



A Methodology-Specific Rubric for Glaserian Classic Grounded Theory: Supporting Fidelity, Rigor, and Constructive Peer Review

Kara L. Vander Linden, EdD

Glaser Center for Grounded Theory, Institute for Research and Theory Methodologies, Poway,
California, USA

Abstract

Many academic journals are adopting standardized reporting guidelines for qualitative research to assess the quality and rigor of the qualitative research being peer-reviewed. Applying generic reporting criteria to Glaserian classic grounded theory studies often leads to misunderstandings or pressures to conform to practices that violate the methodology, contributing to its remodeling. Existing rubrics should include methodological sections that are specific to the research methods and methodologies being used in the research. This article presents and explains such a rubric for Glaserian classic grounded theory. The rubric contains 25 items categorized into 7 categories: (1) methodological clarity, (2) role of the researcher, (3) literature review, (4) problem, purpose, and research question, (5) data collection & theoretical sampling, (6) data analysis, and (7) theory write-up.

Keywords: Glaserian classic grounded theory, peer review, rubric, standardized reporting guidelines, remodeling, quality, rigor

Discussions on quality and rigor are still prevalent in relation to qualitative research. Many academic journals are adopting standardized reporting guidelines for qualitative research, such as the *Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research* (SRQR) and the *Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research* (COREQ), to assess the quality and rigor of the qualitative

research being peer-reviewed. The SRQR is a 21-item checklist that offers general guidance for a broad range of qualitative methodologies (O'Brien et al., 2014). The COREQ provides 32 criteria specifically for studies involving interviews and focus groups (Tong et al., 2007). These tools are shaping expectations for how qualitative research is reported, reviewed, and evaluated across disciplines, but they do not account for the unique methodological differences across various research methodologies. This can especially be seen in relation to Glaserian classic grounded theory¹ (GCGT).

Since GCGT is commonly classified as qualitative research, these criteria are often applied to GCGT articles despite not aligning with the methodological guidelines for GCGT. Because of the unique logic, purpose, and procedures of GCGT, applying standardized reporting tools like SRQR and COREQ to these studies can distort their methodological integrity and lead to confusion among reviewers, editors, and novice researchers. We recommend that existing rubrics include methodological sections that are specific to the research methods and methodologies being used in the research. This article presents and explains such a rubric for Glaserian classic grounded theory.

Limitations of SRQR and COREQ for Glaserian Classic Grounded Theory

While the SRQR and COREQ may work for some flexible or descriptive qualitative designs, they do not account for the variation found within specific research methodologies. This becomes problematic when they are applied indiscriminately without consideration for the

¹ Glaser and Strauss (1967) originally named their methodology grounded theory. However, the use of that name became problematic as they diverged in their application and articulation of grounded theory. To help prevent further confusion, in the early 2000s, Glaser began to refer to the original articulation of grounded theory and his subsequent work as classic grounded theory (Simmons, personal communication). However, previous to this and since, a number of different names have been used by researchers to clarify which approach to grounded theory they were using, including Glaserian grounded theory, classical grounded theory, traditional grounded theory, original grounded theory, etc. Following his death, some researchers using his methodology have added “Glaserian” to classic grounded theory to help preserve his legacy. The use of any of these terms can indicate a methodological orientation with GCGT.

guidelines and core principles of specific methodologies. This can be clearly seen when applying these reporting criteria to GCGT studies. GCGT has a unique methodological design that enables researchers to systematically generate theory from data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978, 1998). Applying generic reporting criteria to GCGT studies often leads to misunderstandings or pressures to conform to practices that violate the methodology's purpose, procedures, and core principles, which can contribute to the remodeling of the methodology (Glaser & Holton, 2004; Vander Linden & Palmieri, 2021).

