



What Can Reading a 50-Year-Old Grounded Theory Teach Us About Grounded Theory? A Companion Article to Weisberg's "The Stages of Friendship Formation"

Kara L. Vander Linden^a

^a Glaser Centre for Grounded Theory, Institute for Research and Theory Methodologies

* Corresponding author: kvanderlinden@mentoringresearchers.org, dr.k.l.vanderlinden@gmail.com

Abstract

This companion article accompanies the reprint of D. Kelley Weisberg's (1993/2026) grounded theory, "The Stages of Friendship Formation," originally written in 1973, and uses it to teach readers about Glaserian classic grounded theory (GCGT). Weisberg's theory explains how people form new friendships after a cross-cultural move has suspended their former ones. Rather than fully summarizing the theory or evaluating Weisberg findings about friendship, the article asks what researchers can learn about developing and writing a GCGT by reading this theory closely. It first explains why reading a theory from outside one's own substantive area builds theoretical sensitivity. It then presents five lessons that the theory illustrates: a classic grounded theory has grounded boundaries and a theoretical code; concepts rise above their indicators; conditions explain variation; concepts carry forward across a theory; and illustrations and literature serve the theory. The article also notes where the structure of Weisberg's paper differs from current publication expectations so that readers do not treat it as a model for organizing a manuscript. It closes with questions that researchers can ask of any completed grounded theory to further develop their theoretical sensitivity.

Keywords: grounded theory, Glaserian classic grounded theory, theoretical sensitivity, theoretical coding, basic social process, teaching grounded theory



Researchers new to Glaserian classic grounded theory (GCGT) often ask what a finished classic grounded theory looks like, especially as they approach writing their first theory. They have often read about concepts, constant comparison, and theoretical codes, but one of the best ways to learn what a grounded theory looks like is to read one and take specific notice of how it is built.

The *Grounded Theory Review* has reprinted D. Kelley Weisberg's (1993/2026) grounded theory, "The Stages of Friendship Formation," which Sociology Press first published in *Examples of Grounded Theory: A Reader* (Glaser, 1993). Weisberg's theory explains how people form new friendships after a cross-cultural move has suspended their former ones. She developed the theory from interviews and field observations with international students in the early 1970s (Weisberg, 1993/2026). The theory is short, yet it contains a full process, the conditions that shape the process, and a clear structure from beginning to end.

This article is a companion to the reprint. The reprint presents the theory, and this article uses Weisberg's theory to teach readers about different aspects of GCGT. It does not summarize Weisberg's theory in full, and it does not evaluate what Weisberg found about friendship. Instead, it asks what a researcher can learn about developing and writing a grounded theory by reading this one closely. I recommend reading the reprint first, then this article, and then the reprint again with the lessons in mind. To make passages easy to find, this article refers to parts of the theory by the headings used in the reprint, such as the Meeting stage or the Forms of

Making Contact section, and page numbers accompany direct quotations.

The article has the following parts. First, I explain why reading a theory from outside your own substantive area helps you develop theoretical sensitivity. Then I briefly summarize Weisberg's theory. Next, five lessons show what the theory demonstrates about GCGT: a theory has grounded boundaries and a theoretical code; concepts rise above their indicators; conditions explain variation; concepts carry forward across a theory; and illustrations and literature serve the theory. After the lessons, I note how the structure of Weisberg's paper differs from current publication expectations so that readers do not treat it as a model for organizing a manuscript. Finally, I offer questions you can ask of any grounded theory, including your own, to continue developing theoretical sensitivity.

Two notes come before we begin. The first concerns language. Weisberg wrote the paper in 1973 and used terms for some groups of people that are no longer preferred. The editor's note with the reprint explains how the journal handled this. In this article, I use current terms and repeat Weisberg's wording only when the point depends on it. The second concerns structure. As a reprint, Weisberg's paper does not follow the *Grounded Theory Review's* current template and formatting requirements, so it should not be considered an example in these regards (see the section Reading the Reprint with Current GCGT Standards).

