The Grounded Theory Review: An international journal
Special Issue, November 2007

The Grounded Theory Review
Special Issue, November 2007

Editor-in-Chief
Judith Holton, Ph.D.
Mount Allison University
Sackville, NB CANADA
Email: Judith@groundedtheoryreview.com

Peer Review Editors
Tom Andrews, Ph.D.
School of Nursing and Midwifery
University College Cork, IRL
Email: t.andrews@ucc.ie

Helene Ekström, MD, Ph.D.
Kronoberg County Research Centre
Department of Community Medicine
Vaxjo, SE
Email: helene.ekstrom@ltkronoberg.se

The Grounded Theory Review (2007), Special Issue

Walter Fernández, Ph.D.
Co-Director,National Centre for Information Systems Research
School of Accounting and Business Information Systems
ANU College of Business and Economics
The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200
Email: walter.fernandez@anu.edu.au

Barry Gibson, Ph.D.
Lecturer in Medical Sociology
Department of Oral Health and Development
School of Clinical Dentistry
Sheffield, UK
Email: b.j.gibson@sheffield.ac.uk

Astrid Gynnild, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Head of Department
Centre for Relational Development
Bergen, NO
Email: agynnild@gmail.com

Cheri Ann Hernandez, RN, PhD, CDE
Associate Professor
Faculty of Nursing, University of Windsor, CAN
Email: cherih@uwindsor.ca

Tina L Johnston, Ph.D.
Department of Science and Mathematics Education
Oregon State University
tina@deadhat.com

Vivian B. Martin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of English (Journalism Program)
Central Connecticut State University
New Britain, CT
Email: martinv@ccsu.edu

The Grounded Theory Review (2007), Special Issue

Antoinette M. McCallin, Ph.D., RN
Head of Research
Division of Health Care Practice
Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences
AUT University
Auckland, New Zealand
Email: amccalli@aut.ac.nz

Alvita Nathaniel, Ph.D., APRN, BC
Director, Nurse Practitioner Track
School of Nursing
West Virginia University
Charleston, WV
Email: anathaniel@hsc.wvu.edu

Mark S. Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
Northern Illinois University
College of Business
Department of Marketing
DeKalb, IL
Email: mrosenbaum@niu.edu

Helen Scott, Ph.D.
Research Associate
Foundation Direct
University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, Hants. UK.
Email: helen.scott@port.ac.uk

Hans Thulesius, GP, Ph.D.
Kronoberg County Research Centre
Department of Community Medicine
Vaxjo, SE
Email: hans.thulesius@ltkronoberg.se

The Grounded Theory Review
Special Issue, November 2007

Contents

From the Editor

This special issue of the Review celebrates the 40th anniversary of the publication of **Discovery** (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and, in so doing, is a special tribute to Barney Glaser, to his energy, his commitment and his dedication to the scholarly pursuit of knowledge and to theory that matters in everyday social life. Those of us who have had the great fortune to meet and learn from Barney are grateful for his genius, his generosity, his patience and his honesty. He's set an example that has touched each of us in a very special way. I hope that you will enjoy reading the personal perspectives shared in this issue. Among those offering tributes are internationally-recognized Swedish scholar, Dr. Evert Gummesson, as well as members of our Peer Review Board from Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Norway, Sweden and the United States.

We are delighted to offer, as well, an interview with Dr. Glaser in conversation with Italian scholar, Dr. Massimiliano Tarozzi who has just completed work on the first Italian translation of **Discovery** (Roma: Armando Editore, in press). The interview takes a look back over the past forty years with Dr. Glaser reflecting on the growth curve of grounded theory, its relevance and its global reach.

Also included in this issue are three pieces by Dr. Glaser – first, an excerpt from his introduction to **The Grounded Theory Seminar Reader** (Glaser & Holton, 2007) in which he shares the motivation for his troubleshooting seminars and the publication of the many Readers that he has edited over the past 40 years. And we are excited to include here a chapter from Dr. Glaser's next book, **Doing Quantitative Grounded Theory** (Sociology Press, forthcoming) in which he details the substantial influence of his early studies under Paul F.

Lazarsfeld at Columbia University on the subsequent emergence of classic grounded theory methodology. Finally, it is most fitting to also reprint here an earlier essay, "In Honor of Anselm Strauss: Collaboration" in which Dr. Glaser pays tribute to his late friend and colleague and the co-originator of the methodology that today we recognize as classic grounded theory.

My first reading of **Discovery** opened a world of learning for me. I'd found what I was seeking in a methodology. The elegance of a good conceptual theory was my quest and **Discovery** showed the way. The balance between systematic process and intuitive creativity - the very essence of classic grounded theory - spoke to me. This was the way to develop real theory - empirically grounded yet free of the burdensome and particularistic descriptive detail that limits conceptual transcendence.

Since first meeting Barney in 2003, I have learned – and re-learned - many valuable lessons; particularly, on staying open to the emergent and to the generative possibilities of grounded theory. I've become all too aware of my propensity to 'structure up' - an approach learned and practiced over many years in my management career. While structure has its place, I have come to recognize its limitations in the creative process. Trusting to emergence has been the great gift for me in working with Barney. I still have much to learn.

- Judith A. Holton, Ph.D.

Submissions

Papers submitted are peer reviewed and comments provided back to the authors; those accepted for publication will be good examples, practical applications or methodological essays of classic grounded theory methodology.

Comments from our readers on papers published are always welcomed, will be shared with the authors and may be published in subsequent issues of the Review.

Forward submissions as Word documents to Judith Holton at judith@groundedtheoryreview.com. See our website www.groundedtheoryreview.com for full submission guidelines.

The Grounded Theory Review (2007), Special Issue

x

Reading Grounded Theory: The value of exampling[1]

Barney G. Glaser, Ph.D., Hon.Ph.D.

I designed the [Grounded Theory] troubleshooting seminar to help candidates complete their dissertations. Candidates have many questions that need answering when doing a GT dissertation to get it moving and finished. The seminar focuses on exactly where the candidate is and tries to move him/her to the next step. Problem coverage is achieved by participant-candidates listening to the troubles of eleven other participant-candidates, and after listening, then engaging in an extensive free and open discussion of all the participants' views of what to do within the GT procedural framework. Of course, I keep the discussion, as best I can, on track and guided by GT procedures. The freedom to talk openly about the problems is often hard to control, BUT always very helpful to the candidate whose particular problem is being considered.

The motivation to participate in these seminars is provided by the critical aspect of doing a dissertation to become a PhD. Candidates are committing themselves to this critical career juncture of changing their status from student to doctor. The value enhancement is tremendous. They invest immense resources of time, energy and trust in becoming a PhD. It is a high value achievement. It is a "mystique" passage to surrounding laymen who see with awe only the magic and value involved in the passage.

At the dissertation stage of their graduate study, these candidates worry whether or not they can truly accomplish a GT dissertation. They are highly motivated to find answers to their GT questions, to get the dissertation done and then get on with the career opportunities commensurate with the PhD. The promised career rewards will be a significant change in

---

[1] This paper is an excerpt from Dr. Glaser's Introduction to **The Grounded Theory Seminar Reader** (Barney G. Glaser & Judith A. Holton, Eds.) Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press, pp.vii-xi.

their lives, which is highly motivating at the candidate stage.

The troubleshooting GT seminar has proven very successful. Subscription to each seminar fills up quite quickly. People come from all over the world. They travel great distances for the help of the seminar. I give them in London, New York City and Mill Valley each year and sometimes in Sweden, France, Scotland and Canada. A few of the countries that candidates come from are Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Malaysia, Chine, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, England, Canada, Spain, Poland, Germany, Iran and, of course, the U.S.A. - mainly the eastern seaboard and Midwest. Some of my more advanced students themselves have given troubleshooting seminars.

The success of these seminars principally comes from the many PhDs that have been accomplished with its help. The seminar also provides help to the many minus mentorees who have chosen to do a GT dissertation and are studying in a department or context where no one knows GT procedures to help with the research. Also, the seminar helps candidates undo the anti-GT help, given by supervisors who actually think they know GT, but do not. Participation in the seminar often legitimates the GT researcher in a departmental context that does not know how to evaluate GT research and may be doubtful as to its merits. And, the GT troubleshooting seminars have generated a worldwide network of GTers discussing GT issues at a moment's notice and sharing working papers through the internet.

After participating, candidates will often return as observers at the next seminar to further and continue their learning and to experience the open discussion on the myriad problems that emerge in GT research. They may return a second, even third time for more troubleshooting participation as their dissertation research advances. Some will often continue to participate as seminar observers after achieving the PhD, returning to share their success in becoming a PhD and further network in person with old friends.