This article is not designed to be an in-depth critique of each element in the SRQR and COREQ, but a couple of examples may help shed light on the limitations of using them to evaluate GCGT studies. For example, both guidelines assume that a literature review precedes data collection to frame the study (O'Brien et al., 2014; Tong et al., 2007). However, one of the methodological procedures in GCGT is to delay the literature review until after the theory emerges inductively from the data to avoid imposing preconceptions on the data (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Holton & Walsh, 2017; Nathaniel, 2022; Simmons, 2022). Another example is that the SRQR and COREQ often lead researchers to report themes derived from data. The result of a GCGT study is not to identify themes but to generate an explanatory theory composed of conceptual categories grounded in data (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Holton & Walsh, 2017; Simmons, 2022). Reporting themes misrepresents the outcome of a grounded theory study, which is a theory that has been systematically developed from data. However, many grounded theory articles misreport themes instead of theory, trying to align with the SRQR and COREQ reporting criteria. These and other discrepancies highlight the need for a methodology-specific rubric that evaluates GCGT research based on its own unique methodological purpose, procedures, and core principles. This will help preserve the integrity of

the methodology, support accurate peer reviews, and guide researchers in transparent reporting that aligns with GCGT.

Foundations for a Glaserian Classic Grounded Theory Rubric

From the first articulation of grounded theory in the seminal book, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Glaser and Strauss (1967) articulated a set of unique criteria by which a grounded theory should be evaluated. These criteria predate the criteria developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that are commonly used to evaluate qualitative research and are embedded in the assumptions of the SRQR and COREQ. The original criteria proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) were designed to ensure the theoretical usefulness and conceptual strength of the resulting grounded theory. The original four criteria were:

- **Fit:** The theory must closely correspond to the data and substantive area from which it emerged. Categories should capture the patterns and variations present in the data.
- **Understandable:** The theory must make sense to the people within the substantive area and to people who work with them.
- **General:** The theory and concepts within it should be general enough to be applied in multiple situations and contexts.
- **Control:** The theory must enable a person to use it to understand the situation, identify the areas where change is possible, and take action.

Glaser (1978, 1992) added to these criteria as he continued to develop and articulate the methodology throughout his lifetime. These criteria include:

- **Relevance:** The theory must address real concerns or problems experienced by people within the substantive area. A relevant theory resonates with those for whom the theory was developed and offers insight into their experiences.

- **Work:** The theory must explain how a main concern of the people within the substantive area are continuously resolved or processed. It should explain how the patterns of behavior of people within the topic area are used to address the main concern.
- **Modifiability:** The theory must remain open to change based on new data. Because GCGT is grounded in emergence, it encourages theoretical development over time as new data provides new theoretical insights.
- **Parsimony:** The theory should be as simple as possible without being simplistic. It should explain the most variation with the fewest number of concepts needed.
- **Scope:** The theory should explain a wide range of variation within the phenomenon.

In addition to these criteria, GCGT is characterized by several core methodological principles (Holton & Walsh, 2017; Simmons, 2022) that shaped the development of the rubric presented in this article. These include:

- **Emergence:** Rather than testing hypotheses or applying preexisting frameworks, researchers using GCGT discover concepts, categories, patterns, and theoretical insights from the data.
- **Conceptual Abstraction:** The goal is not to describe experiences thematically, but to develop abstract conceptual concepts and categories that explain how people within the substantive area resolve or process a main concern.
- **Theory Generation:** The endpoint of GCGT is a theory that is grounded in data but abstracted beyond it to produce a theoretical rendering, not a list of topics or themes.

The criteria and principles presented in this section directly informed the structure and content of the rubric. Each category and item in the rubric reflect one or more of these original criteria or principles. For example, items related to theoretical sampling and memo writing

support fit and emergence. Items on theoretical coding and core category identification support conceptual abstraction and theory generation.

The rubric was developed through engagement with primary GCGT texts (e.g., Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998, 2001), as well as insights drawn from mentoring, reviewing, and teaching researchers conducting GCGT studies across disciplines for over 20 years. It is designed as a practical tool that retains fidelity to the methodological underpinnings of GCGT while supporting transparency, consistency, and thoughtful assessment in academic settings and the peer review process.

