.org/stable/798843

Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1996). *Gerund grounded theory: The basic social process dissertation.* Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2001). *The grounded theory perspective: Conceptualization contrasted with description*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2002). Constructivist grounded theory? *Forum Qualitative Social Research, 3*(3), Article 12.

Glaser, B. (2005). *The grounded theory perspective III: Theoretical coding*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2007). Doing formal grounded theory: A proposal. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2009). *Jargonizing: Using the grounded theory vocabulary*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2010). The future of grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review, 9*(2), 1-15. https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/issue/view/19/15

Glaser, B. (2011). *Getting out of the data: Grounded theory conceptualization*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2012). *Stop, write: Writing grounded theory.* Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2014). *Memoing: A vital grounded theory procedure*. Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2017). *Grounded descriptions: A no no.* Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2022). The future of grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review, 21*(1), 1-10.

Jones, M. & Alony, I. (2011). Guiding the use of grounded theory in doctoral studies—An example from the Australian film industry. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 6*, 95-114.

Konecki, K T. (2021). Anselm L. Strauss and Kathy Charmaz grounded theory. In I. Psaroudakis, T. Müller & A. Salvini (Eds.), *Dealing with grounded theory. discussing, learning, and practice* (pp. 95-106). Pisa University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Krzysztof-Konecki/publication/353608553_ANSELM_L_STRAUSS_AND_KATHY_CHARMAZ

_GROUNDED_THEORY/links/610583f1169a1a0103cc7f65/ANSELM-L-STRAUSS-AND-KATHY-CHARMAZ-GROUNDED-THEORY.pdf

Lindqvist, H. & Forsberg, C. (2023). Constructivist grounded theory and educational research: Constructing theories about teachers' work when analysing relationships between codes. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 46*(2).

Mohajan, D., & Mohajan, H. (2022). Straussian grounded theory: An evolved variant in qualitative research. *Studies in Social Science & Humanities, 2*(2), 33-40. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/116194/1/MPRA_paper_116194.pdf

Mohajan, D., & Mohajan, H. K. (2023). Glaserian grounded theory and Straussian grounded theory: Two standard qualitative research approaches in social sciences. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People, 12*(2), 72-81. https://doi.org/10.26458/jedep.v12i1.794

OpenAI. (2024). ChatGPT (March 14, 2023) [Large language model] https://chatgpt.com/

Rakhmawati, W. (2019). Understanding classic, Straussian, and constructivist grounded theory approaches. *Belitung Nursing Journal, 5*(3), 111-115. https://doi.org/10.33546/bnj.754

Rieger, K. L. (2018). Discriminating among grounded theory approaches. *Nursing Inquiry, 26*(1). https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/nin.12261

Salvini, A. (2019). The methodological convergences between symbolic interactionism and constructivist grounded theory. *Przeglad Socjologii Jakosciowej, 15*(3). 10-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/1733-8069.15.3.02

Simmons, O. (2022). *Experiencing grounded theory: A comprehensive guide to learning, doing, mentoring, teaching, and applying grounded theory*. BrownWalker Press.

Sosa-Díaz, M-J., & Valverde-Berrocoso, J. V. (2022). Grounded theory as a research methodology in educational technology. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221133228

Stern, P. N. (2010). On solid ground: Essential properties for growing grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 114-126). Sage.

Stough, L. M., & Lee, S. (2021). Grounded theory approaches used in educational research journals. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211052203

Strauss, A. (1990). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Thai, M. T. T., Chong, L. C., & Agrawal, N. M. (2012). Straussian grounded-theory method: An illustration. *The Qualitative Report, 17*(Article 52), 1-55. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ981466.pdf

Wiener, C. (2010). Making teams work in conducting grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 293-310). SAGE.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

Funding: The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.