The papers in this Reader will indicate to the reader a sample of the dissertation product successes of the seminar approach and thereby its total success. Yet the reader can be

his/her own judge. The papers are parts, sections, extracts or even chapters of the resulting dissertations. It is my hope that candidate-readers of this volume will be inspired to do a GT dissertation, and that PhD readers will be inspired to try GT research and "ok" their students in doing GT research.

This reader has a progressive part in my history of doing readers. It is the sixth reader that I have edited and each has a progressive purpose for learning and doing GT:

Organizational Careers (1968): As the reader may or may not know, in the late 1960's Anselm and I were intrigued by the general implications of a GT core variable. Core categories naturally have general implications, just waiting for doing formal grounded theory, by expanding the GT research on the core category to many substantive areas. (See: B.G. Glaser, **Doing Formal Grounded Theory**, Sociology Press, 2006). We were fascinated by the power of awareness context theory. Anselm wrote a paper, "Awareness Contexts and Grounded Formal Theory" (Ch 17, in **More Grounded Theory Methodology**, Sociology Press, 1994). Together, we also wrote a formal theory of status passage (Glaser & Strauss, 1971) to put over the idea of formal grounded theory. It was originally stimulated by our book, **Time for Dying** (Sociology Press, 1968).

At the same time, it occurred to me to do a reader on **Organizational Careers** (1968), for the purpose of showing 63 articles of research and thought on organizational careers. The reader could then see how the articles were compared to generate concepts for a formal theory on organizational careers. I said, "In general, organizations obtain work from people by offering them some kind of career within their structures. The operation of organizations, therefore, depends on people's assuming a career orientation toward them." (Glaser, 1968, p.1) As so much of what we all do is linked with organization, I considered an organizational career as a core category with immense general implication needing a formal grounded theory understanding of it patterns. Indeed, 63 plus other authors agreed. This was my first reader.

My second reader, **Examples of Grounded Theory** (1993) came 25 years later, with a clear and present and

needed purpose. I said, "In writing **Basics of Grounded Theory** (Sociology Press, 1992), it became obvious to me that what was needed by the myriad GT readers, researchers and users throughout the world was a book of examples of GT papers and chapters. Researchers need models for how the various facets of GT look when brought together into an integrated piece. This applies to both analysis of qualitative and particularly quantitative data. This reader is designed to achieve this purpose." (Glaser, 1992, p.1). Many of the papers in the Examples Reader were written a long time ago, but remain good examples. Their core categories have lasting qualities. With modification for new times and places, the cores still work and are relevant today. They show that cores and the theories that embody them are truly abstract of time, place and people. Their relevance and grab persists. They endure with fit, workability and relevance. The reader of this Reader can also clearly see that the theory in these articles could not have been predicted or forced beforehand, and especially so by the preframing requirements of Strauss and Corbin.

My third reader, **More Grounded Theory Methodology** (1994) was a sequel to "Examples", to help continue the corrections to Strauss and Corbin's **Basics of Qualitative Research** (1990) as explicated at length in my book, **Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis** (1992). My "Basics" book was received virtually all over the world with success for its critique of Strauss and Corbin by helping to clarify the confusion over the conflict that left so many researchers paralyzed in their research, especially candidates doing dissertations and facing a dissertation committee.

It tried to show how Strauss and Corbin had simply bypassed the scholarship necessary to truly advance GT methodology. They did not take what was said previously on GT methodology and then take it a step further to advance GT. It shows how other authors have deep impressions of GT and how their scholarship is used in an effort to extend GT methodology to adjust it to current concerns. These articles revitalize GT as it was originated in contrast to the Strauss and Corbin remodeling.

My fourth reader, **Grounded Theory, 1984 to 1994**

(1995), was a two volume work of 48 articles and papers. I started the Reader with the caveat, "I can create GT methodology, I can write GT and I can teach GT, BUT I cannot control how GT methodology is used." (Glaser, 1995, p.3). The Reader clearly indicated this simple fact. The articles in this Reader put into relief both the gains of emergence and the banes of forcing techniques that still remain, so that researchers can get on with giving up forcing for total emergence.

The articles show how GT can be used quite well, from beginning to end, to its fullest extent but forcing and preconception are still permitted to insert themselves at various juncture in the studies. What these articles show is not so much that forcing operations still remained in 1984-94, but the importance of shedding routine research forcing techniques so that the generation of theory could truly emerge. As such, the articles are models to be used as learning challenges to giving up forcing.

What came at some surprise to me was that the articles also showed that GT is used all over the world and how widespread its use had become in many disciplines. It also came as a surprise to me how much human resources of time and money were going into GT research and how many careers are based on its starting with the dissertation. GT has emerged as a high impact methodology, changing the perspective of many researchers and beginning to change the perspective of many disciplines. GT had come to stand on its own as a theory of method.

My fifth reader, **Gerund Grounded Theory: The Basic Social Process Dissertation** (1996), followed through on the emergent relevance of GT for dissertation research, which I had learned doing the 1984-94 Reader. The preponderance of use for GT appeared to be for masters and doctoral theses and dissertations; this because of GT's ability to explain high impact dependent variables. The researchers doing dissertations and theses were continually asking me for help on a myriad of issues they faced in their research and with their committees.

It is my observation that studying dissertations in one's

field is the best way to learn how to do one, to write one and to see what one looks like. In short, reading dissertations is a modeling phenomenon on many dimensions. The purpose of "Gerund GT" was to provide models for GT dissertations based on the basic social process theoretical code model. The Reader was to be used as a normative model to emulate.

What was modeled in this Reader of actual dissertation extracts is the conceptualization of the dissertation, the core process and several of the properties and bents and uses of GT methodology by the writer. The Reader helped those who read it to argue their choice of doing a GT dissertation to a doubtful dissertation committee committed to another methodology inimical to GT. The Reader was used to verify, sanctify and legitimate the GT dissertation. I personally know the value of the papers included since all but one author participated in my GT seminars held at University of California, San Francisco.

This, of course, gave me the idea to do the present Reader of papers and articles written by students who have participated in my troubleshooting seminars held over the past 10 years. These indicate the fecundity of my seminars and GT successes in PhD awarding and journal article publications that have come from the seminars. They indicate, as I said above, the spread of GT throughout the world by various disciplines concerned with explaining high impact dependent variables. As models, however varied, they are excellent. So, dear reader, I invite you to read, enjoy and think.

Lastly, to further the "doing of GT", we begin each paper with a brief introductory paragraph on the general implications of its core category. I trust this will further the interest in generating formal theory; at least in formal GT which takes a substantive GT to a more general level. (See, Glaser, **Doing Formal Grounded Theory**, Sociology Press, 2007) The Reader will see that the papers in this Reader are rich in general implications that can easily spawn the generation of formal theory. The reader should bear in mind as well that these papers are but a few of the many papers coming from the GT troubleshooting seminars. The papers are presented in no particular order. Given the richness of their general implications which run to so many areas of social behavior, they are not bounded by any one discipline or field of study.

References

Glaser, B. G. (1968). *Organizational Careers: A sourcebook for theory*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of Grounded Theory: Emergence vs. forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G. (1995). *Grounded Theory, 1984-1994*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G. (1996). *Gerund Grounded Theory: The basic social process dissertation.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2007). *Doing Formal Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (Ed.). (1993). *Examples of Grounded Yheory: A reader*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (Ed.). (1994). *More Grounded Theory Methodology: A reader*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. A. (Eds.). (2007). *The Grounded Theory Seminar Reader*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1968). *Time for Dying*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1971). *Status Passage*. Chicago: Aldine Atherton Inc.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

The History of Grounded Theory Based on Quantitative Methodology[1]

Barney G. Glaser, Ph.D., Hon. Ph.D.

The idea for a grounded theory methodology came from the 1950's when Lazarsfeld[2] started to do methodology of quantitative studies. The methodology he created was not that of the initial procedures applied to quantitative studies but rather trying to figure out the procedures that had been used in "good" quantitative studies. The procedures emerged. As he figured them out, other researchers studied them and started to use them and research methodology was born. This is, of course, how Anselm and I developed GT methodology. We figured out the procedures we had used in the dying study research and in writing it up in **Awareness of Dying** (1965) and **Time for Dying** (1967). Other researchers wanted this GT methodology: they wanted to know how we "did it".

When Lazarsfeld started to do methodologically-oriented quantitative studies, he also started relating the resulting research to theory. He began to discover that the preframed quantitative studies based on speculative, conjectural theory in the 50s was showing the theory to be wrong or not relevant. So he started correcting, modifying or changing many theories based on research data. They were usually studies of social class, voting, employment, etc. So many of these theories steeped in ideology were wrong. He discovered, using methodology, many unobserved variables which changed extant theories and simple findings.