The Rubric: Categories and Criteria Explained

The rubric contains 25 items categorized into 7 categories: (1) methodological clarity, (2) role of the researcher, (3) literature review, (4) problem, purpose, and research question, (5) data collection & theoretical sampling, (6) data analysis, and (7) theory write-up. Each category is explained to provide a context for the individual items, which are presented as questions for consideration when reading a manuscript.

Methodological Clarity

Methodological clarity is foundational in GCGT. Given the proliferation of grounded theory variants (e.g., constructivist, Straussian) and the common practice of mixing methodologies, GCGT studies must clearly and explicitly identify their methodological orientation. Ambiguity or blending across grounded theory approaches undermines theoretical coherence and confuses reviewers, readers, and novice grounded theory researchers.

This category assesses whether the researcher demonstrates a clear commitment to GCGT in both name and practice by evaluating the following questions:

1. Did the researcher explicitly identify the approach to grounded theory used (eg, classic/Glaserian)? Is there clear fidelity to GCGT principles and processes without methodological mixing (e.g., mixing various approaches to GT or with other methods/methodologies)?

Role of the Researcher

In GCGT, the researcher is expected to take a disciplined, neutral stance to allow the emergence of theoretical concepts from the data (Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This is facilitated through limiting preconceptions, staying open to the data, and developing theoretical sensitivity (Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Entering the field with as few preconceived ideas and biases as possible preserves the openness required for emergence. Emergence is also dependent on the theoretical sensitivity of the researcher. Theoretical sensitivity involves a researcher's sensitivity to the data to be able to detect significant patterns, relationships, and variations in the data that point toward a higher-level conceptualization (Glaser, 1968; Glaser & Holton, 2004). By limiting preconceptions, staying open, and cultivating theoretical sensitivity, the researcher fulfills their role as a neutral, rigorous observer who allows a substantive theory to emerge through the analysis of the data.

This category assesses whether the researcher's stance is consistent with GCGT principles through consideration of the following questions.

2. Did the researcher explain limiting preconceptions (biases, pre-existing ideas, or other similar terms) and staying open to the data?
3. Did the researcher discuss developing theoretical sensitivity?

Literature Review

In GCGT, the timing and use of literature are deliberately managed to protect the emergence of concepts directly from the data. A preliminary literature review and the imposition of external frameworks risk introducing preconceived ideas and concepts that can distort theoretical emergence (Glaser, 1998). For this reason, it is advised to either avoid or minimize literature engagement before data analysis. However, Glaser (1998, 2011) recognized that this may be unavoidable due to institutional requirements. He stated that if one is required to review literature, do so, but limit its influence on the design of the study, data collection, and data analysis. Philosophical, theoretical, or conceptual frameworks are similarly avoided to prevent “forcing” the data into pre-existing structures. Literature is typically engaged after the theory has emerged, serving to position, support, and explain the grounded theory within existing knowledge (Nathaniel, 2022).

This category assesses how well the researcher manages literature and frameworks in a manner consistent with GCGT principles.

4. Was a pre-study literature review avoided or minimized, with justification (to preserve emergence/limit preconception)? If a literature review was conducted, does the researcher explain why one was necessary (such as university requirements) and discuss how preconceptions were limited?
5. Did the author avoid using a philosophical, theoretical, or conceptual framework? If one was discussed, did the researchers explain why one was necessary (such as university requirements) and explain how they limited its influence on the study?
6. Was relevant literature reviewed following the emergence of the theory?

