



**From the Editor's Desk:
Be Patient; Trust the Process**

Barry Chametzky, PhD

I was talking with a doctoral candidate the other day. I'll call this person John. During our talk, I was reminded how close my advice to John was to what we do, as classic grounded theorists, when we are memoing. Allow me to explain.

John is working on his dissertation and was having some challenges writing one of the early chapters. I would offer suggestions, and he'd respond with a new draft within hours. While this sounds like an ideal situation, it was not because, while the changes were present, the needed finesse and flow were not.

My advice to John, since he was trying to hurry up and write the chapter, was to be kind to himself and not be in such a hurry. The chapter will get done in due course, but the finesse takes time and diligent thought. My suggestion to him was to do something else to get his mind off writing his dissertation.

Writing a dissertation or a thesis takes great time and finesse for whatever changes are needed must be carefully added into the manuscript to ensure good readability and flow. Such requirements cannot happen immediately. Glaser offered the same advice: don't force anything; it will happen—whatever "it" may be—in due course. We need to trust the process. I'm sure that he does not believe me. Just like when I was working on my dissertation and had pages and pages of memos with no end in sight, and could not yet determine the core category. The younger me would not have believed me either. Yet the advice is valuable. If I could go back in time, I'd

give myself the same advice: just be patient, and it will all come. Sometimes information takes time to develop, like preconscious connections in memos.

So, dear readers, I offer the same advice to you whether you are working on an especially challenging piece of research or trying to accomplish a task quickly: be patient; do something else, and what you want (and perhaps need) to have happen will arrive. As Glaser has often said, trust the process because it works. Very often, we human beings forget to trust.

We, at the *Grounded Theory Review*, are pleased to offer a number of fine articles in this edition. The first article is by Octaviana Rhombe, Hong Ching Goh, and Zuraini Binti Md Ali called “A Grounded Theory of Safeguarding Culture by Reminiscing.” In this study, Rhombe et al. discussed the concept of culturescape on safeguarding culture. In looking at the indigenous Torajan coffee shop culture in Indonesia, Rhombe et al. presented a perspective that has not yet been explored.

The second article is by Barry Chametzky entitled “When is Grounded Theory (GT) not Grounded Theory: Methodological Convergences and Divergences.” In 2022, Glaser explained that grounded theory terminology has grab and that everyone wants to use grounded theory terminology. While this exposure may seem good, there are concerns with such action. In his article, Chametzky discussed methodological similarities and differences when one talks about “grounded theory.” He looked at classic grounded theory along with the research designs proposed by Kathy Charmaz, Strauss, and Corbin and offered similarities and differences between the three designs.

The third article in this edition is by Kara L. Vander Linden and Odis Simmons entitled “A Front-row Seat to the Development of Grounded Theory,” in which Vander Linden interviewed Dr. Odis Simmons, one of the few remaining people “in the world who learned

grounded theory directly from Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss” (para. 3). Simmons has offered readers valuable insights into what learning classic grounded theory from the developers was like.

In reading the fourth article, entitled “Is the Theory of Moral Reckoning in Nursing Ready for Modification?” I am reminded how a classic grounded theory is not eternally static because each time we, as human beings, read it, we gain new insights. Additionally, as we develop and reflect on new things in our lives and read different works, we are able to make connections and develop new insights into the theory that previously were not possible. In this article, Alvita Nathaniel reflected on a theory she presented years earlier: moral reckoning in nursing. In this article, Nathaniel presented “a glimpse at the original theory and some of the popular, empirical, and theoretical literature focusing on healthcare professionals’ experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic” (para. 1).

In our next and fifth article, Ile Doyer and Michael K. Ayomoh wrote about “Staying True to the Data: A Visual and Quantitative Approach to Showcase Coding Rigour and Theoretical Saturation.” In this article, Doyer and Ayormoh used classic grounded theory in a visual and quantitative manner to demonstrate and monitor theoretical saturation. The authors presented a “novel approach” (Abstract) to demonstrate an important level of rigor in using the given research design.

For our sixth article, Annika Barzen wrote a paper entitled “Revisiting Grounded Therapy.” Discussing the idea of a modified application of Grounded Theory as a tool for self-reflection in therapeutic processes. In this paper, Barzen explained how a researcher can “decipher emotional conflicts or behavioral patterns” (Abstract) during therapy. And this more

nuanced perspective can help clients as well as therapists understand and address psychological conflicts, which could lead to healing.

For our next and seventh article, Silvana Ilievska has offered a book review of Helen Scott's new book entitled *Using Grounded Theory: How to Develop Theory for Managed Change*. In the review, Ilievska offered a comprehensive analysis and overview of Scott's book. Ilievska explained that the book is a "valuable, fun, colourful, easy-to-follow and engaging" (Abstract) way to learn about grounded theory and is a practical way to learn the design.

Our next article, a reprint from one of the grounded theory readers, is by Odis Simmons entitled "Grounded Therapy." In this article, Simmons discussed a "methodology by which to achieve therapy" (para. 5). Simmons wrote about how such a methodology, based on the grounded theory research design, can assist in the therapeutic process and the therapist-patient relationship.

Michael Thomas offered our next submission—a second review of Helen Scott's book. Thomas explained how Scott's book is a highly practical piece of scholarship that aligns extremely well with doctoral learners who want to use classic grounded theory as their dissertation research design. Thomas explained that Scott's tone is "in a friendly, practical, and accessible voice" (para. 1) and such a tone is valuable not only to graduate students but also to "practitioner-scholars, and organizational researchers interested in developing substantive theory that can inform and support systemic change" (para. 1).

Our 10th submission is another review of Helen Scott's new *Using Grounded Theory* book. In this submission, John Fullerton commented that the book serves "as an accessible and supportive resource" (Abstract) for novice researchers interested in classic grounded theory.

In our final article, Astrid Gynnild presented “Memoing for Conceptual Emergence: A Key Process in Developing Grounded Theory” in which she wrote about how memos form a foundational element “for theory building” (Abstract) and for reflection which is needed and “crucial to a researcher’s personal growth” (Abstract).

References

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

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The author(s) 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.

© Barry Chametzky, 2025