Why Read a Theory from Outside Your Own Area

In GCGT, researchers read theory to





build theoretical sensitivity, which is the ability to see data conceptually and to see how concepts relate to one another (Glaser, 1978). What GCGT delays is reading in the substantive area under study. Reading in the area too early can bring preconceived concepts into the analysis and interfere with emergence. After the core category emerges, literature in the substantive area can be treated as data and compared with the emerging theory through constant comparison. After the theory is written, a limited amount of that literature can be referenced in relation to specific concepts (Glaser, 1998). Reading theory from outside the study area avoids the problem, so it is the reading a researcher can do before beginning a study and while a study is under way.

Weisberg's theory works for this purpose for readers in almost any field. Friendship formation among people who relocate across cultures is far from most dissertation topics. The exception is a researcher studying relocation, friendship, or cross-cultural adjustment. That researcher should wait to read the theory until their own theory has emerged and then treat Weisberg's theory as data or as a theory to compare with their own (Nathaniel, 2022).

Reading a finished theory also shows what a grounded theory looks like as a written product. Many novice researchers become confident with coding and memoing to develop concepts but struggle more with sorting and organizing their concepts into a theory and writing it up (Glaser, 1978, 1998). Weisberg's theory gives a concrete example. Classic grounded theories are typically written as a running discussion (Glaser &

Strauss, 1967). The structure of the theory is dictated by the theoretical code, which emerges during sorting and organizes the concepts (Glaser, 1978, 2005). The theoretical code helps the researcher express the relationships among the concepts. Seeing how these choices work in a complete theory gives researchers a model for writing their own.

The Theory in Brief

Weisberg's theory explains how people form new friendships under one stated condition: a cross-cultural move has suspended their former friendships. She called this the *generative condition* and built the theory around what it sets in motion.

According to Weisberg (1993/2026), the move disrupts a *social matrix* that has three elements: intimate relationships with family, intimate relationships with friends, and casual relationships with acquaintances. The greater the distance and the longer the duration of the move, the greater the loss. Family cannot be replaced, but friends can, so people work to *re-people* the friends element of the matrix.

Weisberg's theory of re-peopling is a process theory, meaning its overarching theoretical code is the process family (Glaser, 1978). A process theory is structured around stages or phases. Weisberg (1993/2026) explained that re-peopling happens in three stages. In *meeting*, a person encounters a pool of potential friends. Meeting depends on three conditions: a *predisposition* to meet people; *available resources*, mainly time and energy but also mobility, money, and a place to invite people; and a *setting* that brings people together or gathers a specific group. In





making contact, two people interact for the first time. This stage depends on *opening gambits*, the openers that give people something to say, and on *common denominators*, such as a shared background, language, or status, that help a conversation continue. The relocating student faces several obstacles in this stage, including an unfamiliar language, unfamiliar openers, limited knowledge of the host culture, shyness, and different social customs. In *maintaining contact*, the two people turn contact into friendship. This stage requires the most resources and adds *social psychological resources* such as caring, sharing, trust, concern, and affection. Expected returns, which Weisberg (1993/2026) called the *norm of reciprocity*, affect whether maintenance continues.

The process is cyclical. Relocation suspends friendships and does not end them, so when the person returns home, former friendships are reactivated, and the process often begins again with new people (Weisberg, 1993/2026).

Weisberg did not explicitly state a main concern. Main concerns were often implied in earlier grounded theories (Glaser, 2014). Reading the theory, I would state the main concern this way: relocating people lose their friends and are left with a social matrix empty of that element. The loneliness and aloneness that follow become the problem they face. This statement is my reading and not Weisberg's wording. I return to it in Lesson 4, which discusses how a theory connects its parts, and in the questions at the end of this article.