Problem, Purpose, and Research Question

In GCGT, a research problem is not predetermined based on literature or a professional problem (Glaser & Holton, 2004). In GCGT, the research problem is called the main concern and emerges inductively from the data rather than being imposed prior to data collection (Connor et al., 2024; Glaser, 1998). This ensures the research remains grounded in participants' experiences and in the patterns of behavior used to address the main concern. The purpose of GCGT is to generate a theory that explains the core category, which is the overarching pattern of behavior being used by people within the substantive areas as they continually resolve or manage the main concern (Glaser, 1967, 1978, 1998). GCGT does not test existing theories or hypotheses, describe the data, or identify themes. While a formal research question is optional in GCGT, if one is stated, it should be broad and open (Simmons, 2022), allowing conceptual categories to emerge naturally through constant comparison and theoretical sampling.

This category assesses whether the problem, purpose, and any research question reflect the aims of GCGT.

7. Did the research problem (main concern) emerge from the data? Did the researcher articulate what the main concern was?
8. Was the purpose/aim of the research to generate a theory, not to test or verify a theory or a hypothesis, and not to identify themes?
9. While a research question is not required, if provided, it should be broad and open.

Was it?

Data Collection & Theoretical Sampling

In GCGT, data collection is guided by openness and responsiveness to emerging concepts rather than by a more rigid, pre-set design. The process begins with participants or other data

sources from the general area of interest, but without prematurely narrowing the field. All forms of data, including qualitative and quantitative, are considered valid under Glaser's "all is data" (Glaser, 2001, p. 145) dictum. However, data should be collected in open-ended ways that allow participants and materials to reveal their perspectives.

Interviews are often a rich source of data used in GCGT. When used, they should start broadly, commonly with the use of a grand tour or spill question designed to invite the participant to share whatever is most important to them about the topic area (Nathaniel, 2008; Simmons, 2010, 2022). Interviewers should avoid overly specific or leading questions or prompts. As analysis progresses, data collection, coding, memoing, and theoretical sampling occur concurrently, with each informing the other. Theoretical sampling ensures that subsequent data collection is strategically directed by emerging concepts and categories, helping the researcher refine concepts, explore variations, and saturate categories (Glaser, 1978, 1998). This iterative, adaptive approach strengthens the resulting theory's fit, relevance, work, and modifiability (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

This category assesses the alignment of data collection and sampling in GCGT.

10. Did the researcher acknowledge that "all is data" and choose appropriate data sources from the general area of interest/initial population and collection methods (open forms)?
11. If interviews were used, did the researcher(s) use a grand tour/spill question (a broadly worded question designed to encourage the participant to speak about the topic area); if an interview guide was used, were the questions broad?
12. Were data collection, coding, memoing, and analysis conducted concurrently, with each piece of data analyzed before collecting further data?

13. Was theoretical sampling used, and clearly explained, as driven by emerging categories, and did data collection adapt in response to these emerging insights?

Data Analysis Process

In GCGT, analysis is an ongoing, iterative process in which concepts are generated, refined, and integrated into a coherent theory through the use of coding, the constant comparative method of analysis (CCMA), and memoing (Glaser, 1965, 1978, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The process begins with open coding, where the researcher examines the data line-by-line to identify fragments of data, called incidents or indicators, that indicate emerging concepts within the data and name them. CCMA is used throughout data analysis to compare data to data, data to concepts, and concepts to concepts to raise the level of conceptualization. As a main concern and core category emerge, the focus shifts to selective coding, refining, and saturating the concepts related to the core category. Memoing is recording analytic ideas as they arise and is integral to capturing the researcher's developing insights that develop through the use of CCMA (Glaser, 1978, 1998). As the researcher begins to reach theoretical saturation, when no additional properties of the concepts are being discovered in the data, data analysis begins weaving the concepts together into a theory through an iterative process of theoretical coding, sorting, and creating a theoretical outline (Glaser, 1998; Simmons, 2022). Theoretical coding helps the researcher discover the underlying structure to use to organize the theory. Theoretical sorting involves sorting concepts and memos, not sorting data (Glaser, 1998). The theoretical outline helps organize memos and categories into a logical structure (Simmons, 2022), forming the foundation of the final grounded theory.

This category assesses the use of the constant comparative method of analysis, along with coding and memoing in the analysis of data.

14. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of substantive coding, which includes open coding, selective coding, and theoretical coding, as part of data analysis?
15. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of constant comparative analysis?
16. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of memoing to capture the emerging theoretical conceptual ideas developing from the use of CCMA?
17. Did the researcher(s) explain theoretical sorting and creating a theoretical outline?
18. Was saturation of theory (theoretical saturation; not data saturation) achieved and explained?

Theory Write-up

Whereas the previous sections focused primarily on the methodology, this section focuses on the product of a Glaserian classic grounded theory study, the theory. While researchers may be able to describe the research design of their study in alignment with the methodology, the results of their research, the grounded theory, demonstrate their ability to conduct the study and develop a conceptual theory grounded in data. The quality of the write-up of the theory demonstrates the researcher's proficiency at using the GCGT methodology.

The write-up of the theory should clearly identify the main concern and core category, showing how the core category represents a pattern of behavior used to process or resolve the main concern (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Simmons, 2022). The write-up must present a conceptual theory, not just a list of concepts or descriptive themes. The theory explains how the concepts in the theory relate to the core category (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Simmons, 2022). Concepts should be grounded in the data, with limited examples. The final theory should demonstrate strong integration, showing relationships among categories through explicit or implicit use of theoretical codes (Glaser, 1978, 1998; Simmons, 2022). Writing should be in the present tense

for the conceptual level, with the past tense reserved for examples and literature integration. The emphasis should remain on the theory itself, using literature and examples sparingly to support concepts. The presentation should be concise yet capable of explaining broad variation without oversimplifying.

The final category examines the results of a GCGT study, the theory, and is the most important category. Even if a researcher is able to clearly articulate the methodology, if a conceptual theory is not developed and articulated that addresses these criteria, the researcher has failed to meet the purpose of GCGT. If these criteria are not met, the researcher may need to spend more time analyzing the data and possibly work with an experienced grounded theorist to receive mentorship to successfully complete the theory.

19. Did the theory identify a main concern? Does the main concern seem to resonate with real-world problems?
20. Did the theory identify a core category (core variable, core concept) and related concepts? Does the core category explain how a pattern of behavior is used to process or address the main concern?
21. Did the researcher present a conceptual theory, not just description or themes, that explains the core category and how other concepts in the theory relate to the core category?
22. Is the theory composed of concepts? Do the concepts appear to fit the data they were derived from and explain what is going on a conceptual level, not what the researcher thinks should be going on, nor describe what the participants said? (Look for representative quotes; however, remember that examples in GCGT should be limited. Look for alignment between concepts and examples.)

23. Is there a strong integration among the concepts and categories? Are theoretical codes used, either explicitly or implicitly, to organize and show the conceptual relationships among the concepts and categories in the theory?
24. Is the theory written in the present tense (conceptual level), with past tense used only for illustrative examples and integration of literature? Is the write-up theory forward, with the main emphasis on the theory and with examples and literature used sparingly to support concepts?
25. Is the theory concise yet concept dense, explaining a wide range of variation without oversimplification? The theory should explain the theory with the fewest concepts that explain the most variation. A theory that is concise, yet conceptually dense, explaining a wide range of variation, is a sign that theoretical saturation was reached.

Using the Rubric in Practice

This rubric is designed as a flexible, methodologically grounded tool to support researchers, peer reviewers, publishers, faculty, and mentors in writing up research that uses Glaserian classic grounded theory. It is not intended to be used as a rigid checklist but rather to provide structured guidance as an instructional tool. It is also a useful tool to help researchers, peer reviewers, publishers, faculty, and mentors see areas where other approaches to grounded theory diverge from the original version of grounded theory.

For researchers, the rubric can serve as a roadmap not only for writing up and self-assessing GCGT manuscripts but also earlier in the process of learning about GCGT, designing the study, and conducting it. By reviewing each section of the rubric, researchers can ensure that their work demonstrates methodological rigor and remains true to GCGT principles.