Thus, he came up with the idea -- why not just get theory from the data first; data based on a sound methodology. But he was not quite to the idea of GT, since he was still fixed on correcting extant theory with solid, accurate studies based on new studies. Most of his corrections were descriptive and used

---

[1] This paper is Chapter 1 of Dr. Glaser's book, Doing Quantitative Grounded Theory (Sociology Press, forthcoming)

[2] Paul F. Lazarsfeld was founder of Columbia University's Bureau for Applied Social Research

unobserved-to-date facts. There was little conceptualization and the conceptualization was theoretical codes, not substantive codes. Why? Because the newer methodologically-based quantitative studies were seen as producing accurate truths used to test theory. So it was a combination of generating new theory as tests to correct speculative theory with very little conceptualization and mostly unit-bound description. Quantitative research is still pretty much in this mode today; constantly correcting extant theory by testing it with accurate findings. There is little focus is on substantive conceptual generating. Most research generates a few descriptions and some ideas, then back to testing.

GT took this approach a few steps further by just generating conceptual theory abstract of unit, time, place and people, and with no preframing by extant theory before the research began. Then the discovered theory is related back to the literature, both descriptive and theoretical, but not so much to correct it as to advance it with modification by constant comparative transcending concepts, and using many of them in a multivariate theory.

GT, in the hands of Strauss and I, made this abstract move using qualitative data; data which was easier to use and did not have the theory-accurate data-testing wrestle model dominating it. Of course, not too many years later (and to be expected in the bargain) the qualitative methodologists remodeled GT away from conceptual generation to accurate qualitative description (see **The Grounded Theory Perspective II: Description's Remodeling of GT**). But still, and in spite of this remodeling undermining of classical GT, many GT researchers use the GT methodology to generate conceptual substantive theory. It is these pure GT researchers who are lately asking me to write a book on doing quantitative grounded theory (henceforth QGT). In taking on this task, it has brought me back to the roots of the conceptualization of the methodology behind the discovery of GT methodology.

To build up to the detailing of QGT methodology, there is much to consider in keeping it clear of how quantitative research is commonly accomplished. This detailing merely adds to the many forms of quantitative research. It in no way changes or supplants these forms.

Paul F. Lazarsfeld: Roots of GT

Lazarsfeld constantly stressed the idea that sociology, like any scientific discipline, should aim at producing controlled knowledge to give it a more satisfactory direction. Thus the idea most closely associated with Lazarsfeld's name is that of "methodology" (Boudon, 1993, p.12). "Methodology" does not aim to answer questions of the type 'what should be done?' It proposes instead to look at convincing studies in order to understand why they are convincing, why they appear to generate genuine new knowledge." This is of course how we came to discover GT from the **Awareness of Dying** book.

Lazarsfeld repeatedly proposed the French approach *l'explication de text* as the method "par excellence" to write methodology as one studies good writings of research. I, of course, studied *l'explication de text* as a student at the University of Paris where I was a student for one year.   It is simply studying a work line by line to see exactly what is being said. It shows how written research has been built; whether is works well or badly. The value of methodology, Lazarsfeld says, is twofold. It has both theoretical interest and practical interest. On both levels, it makes subsequent research more effective, more reliable, and more able to solve complex theoretical and practical problems.   Under Lazarsfeld, methodology became a new discipline.   Scholars became methodologists, and were sought to help plan and appraise research.

In generating methodology as a discipline, Lazarsfeld developed many effective procedures. A list relevant to QGT is: the interchangeability of indices; the flexible relationship of two and three variables using elaboration analysis; implementing a language of variables and multivariate analysis; the search for unobserved findings in simple distributions; the rule relaxing of strict quantitative procedures for achieving accuracy, tests of theory and verifications in favor of the flexible generation of grounded theory; that is, to generate concepts and their multivariate hypothesis interrelations.   The generated meaning of variables often remains ambiguous or unobserved if they are not examined in the context of several emerging hypotheses in which they are used (Lazarsfeld, p.172). QGT provides this emergent context.

Two more examples of rule relaxing are the use of crude indices and the suspension of text of significance. A third is the flexible search for relationships that were not preconceived or preframed. He also started the use of property space analysis to find underlying dimensions which feed into the development of typologies. These procedures easily feed into generating QGT as well as being the foundation for discovering and generating substantive, conceptual grounded theory with qualitative data.

Lazarsfeld never used a technique in a mechanical fashion, because his object was always to understand the meanings behind human behavior. He never forgot that a joint distribution defines both a majority of cases contributing to the finding but also a minority of deviant cases, which were potentially just as important and required further analysis for their meaning, both quantitatively and also through the qualitative interviews that had been used to develop the survey interview schedule. "This gave the insight into complex processes and decisions" (Boudon, 1993, p.15). This often led to the measurement, meaning and discovery of unobserved variables which, in turn, led to and inspired elaboration analysis and latent structure analysis (more on this technology in chapter xx below), which were the roots of discovery of core categories and subcore categories in the methodology of discovery of GT. His techniques of quantitative analysis for discovery gave birth to the legend of his "quantomania" to discover the non-preconceived, unobserved latent patterns which is, of course, what we do in generating GT with qualitative data and will, with this book, in generating with quantitative data.

He sought in this quest for the unobserved causal statements which, of course, are the roots of the GT quest for resolving the main concern by a core category analysis. He showed the "statistical zealots" of the one time survey that qualitative data were important in the development of causal analysis of one-moment-in-time quantitative data. The qualitative data came from both the interviews made for generating the survey questionnaire and subsequent theoretical sampling interviews. He also compared quantitative studies (for example, in voting) to generate causal

inferences, sometimes descriptive and sometimes conceptual.

Thus we see the seeds of the constant comparative approach of GT. In this comparative quest, he began introducing contextual variables as they emerged through these comparisons. Contextual analysis helped explain the unobserved, emergent variables as conceptual hypotheses, not accurate findings. Thus rule relaxing in the service of generation of GT was begun. He also thus showed that predictions based on a one time survey had a great chance of failure, while his multivariate, comparative approach with other quantitative studies and qualitative data had great application prospect. This again, of course, fed directly into the practical use of multivariate GT using qualitative data, as we detailed in **Discovery of GT** (see Chapter V). Lazarsfeld felt that the use of social research was critical common sense, both to justify the value of social research and to show that the many "common sense" statements of political pundits and advisors were invalid. Thus social research was needed to correct the mechanical, simplistic, ungrounded, particularistic conjectures heretofore very powerful. Although Lazarsfeld focused on politics, this applies in "whatever realm". Again we see the roots of the main position of the **Discovery of GT**. Familiar cultural products are not necessarily correct and grounds for action, as they properly distort ideas of small groups protecting themselves from the larger, more general social inputs. Thus social research according to Lazarsfeld, and GT according the Glaser and Strauss in **Discovery of GT,** is needed to consider contradictory representations and determine what is actually going on. The influence and use of survey research under Lazarsfeld became very strong in the history of sociology, as it is today for GT. Thinking about social issues and problems changed for the educated and for many of those in control of a myriad of social structures.

Lazarsfeld's approach to correcting by social research also led to a more critical view of a priori theoretical thinking of scholars, again a fundamental use of GT as we have seen so many times. He felt that the theorists could not give up their tradition but could be more critical and look to social research for the critique. Lazarsfeld took on the grand theorists with research data as best he could. It was a big struggle. GTers

now feel why bother with a prior theory - why let it potentially impede discovery. Thus the relation of theory to research was growing toward the current position of GT years later: to wit, no preconceptions.

Lazarsfeld realized that survey social research was costly requiring big grants and organizational frameworks - a research institute - and a large research staff with various skills in statistics, interviewing, computers, analytic ability and so on. The division of labor in a research institute would attract funds for survey research. Lazarsfeld said, "A program for the empirical study of action required a staff of collaborators trained to collect and analyze data whenever a research opportunity offered itself." (Lazarsfeld, 1993, p. 152)

Obviously this did not follow into qualitative GT, much GT was done by individual or small, non-enduring or temporary teams. Now I am saying in this book that the same style can prevail using secondary analysis of extant survey data. The danger of institutes for QGT is to preframe by management and to preconceive by senior researchers the research and thus inhibit discovery. Institute research typically requires choosing a specific problem for research and to structure it up. GT just requires an area of interest and an open mind to what problems may emerge.

Though Lazarsfeld essentially put methodology "on the map" by formulating it, he strongly admitted that it capped a trend waiting to happen. The sociological pioneers were strong in the belief that standardized quantitative observations were a condition of objectivity and scientificity for empirical research. He codified generating methodology as a discipline and in the bargain, insisted on the combining of qualitative and quantitative analyses. He made empirical social research based on methodology a necessary style that has lived to this day. So, it was natural when we were asked how we did **Awareness of Dying**, that I wanted to explain it as a methodology. Anselm [Strauss] agreed and therefore we wrote **Discovery of GT**.