Lesson 1: Grounded Boundaries and a Theoretical Code

A classic grounded theory has boundaries that are grounded in the data, and it is organized by a theoretical code. Weisberg's theory shows both. Her theory uses a process code, but not every grounded theory is a process. The code a theory uses depends on what emerges during sorting and theoretical coding.

Grounded Boundaries

Weisberg (1993/2026) began by stating the condition under which her theory operates. The theory explains friendship formation when former friendships have been suspended by cross-cultural relocating. This one sentence sets the boundary of the theory, and the rest of the theory is understood within that boundary.

The boundary is a condition and not a population. The data came from international students, yet the concepts reach beyond them. In the conclusion, Weisberg (1993/2026) identified the recently widowed, relocated families, military families, prisoners, and people seeking distant medical treatment as groups to whom the theory may apply, because their social matrices are also disrupted. When boundaries are grounded in data, I call them grounded boundaries (Vander Linden, 2022). Grounded boundaries are concepts grounded in the data that determine where a theory applies. This is how grounded theory was originally developed (Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), and it is how I was taught to bound a theory. A boundary set by a topic area or population, however, is not grounded in the data. It is set before the study begins and is not discovered



through constant comparison. For this reason, I hold that, whenever possible, a classic grounded theory should have grounded boundaries, and Weisberg's *generative condition* is an example. The *disrupted social matrix* is a concept that fits several groups, while the label *foreign student* fits only one. When researchers name the pattern and not the group, the theory is more generalizable.

The Theoretical Code

A theoretical code is the underlying structure of a theory that emerges through sorting and theoretical coding. A theoretical code explains how the categories in a theory relate to one another and integrate around the core category. Glaser described many theoretical codes, organized into coding families, and the code that fits the data determines how the theory is structured and presented (Glaser, 1978, 2005). The families include process, causes, strategies, consequences, dimensions, and types, among others. A theory about how people move through an experience over time may fit a process code, while a theory that sorts patterns into kinds may fit a type code. Researchers do not choose the code in advance. It becomes visible as they sort their memos and see how the concepts fit together.

Weisberg's data fit a basic social process (BSP). A BSP is a process that moves through stages over time with something changing at each stage. Calling a theory a BSP requires named stages and an account of what moves participants from one stage to the next (Simmons, 2022). Weisberg provided both. The stages are meeting, making contact, and maintaining contact, and the relationship changes at each one: from a pool of potential

friends, to a first interaction, to a friendship.

What moves people through the stages is a set of conditions that must be present at each one. Predisposition shows this clearly. When a person is *friendship saturated* and does not desire additional friends, the predisposition to meet people is absent, and the first step "will not occur" (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 3). The same condition returns in making contact, because both people must be willing to interact or the exchange stays a "one-liner" (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 7). Thus, the process stalls wherever a necessary condition is missing. Researchers who find a staged process in their data can ask the same questions: what must be present for movement from one stage to the next, and what happens when it is absent?

As described in The Theory in Brief, Weisberg treated the process as a cycle. Weisberg also separated conditions that lead to different consequences: death terminates a friendship, while relocation suspends it. A BSP can include recurrence when the data show it, and the consequences of a condition belong in the theory alongside the condition.

More Than One Code at Work

Theories often draw on more than one theoretical code. In Weisberg's theory, the BSP organizes the theory, and other codes appear within it. Weisberg (1993/2026) described strategies, such as structuring time to meet people, choosing a dormitory over a private apartment, seeking settings where a shared language is spoken, and staying home to conserve energy. She also described conditions that make a stage more or less likely. A researcher does not need to force a



process onto data that show something else. The term BSP applies only when named stages are grounded in the data, and when the data show a different pattern, the theory is organized by a different code.