For reviewers and editors, the rubric offers a shared framework for evaluating GCGT submissions fairly and consistently. It helps assess whether the work reflects the defining features of GCGT while avoiding the imposition of expectations drawn from other qualitative traditions.

For faculty and mentors, the rubric can be integrated into research courses and mentoring programs as a teaching tool. It provides a concrete reference for explaining GCGT concepts, clarifying expectations for methodological execution, and helping novice researchers identify strengths and areas for improvement in their own or others' work.

In all cases, the rubric is best used as a conceptual guide rather than a mechanical scoring system. Its purpose is to foster alignment with GCGT's methodological foundations while allowing for creativity, flexibility, and autonomy that were so important to Barney Glaser as he developed the methodology.

Conclusion: Ensuring Methodological Integrity

Evaluating research requires more than a generic set of standards. It demands criteria that align with the logic, purpose, and procedures of the specific methodology. For Glaserian classic grounded theory, this means assessing work through the lens of its unique logic, purpose, and procedures, rather than forcing it into frameworks designed for other research traditions.

Aligning evaluation criteria with methodological logic safeguards the integrity of the research and ensures that the distinctive contributions of GCGT are recognized and valued.

We encourage journals, reviewers, and editorial boards to consider using methodology-specific rubrics like this one to enhance consistency and methodological fidelity in peer review, reduce the risk of methodological distortion, and help foster a scholarly culture that honors methodological diversity. This rubric is offered as both a practical resource and an invitation. We

welcome its use, testing, and feedback for further revisions in varied scholarly and pedagogical contexts. Through shared application and critical feedback, the rubric can evolve to better serve the grounded theory community and the wider field of research. When we evaluate research methodologies by their own standards, we protect the rigor and richness of diverse research approaches while ensuring that each is judged on its own terms.

References

- Connor, J., Flenady, T., Massey, D., & Dwyer, T. (2024). Classic grounded theory: Identifying the main concern. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 47(3), 277–288.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.22381>
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12(4), 436–445. <https://doi.org/10.2307/798843>
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *The basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs. forcing*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (2001). *The grounded theory perspective: Conceptualization contrasted with description*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (2011). Generating formal theory. In V. B. Martin & A. Gynnild (Eds.), *Grounded theory: The philosophy, method, and works of Barney Glaser* (pp. 257–276). BrownWalker Press.

- Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodeling grounded theory. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-5.2.607>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Sociology Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Sage.
- Holton, J. A., & Walsh, I. (2017). *Classic grounded theory: Applications with qualitative and quantitative data*. SAGE.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Nathaniel, A. K. (2008). Eliciting spill: A methodological note. *Grounded Theory Review*, 7(1), 61–66. <https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/368>
- Nathaniel, A. K. (2022). When and how to use extant literature in classic grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review*, 21(2), 33–48. <https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/417>
- O'Brien, B. C., Harris, I. B., Beckman, T. J., Reed, D. A., & Cook, D. A. (2014). Standards for reporting qualitative research: A synthesis of recommendations. *Academic Medicine*, 89(9), 1245–1251. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388>
- Simmons, O. E. (2010). Is that a real theory or did you just make it up? Teaching classic grounded theory. *Grounded Theory Review*, 9(2), 15–38. <https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/70>
- Simmons, O. E. (2022). *Experiencing grounded theory: A comprehensive guide to learning, doing, mentoring, teaching, and applying grounded theory*. BrownWalker Press.

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

Vander Linden, K. L., & Palmieri, P. A. (2021). Criteria for assessing a classic grounded theory study: A brief methodological review with minimum reporting recommendations.

Grounded Theory Review, 20(2), 107–115.

<https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/434>

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.