Lazarsfeld was not without objectors to his empirical methodology research style by many macro-sociology theorists who experienced the challenge to their theories based on conjecture or non-researched thought. He failed to see that his

methodology and emphasis on empirical research were inimical to the highly respected thought of scholars like Weber, Simmel, De Toqueville, Durkheim, Blumer, Pareto, Parsons, etc. He simply felt they should be submitted to empirical research to ascertain their validity. He ignored the accusation of research as just spurious checks. As the reader knows, empirical checks on theory are routine now and GT has gone one step further by stopping preconception of research by extant theory to just discovering theory anew for what is going on and then seeing how it fits into current theory that is relevant.

Lazarsfeld talked about how methodology could help by the process of substruction. The means reducing types in a theory to their essential attributes or dimensions and then systematically putting them back together with indicators from the survey data by constructing indexes, and 2 and 3 variable property spaces to test the theory and discover unobserved variable relations to it. QGT does the same with elaboration analysis but does not draw on extant theory and its substruction; substructing instead the emergent theory patterns that come from initially pursuing an area of concern using elaboration analysis. By substruction, theory starts to be built or generated in QGT, rather than using quantitative findings to correct theory.

Lazarsfeld insisted "take your favorite theory … and translate it into lines connecting points in an attribute space (by substruction). While you will not obtain an empirical answer, you will be helped by the clearer formulation of problems and by seeing unexpected connections between possible solutions." (Lazarsfeld, 1993, p.261). Substruction produces the emergent as the dimensions of a concept are worked with and related to other concepts. Clearly, this was the precursor to GT methodology, especially in using the interchangeability of indices.

Lazarsfeld continues, "The technical and organizational nature of empirical social research leads to formal ideas, to distinctions and interconnections relevant for many sociological pursuits well beyond the realm of strictly empirical research." The language is not what we use today, but the ideas are for GT. He is saying that methodology and substruction can generate concepts with formal implications; that is, the general

implications of the concepts go well beyond the substantive realm where they are discovered. This idea anticipates my book on doing formal GT" (Glaser, 2006).

In QGT, getting at the underlying pattern of what is being said or what is going on through the intense *explication de text* of written words, in papers or interviews or 3 variable tables is a joy. It is an experience to which the reader would not otherwise have access; it convinced Lazarsfeld of the value of the methodological approach. We, of course, see this all the time in the line-by-line analysis of interviews and field notes when generating substantive GT.

As I said above, the increasing draw to quantitative methodology started the need for institutes for methodological training, large team work and the managing the funds required for surveys. The appropriate organizational structure kept changing its form. But whatever the form, the consequence of this was that the institute, pushing its methodology, became a technical training ground for graduate students in which their educated interests were subordinated to institute needs and their dissertations supervised to be sure the methods were applied correctly.

Lazarsfeld said, "Students who receive most of their training on organized quantitative projects become one-sided; instead of developing interest on their own, they become mercenaries of their employers, where institutes become influential, important sociological problems are neglected because they do not lend themselves to study by the "Research Machinery". People who work best on their own find themselves without support and are regarded as outsiders." (Lazarsfeld, 1993, p. 268)

Here is where GT left the methodology movement. Its methodology fostered and inspired the single researcher or small team working with qualitative data, unencumbered by the constraints of an institute structure that maximizes the institute's preconceived notion of creativity. Many GT researchers, if fact, are minus mentorees working in isolation (Stern, 1994). Others network by the internet to help each other. The Grounded Theory Institute is merely a source of networking for Q&A among its participants. Grounded theory

troubleshooting seminars are strictly voluntary and not university or institute linked. QGT using secondary analysis can follow in this single researcher approach with no constraints on the creativity afforded by discovery. While quantitative research institutes can provide secondary analysis data, as a GT researcher, one should always negotiate the freedom to work on one's own area of interest and discovery whatever may emerge. GT methodology preserves the traditional scholarly value of creativity. The GT researcher's career is based on solo creativity, not on the destiny of an institute. QGT must follow in this path of solo creativity.

Methodology, started over 40 years ago, brought in the utilization of research findings in both the applied social research realms and in the correction of grand theory as it grounded research to everyday realities. This utilization has been improved immensely with the growth of qualitative substantive GT. I see no reason that QGT will be any less useful.

Qualitative analysis was not always so useful. Lazarsfeld thought that utilization was an urgent problem in the 70's. He said, "I do not believe that empirical social research of the type we are discussing [methodologically driven] can contribute much to social revolution" (Lazarsfeld, 1962, p.262). On the other hand, does empirical social research help the agencies and organizations that solicit and pay for the research? Lazarsfeld doubted it. He said, "The greatest difficultly in providing concrete examples [of utilization] comes at the two extremes of the utilization spectrum: the exponents of basic social change and the people who want guidance for immediate policy and action are most often disappointed" (Lazarsfeld, 1962, p.262). but he felt that modest utilization was impressive. I have discussed usefulness of GT at length in my books. It is very useful as it provides empirical, theoretical explanations with intervention variables and by imbuing ongoing thought for goal-oriented action of important dependent variables. (See chapter X in **Discovery**, Chapter 14 in **Awareness of Dying** and Chapter 6 in **Doing Formal Theory**.) I have seen the usefulness of GT time and again in interventions as one realizes the general implications of core category analysis (See Glaser & Holton, **The GT Seminar Reader**). QGT will fit into

this usefulness very easily. .

Conclusion

In sum, the seeds of GT in general are all through Lazarsfeld's writings on methodology. Methodology forces one to be explicit about the procedures used in research to better future research. It guides future research, supervised research and contract research. It did not require a social movement to take hold. It was a natural step to achieving a generalized goal of all research - a reliable product. Grounded theory is a clear set of procedures for generating conceptual hypotheses about how people resolve a main concern. It is not a lock step, rigid methodology as are some statistical methodologies. For GT, methodology is a set of procedures that go on sequentially, subsequently, and simultaneously as applied to different parts of the theory as they emerge. GT methodology guides the search for latent patterns. It assures the consistency of type of product in many GTs, and cuts to a minimum the particularistic thought of the GT researcher. The remodelers of GT methodology (see **The GT Perspective II**) try to break through this consistency of product. GT methodology points out and resolves the often "at odds" difference between research and speculation, thus changing the way people think about the issues and main concerns research.

As we saw above, quantitative methodology got started and became popular by correcting extant grand theory. In this, we have seen many of the seeds of GT methodology. In the next chapter, we turn to looking at the difference between testing methodology and generating methodology; and especially how the formulation of QGT methodology changes and affects statistical, testing quantitative methodology. To be sure, QGT methodology is waiting to happen and will in this monograph.

References

Boudon, R. (1993). Introduction. In P. F. Lazarsfeld (Ed.), *On Social Research and its Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2003). *The Grounded Theory Perspective II: Description's remodeling of grounded theory methodology*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2006). *Doing Formal Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1965). *Awareness of Dying*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1974). *Time for Dying*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. (Ed.). (1993). *On Social Research and its Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stern, P. N. (1994). Eroding Grounded Theory. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Forty Years after Discovery: Grounded theory worldwide

Barney Glaser in conversation with Massimiliano Tarozzi[1]

Massimiliano Tarozzi (MT):
Forty years have passed since **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** was first published. Now we know that it was a revolutionary book for many sides and today we are able to carefully describe the profile of its innovative proposal. But, how was it received at that time among the scientific community? In particular among sociologists or in general among social scientists? Now it is well known the success of this book, and we know the place that it has in the history of sociology. But what was the reaction at the beginning – at the very beginning?

Barney Glaser (BGG):
Well, the reaction was big. It was like a bomb; no question. It challenged 'received theory' to the max and questioned the productivity and research with respect to theory, research which was being used to test hypotheses as opposed to generating them. So it was – it had many reactions but overall some of the people loved it, thought at last they were free. Others damned it because it put their work into jeopardy.

So in that sense, it was very controversial and very positive. Not only did it put a call or an attack on received theory and conjecture and speculation but it showed a way out. It wasn't just an argument; it was a solution. And it grew as people assimilated it.

MT: I see. But at the beginning, 40 years ago, did it receive many reviews in journals? I cannot imagine what were the first comments about the book, both in the journal reviews and in informal reactions.

---

[1] The present conversation will be published in Italian in appendix to the first Italian translation of *The Discovery of Grounded Theory,* (Roma: Armando Editore, in press).

BGG: I don't remember if **Discovery** was reviewed but it was written in response to the success of **Awareness of Dying. Awareness of Dying** was very successful. It was widely read and all could think, "How'd they do it? How'd they do it?" So being trained in methodology, I suggested to Anselm that we write a methodology on how we did it. In the bargain, we wrote a new methodology which changed a lot of people's views of how to do theory, how to do method and do research. So it wasn't just alone. It was a significant response to **Awareness** which itself is in four languages.