Lesson 2: Concepts Rise Above Their Indicators

A concept is an abstract, generalized idea that is given a name to identify a pattern in real-life phenomena (Vander Linden, 2022). In GCGT, a concept is not the same as the behaviors it names. The behaviors are indicators, and the concept is the pattern the indicators share. The Forms of Making Contact section of Weisberg's (1993/2026) theory shows this clearly. The concept is the *opening gambit*. Weisberg first stated what it is and does: a person needs something to talk about in order to make contact, and an opener provides it, which promotes further interaction. Then she showed the forms the concept takes. Greetings and salutations, self-introductions, comments or questions about the other person, remarks about the weather or the time, and comments about a shared activity are all behaviors a researcher could observe, so each one is an indicator.

Theoretical Definitions Come from Indicators

In analysis, the indicators come first. Researchers constantly compare indicators with one another and with the emerging concept until the pattern they share becomes clear (Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). That pattern is latent, meaning it lies beneath the behaviors and does not appear in a single indicator. The researcher names the pattern and provides a theoretical definition that identifies the conceptual pattern, enabling the

reader to recognize it. A theoretical definition is built from the conceptualization of indicators in the data. It does not come from a dictionary, a prior study, or a definition set before data collection.

From Weisberg's five forms of opener, a reader might develop a theoretical definition such as this: an opening gambit is a verbal move that begins an interaction by supplying something to talk about, which promotes further interaction between the two parties. This is my reading of the theory and not Weisberg's wording. It provides an example of how a theoretical definition is conceptualized from indicators in the data.

In the write-up, the order reverses. The theoretical definition is provided when the concept is first discussed, along with properties and dimensions. Illustrations come at the end. Leading with data makes a category sound descriptive, while leading with the discussion of the concept makes it sound conceptual (Glaser, 2001). Weisberg's section partly followed this order. She stated the function of the opener first, which is close to a theoretical definition, and then presented the forms. Her example phrases appeared with the forms and not at the end, and she repeated the function statement after the forms were listed. Researchers can test their own category sections the same way. A section that lists behaviors and stops is still at the indicator level. A section that states a theoretical definition and explains conceptually what the behaviors indicate about what people are doing in the substantive area, and why, is written at the conceptual level.





Names with Imagery

The name of a concept matters because it must fit the data and give the reader something to hold onto (Glaser, 1978). *Opening gambit* does both. A gambit is a deliberate first move that offers something to get things started, and readers recognize the pattern from their own lives. The name does conceptual work on its own and helps readers grasp the concept quickly.

Weisberg's (1993/2026) theory contains other codes (the names given to concepts) worth noticing. *Re-peopling* a social matrix, time *spent abortively*, and *cliente-specific settings* each carry a compact image and a pattern. Some codes came from other authors, such as culture fatigue and sociopetal settings (see How Other Authors' Concepts Enter), and others were Weisberg's own, such as friendship saturation and cliente-specific settings (Weisberg, 1993/2026). A concept's name has fit, so it captures what the indicators share, and it has grab, so readers remember it (Glaser, 1978). During open coding, codes usually stay close to the indicators and become more abstract as constant comparison continues. If a more abstract name of a concept loses fit, the researcher changes it.

Abstraction by Comparison Across Groups

Two concepts in Weisberg's theory show how comparing very different groups raises the level of abstraction. The first is *cliente-specific settings*. Weisberg (1993/2026) compared organizations of people from the same home country, religious settings, centers for people who are deaf or

blind, and bars and other places organized around a shared preference. The groups differed widely. What the settings share is that they attract people who "figuratively talk the same language" (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 7) and share a culture. The concept names that pattern, and it is generalizable beyond the groups Weisberg interviewed.

The second is *energy saturation*. Going to bed, reading, and staying home are behaviors, and as indicators, they point to a shared pattern: people conserve energy by avoiding meeting others. The same concept covers a relocating student recovering from culture fatigue and people whose health limits their energy, such as people with emphysema or multiple sclerosis (Weisberg, 1993/2026). The concept holds across all three groups, which shows that it belongs to the pattern and not to one population.

The practical lesson is this. When indicators come from very different sources, ask what they have in common and name that. The more varied the indicators that fit the name, the more generalizable the concept.