© Kara L. Vander Linden, 2025



Appendix: Glaserian Classic Grounded Theory Rubric

Author:	
Title:	
	Reviewer Comments: How did the researcher address or fail to address the rubric items? If the researcher explained that they modified the method due to institutional or ethical requirements, note it in the comments. Also include any other information you believe is relevant. Provide constructive and instructive feedback that can help the researcher become a better grounded theorist.
Criteria	
<i>Methodological Clarity</i>	
1. Did the researcher explicitly identify the approach to grounded theory used (eg., classic/Glaserian)? Is there clear fidelity to GCGT principles and processes without methodological mixing (e.g., mixing various approaches to GT or with other methods/methodologies)?	
<i>Role of the Researcher</i>	
2. Did the researcher explain limiting preconceptions (biases, pre-existing ideas, or other similar terms) and staying open to the data?	
3. Did the researcher discuss developing theoretical sensitivity?	
<i>Literature Review</i>	
4. Was a pre-study literature review avoided or minimized, with justification (to preserve emergence/limit preconception)? If a literature review was conducted, does the researcher explain why one was necessary (such as university requirements) and discuss how preconceptions were limited?	
5. Did the researchers avoid using a philosophical, theoretical, or conceptual framework? If one was discussed, did the researchers explain why one was necessary (such as university requirements) and explain how they limited its influence on the study?	
6. Was relevant literature reviewed following the emergence of the theory?	
<i>Problem, Purpose, and Research Question</i>	
7. Did the research problem (main concern) emerge from the data? Did the researcher articulate what the main concern was?	

8. Was the purpose/aim of the research to generate a theory, not to test or verify a theory or a hypothesis, and not to identify themes?	
9. While a research question is not required, if provided, it should be broad and open. Was it?	
<i>Data Collection & Theoretical Sampling</i>	
10. Did the researcher acknowledge that "all is data" and choose appropriate data sources from the general area of interest/initial population and collection methods (open forms)?	
11. If interviews were used, did the researcher(s) use a grand tour/spill question (a broadly worded question designed to encourage the participant to speak about the topic area); if an interview guide was used, were the questions broad?	
12. Were data collection, coding, memoing, and analysis conducted concurrently, with each piece of data analyzed before collecting further data.	
13. Was theoretical sampling used, and clearly explained, as driven by emerging categories, and did data collection adapt in response to these emerging insights?	
<i>Data Analysis Process</i>	
14. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of substantive coding, which includes open coding, selective coding, and theoretical coding, as part of data analysis?	
15. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of constant comparative analysis?	
16. Did the researcher(s) explain the use of memoing to capture the emerging theoretical conceptual ideas developing from the use of CCMA?	
17. Did the researcher(s) explain theoretical sorting and creating a theoretical outline?	
18. Was saturation of theory (theoretical saturation; not data saturation) achieved and explained?	
<i>Theory Write-up</i>	
19. Did the theory identify a main concern? Does the main concern seem to resonate with real-world problems?	
20. Did the theory identify a core category (core variable, core concept) and related concepts? Does the core category explain how a pattern of behavior is used to process or address the main concern?	
21. Did the researcher present a conceptual theory, not just description or themes, that explains the core category and how other concepts in the theory relate to the core category?	

<p>22. Is the theory composed of concepts? Do the concepts appear to fit the data they were derived from and explain what is going on a conceptual level, not what the researcher thinks should be going on, nor describe what the participants said? (Look for representative quotes; however, remember that examples in GCGT should be limited. Look for alignment between concepts and examples.)</p>	
<p>23. Is there a strong integration among the concepts and categories? Are theoretical codes used, either explicitly or implicitly, to organize and show the conceptual relationships among the concepts and categories in the theory?</p>	
<p>24. Is the theory written in the present tense (conceptual level), with past tense used only for illustrative examples and integration of literature? Is the write-up theory forward, with the main emphasis on the theory and with examples and literature used sparingly to support concepts?</p>	
<p>25. Is the theory concise yet concept dense, explaining a wide range of variation without oversimplification? The theory should explain the theory with the fewest concepts that explain the most variation. A theory that is concise, yet conceptually dense, explaining a wide range of variation, is a sign that theoretical saturation was reached.</p>	