MT: So **Awareness** was a success. And the success of **Discovery** has grown year by year, as researchers keep using it with growing competence. In particular, my perception – my feeling – is that the success of the book has been a retarded burst. It was probably bigger 15 years later than at the very beginning. So it received a full international recognition only in the Eighties. It was in the next decade that the success of both the book and the method, was growing and growing, not only in North America but was spread everywhere and in particular in Europe. I believe that at the end of the sixties sociologists and laymen were not yet ready to assimilate and practice the innovations of this methodology.

A few years ago, you wrote that talking with Strauss you agreed that your book was in advance of 15 or 20 years, with respect to your times (Glaser, 1998, p.21). What did you mean? Do you think that there are specific reasons for this delayed success? Why people were not ready for this book?

BGG: Yeah, it's delayed action learning. People liked it in the beginning but as they started to use it and experience it and felt its power and success and the delayed action, they started proffering it more and more. So I mean that's the curve I was telling you about. It grows and grows. People start talking about it – its power, its grab, its endurance. And, the book itself is a grounded theory. It wasn't thought up. It was based on doing **Awareness** and **Time for Dying**. So it was grounded in research. That has tremendous grab.

Well, one delay is resistance to seeing its power. Yeah. But once again, even for the people wanting it, it's delayed action. Its grab is ever enduring. It's slow, although the concepts, like

what you were saying – what was the one – of instant grab, the method itself has tremendous grab. I mean it holds you. And that's why I wrote Theoretical Sensitivity in '78? Which was 11 years later. To get more clarification 'cause people were running around with it [**Discovery**] and trying to use it. Now, forty years later, there's a growth curve.

MT: So after the success of **Awareness** there was a slow but continuing development that followed an even more aware application of the method. Did this happen at the same level, both in North America and in Europe or in other countries? Or was it recognized first in the United States and then elsewhere? My perception is that the book and its methodology arrived later in Europe, especially in continental Europe. And in particular it arrived not immediately in sociology.

 BGG: Yeah. Oh, yeah. **Awareness** was published very quickly in other languages because it dealt with nursing which is universal. And it dealt with high impact variables, high impact dependent variables. And so I don't think it spread in sociology. It spread in management and in education where people were fed up with the standard categories.

MT: This introduces another key issue. What are, in your opinion, the main fields of application or disciplinary perspectives or the main research areas of grounded theory?

BGG: Oh, it's management, business, education, social work, nursing, medicine. It's growing in medicine. I mean we organized a seminar in Malmo, Sweden where there are 12 doctors, all trying to do grounded theory 'cause they have a community management orientation.

These medical doctors are social psychologically oriented, not like here. And it's big in medicine in Europe. Not in France. But it hasn't taken hold in France at all and very little in Germany 'cause Anselm had very good friends in Germany that didn't like me. However, **Discovery** has been translated into German too.

MT: What are the reasons why the grounded theory was spread about these fields of application you mentioned? I believe that one of the main characteristics of the method, clear also in the founding book, is that "it fits, is relevant and

works". That's the reason why it is particularly suitable in those fields where people demand research practices with concrete guidelines and directions for action and change. Some practical disciplines (education, nursing, marketing, etc.)- and education is my field - those which cannot stop at a descriptive level in their theories can find affinity with a methodology that starts from the main concern of participants and ends with a theory that works, fit, is relevant and useful. Research offering as a result a theory, rather than a detailed description, allows practitioners to transform the explored contexts. And where it is necessary to train practitioners and professionals, reinforce knowledge and skills, a grounded theory seems to be a sound basis upon which to build education programs, decision making, situation change, emancipation of educators, nursing, and other practitioners.

BGG: Well, also, because those fields deal with high-impact dependent variables. The explanations of what's going on are very relevant in this sort of practice. That's why GT focuses on dependent variables. It deals with these dependent variables and their relevance and work and fit when they deal with these variables like nursing care, medical treatment, management consultancy – whatever you want to call it. It gives good answers to high-impact variables. But you have to add one more dimension to what you're doing. One of the spreads of grounded theory that is often not mentioned. You know what it is?

The jargon. The words. They have so much grab that they're used everywhere to justify research that has nothing to do with grounded theory. So I'm always telling my students if I've invented anything that really works, it's the jargon. "I did theoretical sampling". Oh. And "did you saturate your category"? Yes. It's wonderful. And "did you constant compare"? Oh, yes, "I do constant comparisons all the time" and the jargon is so –

But, you know, grounded theory is a theory and it was generated from research data and it just proves the point of how great grounded theory is but they don't realize that. They use the categories, the jargon, and it's jargonized everywhere and that's probably what you're picking up in part as its popularity. I created a concept. It's gonna live forever. It has

enduring grab.

So the jargon is far ahead of the method as I originated, although there's people getting Ph.D.s right and left using the proper method. I'm going to Norway to hear a defense. I just read another one [thesis] today from England. Somebody else just got their degree. It's great. You know, people have remodeled the method but they haven't remodeled the jargon. They've used it to remodel grounded theory.

MT: In this sense the jargon is a way to legitimize data. And at the same time it can legitimate you in front of your committee.

BGG: That's exactly it. It's a legitimater. The jargon is a legitimater. Yeah. "I used grounded theory". Even the term "grounded theory" is a concept created out of studying our research [**Awareness of Dying**]. It wasn't thought up. It was generated from the research we did on dying, combining Anselm's talents and my data.

And if you – no matter who publishes this book, there are a lot of people who are gonna buy it, not because they want to do the method but because they want to read on legitimating jargon.

MT: Very interesting. According to this, the translation is very important. What you said is particularly important also for the first translation of **Discovery** in Italian. Because we have to be aware that in translating - for the first time - the language of the founders, we are creating the jargon for the future.

BGG: That's exactly it.

MT: Because in Italian, the technical jargon of GT - like these terms, theoretical sampling, constant comparative method and so on - are not so broadly spread and well established as words. So they do not have that legitimizing power you mentioned. At the same time, this is an advantage. As Grounded Theory is quite a new method [in Italian], the words that became jargon in English, when translated into Italian, these words acquire a new vitality, a new evocative power. That is my feeling. They are very powerful because they are not so established and they have not lost their original meaning. So, maybe, the fresh language, like poetic metaphors, is still the way to access the essence of the method.

Probably this legitimating problem is mainly in English-based languages and in the English countries. In the future, as the method spreads in many fields in Italy, the question you pose about the legitimizing function of the jargon will become more evident in Italy as well. At the moment, I think, the language of GT still preserves its innovative force for us.

BGG: The current generation uses the legitimating jargon of the method, not the method. The jargon justifies everything they do.

MT: I know. That's the problem, I think. To be aware and to try to avoid: to keep the meaningfulness of your words.

BGG: Well, you can't deny the meaningful – I mean it's all data, right? And the use of the jargon for justification, legitimation, is very real – very. You know, you can say they shouldn't do that but it's very real that people need to somehow legitimize what they're doing with the proper words. That, too, was a phenomenon. And I've asked a colleague of mine to write a paper on the legitimating jargon of grounded theory.

I just read an article on Sunday on ethnography which is all description saying you can do grounded theory by generating a concept. Well, I mean if anything is further from grounded theory, it's ethnography 'cause grounded theory does away with the description. But, you know, according to this paper it's like generating a category made ethnography grounded theory.

So it's very real. If you think about legitimating jargons, they're everywhere. It's a normal human process. It occurs in marriage, child rearing, just about everything. Once legitimated, the words have such grab that they move on with no reference till they're applied.

MT: Coming back to fields of application. Probably in these fields – education, organization, management, nursing – there is a request to research, to transform the field, not only to describe.

And a theory is stronger, too, than a description to transform a field and to making decisions. As a nurse, as an educator, as a manager, you have to transform the reality you are exploring. So from another side, my opinion is that these fields need to create professionals with specific skills and these skills have to

be based on something sound or something solid, something scientific.

BGG: Based on legitimating jargon.

MT: and also on a theoretical perspective or an epistemology

BGG: Epistemology.   A theory of – or a theoretical perspective. That's all bullshit for grounded theory. You can read it in **Theoretical Coding** (2005).   GT is just a stupid little method. That's all it is. The epistemology is irrelevant. It's how you use it. GT is based on a concept indicating method which has been used for years in psychology. You get concepts out of indicators and the interchangeability of indicators and you get a theory. That's it. People do them all the time.

And psychologists – they use hundreds of indicators to specify a character, whether someone's depressed, bipolar, has anger problems. But sorry, it's just a dumb little method. I mean to put it on the epistemological or the theoretical like it's a symbolic interaction method. That's nonsense. You can use it with symbolic interaction. You can use it with any kind of perspective. There's latent patterns everywhere. There's even latent patterns going on here. Did you know that?

MT: So I guess symbolic interactionism is not, in your opinion, a theoretical perspective behind grounded theory, although almost all agree in recognizing its influence through the Chicago school.

