



**From the Editor's Desk:**

**Self-Reflection and Classic Grounded Theory**

Barry Chametzky, PhD

By way of an editorial for this edition, I would like to share some personal growth I am doing and experiencing. I am beginning to understand my own needs and wishes; I am beginning to understand why I behave and say things I do. In short, I am beginning a personal awakening. Leaning into the difficult elements causes intense emotions that need to be understood and unraveled. Often, but not exclusively, when I experience an emotion, it stems from something of which I am not yet aware. Leaning into those feelings, reflecting, and engaging in self-questioning—much like a grand tour question from Spradley (1979)—are needed to discover the root cause, whatever it might be.

In many respects, this personal development is not unlike what we researchers do in classic grounded theory. Initially, researchers need, to the extent possible (Simmons, 2011), to enter the research arena with a *tabula rasa*. But every researcher knows that truly experiencing a *tabula rasa* is not possible. Yet, setting aside ideas is mandatory in classic grounded theory. Additionally, as we researchers develop our memos and constantly compare our data (Glaser, 1965), we, too, develop depth in our classic grounded theory research. Only through (often) intense analysis and leaning into our preconscious thoughts can we, too, explore a new world and find important connections. As such, I invite each of you, when you are ready, to experience the wondrous process of classic grounded theory on a more personal and introspective level.

We at the *Grounded Theory Review* are fortunate for this edition because there are a number of fascinating and excellent pieces of research to present; I am truly excited to present these 8 articles to you.

Through studying a number of patients who were hospitalized to understand “their interactions and relationships with interprofessional healthcare teams” (Abstract), Didier, Nathaniel, Scott, and Zumstein-Shaha have uncovered and discovered a theory which explains how these patients “ensure protection of their own personhood in order to receive optimal care” (Abstract).

Chametzky presented a paper on confusion in classic GT earlier this year and referred to a comment that Glaser (1999) had made: an important characteristic of a grounded theorist is to “tolerate some confusion, and [ . . . ] tolerate confusion’s attendant regression” (p. 838). In Chametzky’s paper, he discussed different elements of confusion during the grounded theory process.

Our next paper is a research protocol by White, White, and Vander Linden. In their paper, White et al. wrote about formulating a theory concerning how caregivers of spouses have dealt with the loss of their partners to Parkinson’s disease. Such a theory will be extremely valuable and is also reminiscent of the 1965 seminal work by Glaser and Strauss, *Awareness of Dying*.

While researchers using Glaserian grounded theory aim to develop a substantive theory to explain the main concern of participants, the theory does not necessarily have to end with the publication of that theory. In her article, Vander Linden presented valuable insights regarding how one may move past a substantive theory to the development of mid-range and

formal grounded theories. She also presented some potential obstacles in moving “beyond the substantive grounded theory” (Abstract).

For our next article, we at the *Grounded Theory Review* are pleased, as a way to preview exciting things in the future, to present the forward notes of the electronic version of *Doing Grounded Theory* that Nathaniel and Andrews have written. As Nathaniel and Andrews commented, the reason for the electronic version of Glaser’s 1998 work is to “ensure that primary sources of classic grounded theory become widely available to contemporary students and scholars” (Forward para. 1).

An insightful topic, our next article concerns various common misunderstandings and confusions that researchers may experience in classic grounded theory. Andrews explained several points of confusion researchers have in classic grounded theory. Andrews also devoted a section of his paper to the justification for the version of grounded theory developed by Charmaz. Such analysis opens the door for further intellectual discussions.

Readers of Glaser’s work know that grounded theory is all around us. In our next article, Martin presented a connection between grounded theory and journalism. Specifically, she elucidated the similarities between the “tension between description (storytelling) versus theorizing [and] description and analysis in journalism” (Abstract). Such an article proves insightful and indeed valuable as one sees that grounded theory is all around us.

Glaser spent his entire life talking about classic grounded theory and how the variants proposed by Charmaz and Corbin and Strauss are remodeled versions. Yet, in some areas of the world, those variants are the accepted and common norms. In his article on *Pressing the reset button: Celebrating the unlearning of grounded theory in the People’s Republic of China*, Fei explained how, in the People’s Republic of China, the accepted version of

grounded theory is by Strauss and Corbin. This accepted practice, because of incredible and persistent work by many people, is beginning to shift to Glaserian grounded theory. Such a shift, as Fei explained, is substantial. The information that Fei presented in this article sheds great light on some of the changes taking place.

As another year is drawing to a close, I know that 2024 has been, well, rather interesting, to be sure. But I do want to end this editorial on a grateful note; thank you so much to all the editorial staff, reviewers, and certainly readers of the *Grounded Theory Review*. Without everyone, we would not be where we are. On behalf of everyone here at the *Grounded Theory Review*, I would like to wish you and your families a very happy, safe, and joyous holiday season. Here's to the coming year filled with health, prosperity, joy, and everything you want.

### References

- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1965). *Awareness of dying*. Aldine Transaction.
- Glaser, B. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12(4), 436–445. <http://ucpressjournals.com/journal.php?j=sp>
- Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. (1999). The future of grounded theory. *Qualitative health research*, 9(6), 836–845. [http://www.rincondepaco.com.mx/rincon/Inicio/Seminario/Documentos/Met\\_otros/Docs\\_Dra\\_Fleiz/Lecturas\\_sugeridas/Glaser\\_future\\_grounding\\_theory.pdf](http://www.rincondepaco.com.mx/rincon/Inicio/Seminario/Documentos/Met_otros/Docs_Dra_Fleiz/Lecturas_sugeridas/Glaser_future_grounding_theory.pdf)
- Simmons, O. (2011). Why classic grounded theory. In V. Martin & A. Gynnild (Eds.), *Grounded theory: The philosophy, method, and work of Barney Glaser*. (pp. 15–30). BrownWalker [sic] Press.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

**Disclosures:**

**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:** Disclose funding source(s) or include the following statement: "The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article."

© Chametzky 2024