Lesson 3: Conditions Explain Variation

A process theory is useful because it explains why the process looks different for different people. In Weisberg's theory, conditions do this work. Meeting depends on *predisposition*, *available resources*, and *setting*, and each of these varies across people and situations. The Meeting stage is organized around that variation.

Variation Within a Concept

Friendship saturation shows how a concept carries variation. People differ in how many friends, or how many friends of a certain kind, they want. Some are satisfied





with several close friends or one partner, and some reach saturation at no friends at all. The point at which friendship saturation occurs varies from person to person, and when it occurs, the predisposition to meet people is absent.

GCGT distinguishes the properties of a category from its dimensions (Glaser, 1978). Properties are the defining characteristics of a category that allow a reader to recognize it in real life. Dimensions capture how the category varies while remaining the same category. Weisberg did not use these terms, but the distinction is visible in how she treated time. Time is a finite supply that a person can structure and plan, and these characteristics describe what time is as a resource. Time also ranges from abundant to scarce. Employed parents often reach *time saturation*, while the relocating student, who is not employed and spends days between study and class, usually has abundant time. The first set of statements answers “what is this resource?” and the second answers “how does it vary?” Researchers who keep the two apart write clearer category sections and see more quickly what remains to be developed.

Contrast Cases

Weisberg used contrasts to show what a concept does. The friendship-saturated person and the relocating student sit at opposite ends of the same concept. The saturated person has a full social matrix and does not want more friends. The relocating student has lost the matrix, and the loneliness that follows heightens the willingness to meet people. Comparing the two shows that predisposition varies with a person’s conditions.

Another contrast separates two resources. A person in poor health may have abundant time but too little energy to meet anyone. A person who is employed or raising children may have the energy but not the time. Because the two vary independently, Weisberg treated time and energy as two resources and did not combine them. When a researcher is unsure whether two codes name one concept or two, the same check applies: ask whether they vary independently.

Higher-Level Conditions

Weisberg closed the Meeting stage by gathering its conditions into two groups. Predisposition is a *social psychological condition*, and resources and setting are *structural conditions*. This grouping is a move toward integration because it places several lower-level concepts under two broader ones and shows how they relate. Researchers see the same move wherever a theory reaches a higher level of abstraction without losing contact with the concepts beneath it.

Lesson 4: Carry Concepts Forward and Write One Integrated Theory

A reader who moves from the Meeting stage to the Making Contact stage finds a theory that stays consistent. Concepts introduced early return later without being introduced again. This is the carry-forward rule in practice: introduce and illustrate a concept once, then carry it forward conceptually through the rest of the theory (Glaser, 1978, 2014).

How a Concept Builds

Time and energy appear first in the Meeting stage, where each has its own subsection. These concepts reappear in the





Making Contact stage, each in a sentence or two. Time is needed for the first interaction, which explains why contact is difficult on busy streets and in supermarkets. Energy is needed for speaking, which is demanding for people with limited breath and for people conversing in a second language. They return again in the Maintaining Contact stage, where time goes to exchanging information and doing things together, and energy matters most for shared activities. When energy runs short, maintenance “often proceeds only on the level of conversation” (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 12).

Weisberg did not redefine either concept along the way. Each keeps its identity and gains a new application at each stage, and readers learn more about it each time it appears. *Energy saturation*, for example, first limits who meets whom, then limits who speaks comfortably, and finally limits what friends do together. Researchers writing a theory section can follow the same rule. Once a concept is established, build on it and avoid describing it again from the beginning (Glaser, 1978).

Integration as a Quality of the Writing

In GCGT, an integrated theory is one that ties the categories together (Glaser, 1978). Each concept and stage in Weisberg’s theory explained how it related to the surrounding concepts or stages. The Making Contact stage began with “after a meeting has occurred” (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 7), which placed it in the sequence. It returned to predisposition with “once again, we see” (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 7) that predisposition is a necessary condition. It ended by tying its difficulties back to the

generative condition: language difficulty, unfamiliar openers, limited shared knowledge, shyness, and different customs made the stage hard for the relocating student because of the student’s situation.