BGG: Absolutely no. It's just a dumb – you might say a routine psychological method that's used all the time in judging people.   They generate psychological conditions by doing constant comparison method.   It's just a concept indicating method and it gets used and then you relate the concepts to conditions.   You can use it with symbolic interaction data, which I'm not sure what it is anyway. Are you? Did you know that your making meaning is like yourself indicating to myself that your meaning is the same as mine?

I mean, it's like, tell me what's the point. You know, it's like – well, it's nonsense. It's symbolic interactions and as you're reading in **Theoretical Coding**; everybody wants to possess it as their method, give it their epistemology, give it their perspective. It's a general method that anybody can use with

any kind of data. It can be used with documents, videos. It doesn't matter; whatever the data is. What you're looking for are latent patterns and they're everywhere so one of the latent patterns is everybody wants to possess it and it's their perspective.

MT: So with any kind of data and within any kind of paradigm?

BGG: What's a paradigm? I don't know. What is a paradigm?

MT: According to Kuhn it is a framework shared by members of a given scientific community that functions as map, in a certain era or period of time, for any further scientific activity.

BGG: Like what?

MT: Like – it's – to me, it's a shared agreement among the scientific community about common beliefs, techniques, methods, the idea of science in itself.

BGG: That's all it is. Just more data generating an answer. GT can be used with any kind of paradigm and if you want to get legitimation, you throw in the paradigm buzz words. So symbolic interaction does it, right? It's just like constructionism. It's one kind of data and often not very interesting.

MT: So if I understand well, you mean that GT can be used with any kind of data and also within any kind of paradigm, including constructionism?

BGG: Yeah, 'cause there's a lot of data that's just data that you use in grounded theory. It depends. What data are you using? It can be used with any data. I talked about four kinds of data – basic data – so what were they? Proper line data. You say what you're supposed to say because who gives a shit. You're not gonna risk telling the researcher something that could wreck your life or your job. So, proper line data and there's baseline data. Interpreted data where you don't tell the data; you interpret how the data should be told.

And vague; vague data is big. Have you ever talked with a lawyer? It's always vague. They give nothing. Oh, they're big on "ahha's" and "uhmm's". They're vague, right? Oh. So

there's vague data. One of my best students, Richard Rizzo, wrote a paper that got an award. He came back from the Haight-Ashbury saying, "I couldn't get any data." You remember the Haight-Ashbury? The flower children in San Francisco? They were all runaways and on drugs and I don't know if you remember that time.

MT: Actually no. I was in a small kindergarten in Bologna, Italy at that time.

BGG: It was a big area in the city that was being taken over by adolescents and young kids and all kinds of drugs and all kinds of – you might say benign deviants. And they were called the flower children. He went in to study the Haight-Ashbury and he said, "No one will tell me anything." So is that symbolic interaction? No. I said, "You have one of the richest studies there is in the city. Everybody's vagueing out on you. Where are your friends? Where are you from? Where do you get your money?"

And he went and did this paper on vagueing out in the Haight-Ashbury and got an award for it. So where was the symbolic meaning? I mean it was wonderful. And then I realized, yeah, so many people vague out on others which means they give nothing. Course, the flower children gave nothing 'cause they didn't want to be reported to the police, reported to their parents, you know, seen as copping out on their friends. Interesting, huh?

Now you're gonna see – you're gonna look around and see vagueing out all around you.

BGG: That's one of the powers of grounded theory which I write about in my next book [Doing Formal Grounded Theory, 2007]. The general implications of these words is phenomenal. I called my lawyer. We had a little problem. He says, "I'm gonna go on over there and see what we can do." And I said, "Why bother? He'll just vague out on you. Why should I spend the money?" He says, "You're right." I'd be told nothing except him being able to charge his client $500.00.

That's another thing about grounded theory. You have some powerful concepts with general implications - these variables are seen everywhere. And that's what my next book is about –

everywhere. Yesterday, I was with somebody – oh, I was with somebody, a layman, an intelligent layman who was doing graduate work in English, but for you and me, he's an intelligent layman. He said, "Barney, I still see everywhere what you were saying." I said, "What did I say?" He said, "You talk about super normalizing and I see it everywhere and are you super normalizing now? And you never wrote about super normalizing."

When Kathy Charmaz was my student, she did a marvelous dissertation on super normalizing. Where you have an injury or a condition and you act more normal than ever to prove you don't have it.

Super normalizing goes on all around you. She [Charmaz] studied heart attack victims. They were told they have a bad heart so they go out and prove they don't by excessing and that was fear. Skiers supernormalize - maybe not in Italy – but in the Sierras. A lot of people super normalize. They get hurt and then they go out and ski even harder to prove they're not hurt and they're really fucking themselves up.

Football players do it. There's a lot of situations where people go beyond the normal to prove they're not below the normal. And now you know this concept.   You're gonna see it everywhere. It's very real. And interesting enough, at the same time that Kathy was developing her theory of supernormalizing, somebody else was also studying heart attack victims. You know what she found? The opposite end of the continuum – cutting back.

Doctor has said you have a bad heart. You better cut back. How do I cut back? The doctor said, "How do I know? Look at what you do and don't do it." And so she [Patricia Mullen] did a study of cutting back. They cut back on sex. They cut back on biking, running, work.   So, at the same moment that someone's studying excessing, she's studying decessing. Isn't that interesting?

So you get different grounded theories out of the same data and they're both just as real. You know how far we are beyond any crap about epistemology and theoretical perspectives? And the super normalizing? What is that?

Back to supernormalizing, I mean I know people who have given themselves terrible injuries super normalizing in skiing. When you fall down and you hurt a knee and you go back and ski like it doesn't hurt and then you're in the hospital. I have a friend who died lifting bales of hay to prove his heart wasn't bad. Yeah. Apply that. These are concepts that just came out of this concept indicator model which is as old as the hills and it's irrelevant but call it super normalizing stuff. You get it?

MT: Yeah. You can see everywhere these key variables, key concepts.

BGG: It does – it goes on everywhere - like pain leveling. As opposed to getting cured, people go to dentists, doctors to get their pain leveled. There's a big industry on pain levelers with no cures.

MT: So you mean that the existence of these key variables, these core variables per se, that you can find in various social contexts and in diverse substantive areas, is reflecting some patterns that are into reality, some hidden structures existing objectively into the reality, irrespective of the stance or the type of perspective that one imposes on them.

BGG: They're latent patterns. It's like credentializing.

I had a student in one of my seminars. At the time, I didn't want people who were doing dissertations out of my seminars because it held up the work 'cause there's too many stakes involved but one day she came and threw a dissertation on my desk and said, "I've just got my degree. I broke your word and I did a dissertation out of your seminar without telling you." And I said, "What's it about?" She said, "Credentializing. Nurses getting credentials."

Now think about it. Credentializing is a fundamental latent pattern in all our lives. It varies from a two-week training program to a 12-year training program to get credentials, and every one of the things she said could be seen as relevant to credentializing of every kind. And, you know, that doesn't begin to cover it; there's always more. Credentializing is very big. It's the way our world is run, right?

MT: Coming back to the history of these first 40 years. Many things have happened in this time span. Deep

transformations have occurred in social sciences, and huge reflections about its foundation. How, if at all, has grounded theory been modified or remodeled during these years?

BGG: Well, the grounded theory I deal with hasn't been but remodelers have done it to bring us back to qualitative description. One of the realities behind that is not everybody can conceptualize but they want to do grounded theory or they think – you know, all research is grounded. Just is. The notion of research is if you have an idea that you find data. So the people who can't conceptualize tend to want to use grounded theory just for qualitative data analysis which they think is grounded 'cause it's research. I wrote a book on it. You should read it.

On the default remodeling, it says there's more describers than conceptualizers. Let's put it this way. A lot of people – a lot less people can conceptualize but a lot more can than are. But most people describe at length. On and on and on. And if you were in conversation, you'd say they're saying the same thing over and over again 'cause it's just the interchangeability of indices. But they don't know it.

They say the same thing over and over again in different ways just because it's the same pattern.

So the remodeling of GT is based on a very real human condition. Ground theory has status and the jargon has status and people want to do it and call it that. They'll call a routine qualitative analysis - and just like the ethnography paper I mentioned earlier- Thank God, we're right in the middle of ethnography on grounded theory! His concepts are always going deeper but not systematically generated as the method requires.

MT: Talking about the success of grounded theory, one of the reasons for its spread worldwide has been the Strauss and Corbin's book Basics of qualitative research. An international best-seller that seemed to respond to the requirements of those who, in doing grounded theory, needed detailed practical guidelines. Your argument with Strauss is well known. But, if you do not mind to speak about it, what are the basic methodological reasons for this divide, beyond your punctual critiques to this book?

BGG: Well, he went to forcing the data with pre-framing, preconceived concepts and preconceived frameworks like process and the 5 C's - conditions, consequence. Although I taught him that framework, I said it has to emerge. You don't know in advance what the theoretical codes are gonna be or the categories. Get away from preconceiving the research.