The reader never has to guess how a concept or section connects to the rest of the theory. Each section states what the stage is, what shapes it, how it connects to the stage before and after, and how it relates to the main concern: the loss of friends and the loneliness that follows. This relational work changes a list of concepts into an integrated theory.

Lesson 5: Illustrations and Literature

Serve the Theory

When writing a grounded theory, the theory is the focus, and not the data, the participants, or the literature. Weisberg’s theory provides examples of how to use data as illustrations and literature to serve the theory.

The Concept First, Then a Brief Illustration

One of the clearest examples of Weisberg (1993/2026) using a data excerpt as an illustration is a student’s remark in the Making Contact stage. The student explained that they came with no topics to discuss with Americans, and that it was hard to talk if you had nothing to discuss. The remark followed the concept it illustrated. Weisberg first explained that a relocating person shares only part of the host culture’s *socially distributed knowledge* and may not have topics for first conversations. Then she gave the student’s words. The order matters. A quotation placed before its concept makes the text read as qualitative description, while a quotation





placed after the concept shows what the concept looks like in a person's life.

The purpose of an illustration is imagery and meaning, not proof. A grounded theory offers conceptual hypotheses and not verified findings (Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), so an illustration clarifies an abstract concept and does not establish it. One well-chosen excerpt is usually enough to give a concept its meaning, and after that the concept carries forward without more illustration. Weisberg largely followed this practice. Her other first-person fragment, a student's puzzled answer to "how do you do?" (Weisberg, 1993/2026, p. 9), was one line that added to the opening gambit concept and was not repeated.

The opening gambit section gave many example phrases for each form of opener, and the theory did not say which came from the data and which were representative. Researchers writing today keep such lists short. The concept name and its stated function usually carry the meaning, and a long run of examples invites incident tripping (Glaser, 1998), which is stringing together interesting examples for their own sake.

How Other Authors' Concepts Enter

Weisberg brought in concepts from several authors: Hall's (1969) *sociopetal settings*, Schutz's (1962) *socially distributed knowledge*, Szanton's (1966) *culture fatigue*, Gouldner's (1960) *norm of reciprocity*, and Simmel's *strain toward totality*, which McCall (1970) elaborated (all as cited in Weisberg, 1993/2026). The pattern was consistent. She used literature as data. She introduced each concept where it earned its

way into her theory and credited the original author for concepts that fit and worked within her theory. Weisberg placed longer discussions in footnotes, although it is also common for such content to appear in the discussion section.

Weisberg also used literature to modify a claim. McCall and Simmons (1966, as cited in Weisberg, 1993/2026) argued that frequent interaction is a necessary condition for a strong relationship. Weisberg's theory explained that friendships may be sustained without frequent contact and may even be suspended and renewed later (Weisberg, 1993/2026). This is what comparison with existing literature does when it goes well: it modifies or extends what is known and does not just repeat it.

One difference in timing is worth noting. In the conclusion, Weisberg (1993/2026) stated that a survey of the literature found little attention to the interactional difficulties of relocating students. Weisberg did not state when the survey took place. GCGT recommends delaying the literature review in the substantive area until the theory has emerged and then comparing the literature as data (Glaser, 1978, 1998). Readers can notice this difference and learn from it without treating the theory as a model for timing.

Reading the Reprint with Current GCGT Standards

Weisberg wrote "The Stages of Friendship Formation" in 1973, and it was later published in a collection of grounded theory examples (Glaser, 1993). It was not written to current publication standards, so it does not contain everything a GCGT article





contains today. Of note, the paper falls short of today's standards for publishing in the *Grounding Theory Review* in several areas. It is not structured and organized according to current expectations. Research articles that present a classic grounding theory typically begin with an introduction, followed by a methodology section that explains how the research was conducted in alignment with GCGT. Next, the theory is presented and is followed by a discussion and conclusion (Grounding Theory Review, 2026). Weisberg's paper lacked many of these sections. Even the discussion of the methodology was limited and missed information that would be expected in an article submitted for publication today. Thus, the structure and organization of the paper should not be used as an example in preparing a manuscript. Despite this, there is much that can be learned from Weisberg's theory.