I can't tell you how many people who call me and say, "I'm supposed to study this and I can't find it." Well, according to Anselm's method, this is what you're supposed to look for and you will find it or die. And I get so many calls like that. So use grounded theory. Forget what you're supposed to find and just see what you are finding. A good example would be some student called me from Texas, very smart woman, saying, "I'm supposed to study context-oriented social work." You know what that is? That is – context-oriented social work is you treat these people who need social welfare like they're victims of society.

And she went out and started talking to these people, the social workers. Well, they couldn't do context-oriented social work 'cause they weren't trained in context. They had ideology but they weren't using it. They were very concerned about the every day problems of the clients. It was just so irrelevant she didn't know what to do. I said, "Look at what's actually going on. Forget it."

And she came out with a beautiful theory of accompanying, wherein the social worker accompanies the client through a phase, not getting behind and not getting ahead but helping them through a phase and staying relevant to their problem. So she made a contribution to the doing of social work and everybody took out content-oriented social work as so irrelevant. I mean would you go for food stamps and have someone say, "I don't know. But you're just a victim of society." But I need to eat!

MT: So one of the problems of Strauss' approach, late Strauss' approach…

BGG: Is forcing data. Framing elements

I'm supposed to find conditions and consequences. It's not earned relevance like I require but preconceived relevance, and

the other problem was if what they find contradicts received theory. It's outrageous. You're not supposed to tell anybody that.

MT: I well understand what you are saying. I worked as social worker educator before enter the university. So the problem of Strauss's approach, with Corbin, is to cage research problems into rigid frameworks that force data to find dimensions and conditions. Do you believe that this is unavoidable if one tries to create detailed instructions for doing grounded theory? And that this effort to operationalize the method is the reason why basically one is framing and forcing and one ends up pre-conceiving what is supposed to discover?

BGG: Yes. He [Strauss]wanted to – there's two things. First, when you do grounded theory, you have to tolerate confusion until you see what's really going on. The person teaching also has to be able to tolerate confusion in their students, so they have to stand it too and quite often the professor can't stand it. That's a generous interpretation. So he pre-frames the student so they'll find something, even if it isn't a finding.

The other thing is the professor doesn't want them to find anything. They want them to work in their area of research which is exploitation. You will not study what you're interested in. You'll study what I wrote about and add to it. So you get pre-framed in.

MT: This is very difficult because you have to deal with this and try it. It is not easy.

BGG: No, but you have to choose the right students to do grounded theory 'cause not all can do it.

MT: In years, another new frontier of GT seems to be the constructivist approach. Kathy Charmaz outlined a divide between objectivistic and constructivist grounded theory, which has been very successful with these terms. According to her opinion, you and the "classical GT" belong to the objectivistic approach to grounded theory.

I read your reply in the "Forum of Qualitative Social Research" in 2002. But what is your opinion about this, about objectivism and grounded theory? If someone tells you, you are objectivistic, do you feel uncomfortable about this label or does

it matter for your approach to grounded theory?

BGG: Well, she's doing what academics do – trying to lay a claim for her growth and recognition by fostering perspectives. I think it's irrelevant. You have to look at the data you've got. I don't know what objectivism or post-modernism or modernism is. I mean if I told you the theory on credentializing, was that post-modern, modern, objectivistic, constructivist?

I mean is it relevant? I mean this guy asked me the other day, "Barney, I see super normalizing all around me. Am I right?" He's trying to use this concept because it has such grab. You know, it's not relevant to me whether it's constructed, objectivist – it's not relevant. But it's in the nature of advanced academics to try and generate this perspective that they seem to get trapped into and become devotees of. It's bullshit. It's more like religion. You have a student in the field doing research. What is he supposed to do? Come back and say, "I've got some objective data and some constructed"?

Let's go back to credentializing. I think potentially there's a very big problem in California today. Do we credentialize non-registered Mexicans to drive? Credentializing is a qualifier. It qualifies you. I mean that's important, to say we can't give them a driver's license. They're here. We're not throwing them out but we can't give them a driver's license 'cause they're not citizens? We need to qualify them as drivers or they'll be killing people on the roads.

So is that objectivist, constructivist? I mean is it even relevant? But it's a major problem. Personally, I think they should all get driver's licenses. They should be credentialized no matter what. I'm interested in people doing research and getting good names for good latent patterns.

And the social structural control over epistemologies and perspectives is phenomenal. It's just another sociological phenomenon. You could say – according to Parsons, it's a functional requirement that departments have their own epistemology and perspectives and someone wants to grab that prize. But that's another phenomenon in its own right. It's just more data.

MT: Yes, I understand that from the research practice point

of view the epistemological question is irrelevant. It is only further data but there are different ways to deal with data. When **Discovery of Grounded Theory** first came out 40 years ago, you and Strauss challenged the common way to deal with data. You proposed not just verifying preset theory, nor just describing social reality, but generating theory from data. This very simple statement at that time was very revolutionary, since you challenged the dominant paradigm. It is a fact that your contribution influenced and questioned the traditional prevailing epistemological paradigm. So the epistemological issue is not so far from GT, and your sociological revolution effected also at this level and not only in innovating research procedures.

BGG: You could put it on that level. It was also just on the level of how you do research.

But it challenged another way of doing it. See, I'm gaining more and more insight into it. Yes, we challenged a paradigm which is a model for doing research. It was – and it was a pretty fundamental model for research. A lot of these other perspectives are much more in-group and departmental oriented. I guess the paradigm - besides legitimizing the dignifying object, making it sound like science. But it's all just data. It's structures; places. It's big - Parson calls it socially structured vested social fictions that run the world.

MT: In the 40 years, from the very first revolutionary formulation of GT, many things have changed in social sciences. I would like to raise two main debates in particular. One is the new debate about using qualitative and quantitative data in grounded theory. The second is about the interpretive turn in social sciences.

BGG: Regarding the first point. I have always claimed that quantitative data can be used in GT. I am writing a book on quantitative grounded theory, which is a takeoff from that chapter in **Discovery.**

BGG: Regarding the second point, if with the interpretive turn you mean constructivism, just take the example of credentialing nurses by forcing them to get bachelor's degrees. A lot of the credentializing is poo-poo. One of the categories is "I know it all already and why do I have to relearn it." But I

mean credentializing is not an interpretation. It goes on all over to qualify people to do jobs. You want to know they're qualified. They want to be qualified to make income. It's very real. You're flying home. You want a credentialized pilot. You want to know his training.

I think empirically the notion of interpretive and constructivism came out of one – you might say – major but minor form of qualitative research. That is 'depth' interviews. That's like we're talking and I'm feeding you more meanings and you're feeding me meanings and we construct a joint meaning. But most research is just observation and listening.

This long two-hour depth interview can be very constructivist or interpretive and that's different than interpreted data where you tell people the way they're supposed to see it. We did a study of a mental health facility. You never get real data. You get told the way they interpret it as data which is different. That's interpreted data.

MT: So interpreting is nothing more that a further and different kind of data, but it is data. It is not a different kind of stance, a particular posture of the researcher that co-constructs data or that analyses them irrespective of his/her point of view.

BGG: Yeah, it's just data. That's just like proper line. They get mixed. Proper line data is – I've seen it so many times in people starting to study management problems and they go to the workers. Now what worker in his right mind would tell you the truth? Why should he put up his job just to give you reality? He gives you what he knows he's supposed to say, especially if you have a tape recorder going. I mean it's just – you just don't get good data. You get proper lines.

That's one reason I don't like tape recorders because it forces people to tell you what they think they should be saying to cover their ass as opposed to really telling you what's going on. So – but see, none of the people really get it. I mean I've been involved in hundreds of grounded theories and I see all these things and you might say it's so far beyond this perspective and epistemology jargon.

What was it when Diane Vaughn did the study of the crash of – what was it? Apollo 13? And discovered it was

organizationally produced error. A lot of people knew about it but they didn't have the power to stop it and maybe a few people who began to have the power were afraid because it would invalidate schedules and grants. There's a lot of issues involved.

And I would just suggest never do these in-depth interviews although some people do it. And interviews should be very open-ended where you don't say much. You will - what I call - instill a spill. Once you hit relevance then all you have to do is mention it – like I was doing a study of inheritance.

All I had to do was say I'm studying inheritance and they lined up to tell me their story. So there was no interpretivism. There was no mutual construction involved because it dealt with only four things – the anticipation, the actual inheritance, distribution and the use. But to repeat what I just said - one type of data is like another - call it interpretivist or constructivist. It's not relevant for grounded theory generation.

MT: There are several ways to conceive the grounded theory approach. In your opinion, is it a methodology or a method? I have the impression that **Discovery of Grounded Theory** is a methodological book and then years later, probably Theoretical Sensitivity is more concerned about method. What do you think?