Using Weisberg's Theory to Build Theoretical Sensitivity

Reading theory from outside your own substantive area builds theoretical sensitivity (Glaser, 1978), and the questions below are one way to read Weisberg's theory for that purpose. They work on Weisberg's theory and on other grounding theories.

A caution comes first. These questions are for reading and evaluating a finished theory or for checking a draft after the theory has emerged. They are not a guide for collecting or coding data. During open coding, the data lead. The theoretical code and the relationships among concepts emerge through constant comparison and memo sorting, and asking for them too early forces the analysis.

1. *Boundaries.* What concept bounds the theory, and what does the theory explain within it?
2. *Main concern.* What do participants appear to be continually working on? Does the theory state the concern at a conceptual level, and does each part of the theory connect back to it?
3. *Theoretical code.* What theoretical code organizes the theory? If it is a basic social process, are the stages named, and what moves participants from one stage to the next?
4. *Concepts and indicators.* For each concept, which behaviors are the indicators, and what theoretical definition do they produce? Does the name have fit and grab?
5. *Properties and dimensions.* Which statements describe what the category is, and which describe how it varies?
6. *Variation.* Under what conditions does each concept appear, strengthen, or fade? Which concepts vary independently of one another?
7. *Carry-forward and integration.* Does a concept return without being introduced again? Does each section state how it relates to the sections around it and to the main concern?
8. *Illustration.* Does each illustration follow its concept, and does it give imagery without





claiming proof?

9. *Literature.* How and when does other authors' work enter? Does it modify or extend the theory, or does it replace the theory's own concepts?

I suggest reading Weisberg's paper twice. The first time, read it as a reader would and note what you learn. The second time, read it for structure and note where each question is answered. This will help you begin to see the structure of theory and how it is written, and it will further develop your theoretical sensitivity.

Conclusion

This article demonstrates how Weisberg's theory can teach us about classic grounded theory through a finished example. The theory shows grounded boundaries and a theoretical code that fits the data, concepts that rise above their indicators, conditions that explain variation, concepts carried forward through every stage, and illustrations and literature that serve the theory. Weisberg (1993/2026) also described the theory as open to further study, and researchers who study relocation, friendship, or another disrupted social matrix can compare it with their own theory once their theory is written. Until then, the theory offers a model of how a theory is built and how it can be read to further develop theoretical sensitivity





References

- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (Ed.). (1993). *Examples of grounded theory: A reader*. 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. (2005). *The grounded theory perspective III: Theoretical coding*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (2014). *Applying grounded theory: A neglected option*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine.
- Grounded Theory Review. (2026). *Author guidelines*.
<https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/about/submissions>
- 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>
- Simmons, O. (2022). *Experiencing grounded theory: A comprehensive guide to learning, doing, mentoring, teaching, and applying grounded theory*. BrownWalker Press.
- Vander Linden, K. L. (2022). What is “theory” in grounded theory? *Grounded Theory Review*, 21(2), 10–15. <https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/414>
- Weisberg, D. K. (2026). The stages of friendship formation. *Grounded Theory Review*, 26, Article 20. <https://groundedtheoryreview.org/index.php/gtr/article/view/527> (Original work published 1993)



Disclosures

Author Contributions: The author is the sole contributor of this document and the content therein.

Conflict of Interest: The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

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

© 2026, Kara L. Vander Linden

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the Grounded Theory Review (GTR), the editor(s) and editorial board, and/or the Institute for Research and Theory Methodologies (RTM) and RTM board. The GTR, editor(s) and editorial board, and RTM and RTM board disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.