BGG: It's a methodology. And a method. Methodology – well, theory is method. It's a theory of how to generate concepts from data that fit, work and are relevant. The books you mentioned, well, they have both dimensions, some more, some less.

MT: Looking at the future, what are, in your opinion, the new challenges or the points in which grounded theory should be improved? Or, what are at present some weak points that looking at the future you think that grounded theory should overcome?

BGG: More people who could be trained adequately. All over the world because it's being used all over the world and people are craving help one way or. You'd be surprised some of the people in the departments that have no notion or are antithetical to it [GT], then see it and they're grabbed by it and

want to do it and they need help.

So that's a need, you might say, a well-run network of people who will help others do it. I don't know if it'll ever be seeded in one department. Well, there are departments who say they train people but it's not really grounded theory. It's more qualitative and some conceptual description. So that's where I see the training and the satisfying.

My books help. I've sent them all over the world and I think we're giving a seminar in China. I go to England. I go to New York. I just had a seminar in Mill Valley. And people come from all over. They want to get trained in the method. They don't like to be minus-mentored in its use. Interesting. So that's a big problem. It will not be seeded in any one department because there's so many people doing it in all kinds of departments.

MT: This seems to be a typical dilemma of the history and the nature of grounded theory. From on one side, you cannot establish canon, a rigid set of procedures, because GT is constitutively against closed, narrow and dogmatic perspectives. It cannot be forced with a predetermined set of detailed guidelines that would frame the data. However, from another side, you have to describe a correct way to do grounded theory.

This is maybe one of the most revolutionary aspects of **Discovery**. Because it is perhaps the first methodological book in qualitative research, seeking to outline systematic procedures for a non-formalized approach where the whole process is not fully controllable in advance.

BGG: Well, wait a minute. GT is procedures-unbendable although people bend them all the time. But they're procedures which open you up as opposed to close you down.

MT: But procedures tend to become rigid and to turn into jargon, canon, mostly when they are written. If you don't give proper training, that quite probably human networks can substitute written canon's orthodoxy. Human networks spread all over the world in training groups that help and support each other. This could probably be a way to disseminate and to preserve grounded theory but not in that rigid – strong and

rigid – way which is, of course, the problem of Strauss and Corbin you mentioned before (as well as forcing data into preconceived thoughts).

BGG: The procedures I'd say they are rigorous in what you do as you move along to discovery. They help you discover and keep you open.

That's the big problem today. More and more people are trying to do it. I mean there's some guy in the Philippines screaming for help because there's too many things that's bullshit and he needs help. He's doing a marvelous study on how to particularize the universal. This is really good. He's a monk and his order has a universal need to help at-risk adolescents, right? You know, it's altruistic. It's ideological. He goes out and studies it. Do they help at-risk adolescents?

They particularize the universal to a small group of adolescents who are smart, sane and capable of learning. They are the dangerous ones. And so they maintain this front that they're helping people and indeed the people they help are really helped but there's another whole group who really needs help who aren't getting help.

And in the bargain, by particularizing the universal, they become altruistic which makes them look even better because they get so excited about – you know, have you taught a good student who learns and how exciting it is? They get so excited they work 12 hours a day instead of the required 8 so they chalk it up to altruism and that's perfect fiction. I mean in reality it produces the fiction to become like them and these are Jesuit monks or Buddhist monks. I'm not sure. …

But this goes on all the time. It goes on in schools when teachers pick up the best students. It's such a universal and accepted thing. I read another study where people privatized public education tracks. They're getting involved in a merit system situation and they buy out the merit. Social influence, money, etc.

Like getting their kids into the best math class even though they're not good at math - or getting kids into the best college. But the front is public and the path has been privatized. Interesting. It doesn't matter. It's the same pattern.

…

Interview conducted in Mill Valley, California, July 2006

Author:

Massimiliano Tarozzi teaches Qualitative Research Methods at the University of Trento (Italy). He has translated (into Italian) **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** (Roma: Armando Editore, in press), and he is author of the methodological book **Che cos'è la grounded theory** [What is Grounded Theory] (Roma: Carocci, in press).

Email: tarozzi@form.unitn.it

After Discovery: Growing Success

The following commentaries are offered in tribute to Barney Glaser for his contributions to research, knowledge and the careers of so many …

Grounded Theory 40 Years – A Jubilee Extraordinaire

Evert Gummesson, Ph.D.

Had I known when I was 40 what I know now, I would have devoted my research to 1.) grounded theory (GT) and 2.) the family called complexity theory (CT), developed within natural sciences but with equal relevance for social sciences, and of which network theory is part. GT and CT alike are theories of life and methods of investigating and learning about life. They are even lifestyles. They are not in competition but supplementary. In fact, GT would mix well in the CT family.

So maybe my life after 40 has been wasted, but no, that sounds too "rational." I needed the time to mature. And if I can't profit from all of my current insights in this life, I am well prepared for my next incarnation.

GT researchers are the postmodern alchemists who transform the concrete mud of substantive data into the golden wisdom of formal and abstract concepts of divine validity. They are postmodern in the sense that they are not stuck in the mud of received wisdom; they are intellectual and disrespectful rebels.

Las Vegas had its Siegfried & Roy, taming white tigers and dazzling the audience with illusions. Just as full of magic but devoid of illusions, sociology has its Barney & Anselm. Be it that GT was created by two gentlemen, but it is not a macho theory. It is androgynous, an amalgam of female and male qualities. Or yin and yang, if you wish. Although GT is structured and rigorous (male) it is equally flexible, intuitive and common-sensical (female). And through GT reality gently emerges (female); it is not the outcome of crude forcing (male).

Although GT is described as theory generating it is equally theory testing. Not in the sense that it is there to tell how stupid received theories were, but to offer improved theory. In doing so it is a parallel to what total quality management from industry calls "continual improvement." Constant comparison

leads to constant improvement. So if the new theory works better it should automatically replace old theory. No confrontation necessary, no defense necessary.

But the conventional scientific community and the frail persona of the bulk of professors are reluctant to accept innovation, especially if it means quantum leaps. So it takes time. Despite this, I am happy to say that GT is getting more and more into the business schools. It is still a rare but colorful bird among the black and white ones that populate their methodological zoo. In economics I see little progress. It is so prejudiced by obsolete theory and methodological ritualism in which reality and its complexity has little place – despite the fact that the economy of the world, of nations and industries is characterized by extreme complexity and in need of a theoretical overhaul. I am convinced that if more GT studies were made in management and economics our social map would change. Both disciplines, much more so economics ("We are a mature science!") than business and management (according to economists an immature "science"), are addicted to forcing and deductive testing of received theory. They urgently need to get their act together and go into rehab. I am convinced that if GT became mandatory as research approach in business schools and economics departments, the two disciplines would be reinvented.

So what is the conclusion? Very obvious, GT is not a middle-aged theory and methodology. It is a timeless, rebellious youngster.

<div align="right">--- September 21, 2007</div>

Author
Evert Gummesson, Ph.D.
Professor of Marketing and Management
Stockholm University School of Business
Email: eg@fek.su.se

Homage à Barney Glaser's Discovery

Hans Thulesius, Ph.D.

> *In the 60's a time of progress and resurgence*
>
> *A bright guy from Frisco uncovered emergence*
>
> *Away with conjecture and fanciful fictions*
>
> *Coding for concepts gives grounded predictions*
>
> *Let's cheer for the man who discovered emergence*[1]

It is 40 years since "Discovery of Grounded Theory" and seven years since I discovered classic GT. And it all happened because Barney Glaser came to my small Swedish hometown for a three hour seminar. These years have been truly exciting. I have experienced so much creativity in my research thanks to the method. And GT has also released originality in my research, which gave me a Dissertation-of-the-year award in Swedish family medicine in 2003. Post-doc it has secured me a research position with a lot of freedom allowing me to go on using GT in various fields. So it is true as Barney says that GT gives autonomy to the researcher.

GT the way Barney teaches it is especially exciting since he, as a person, embodies the method. He walks the way he talks and uses GT analysis for everything in his life. Sociology Press, his investment company, all the houses he builds, the GT seminars, and of course all the books he has written. Everything based on GT analysis. That is amazing and sets an example. As he says "If the method is that good, why don't you use it on your own life? Take notes!" GT really has potential that at least I myself have yet to discover.

When I ordered my first book from Sociology Press in April

---

[1] This light-hearted limerick was composed and recited by Hans Thulesius at a special tribute dinner for Barney Glaser, at Clos Maggiore, Covent Garden, London, April 24, 2007

2000 (**Doing Grounded Theory**, which I have since translated into Swedish), it arrived with a handwritten line from Barney. Ever since, he has personally been there with support. And even though it was sometimes just a two-word e-mail reply to a multi-paragraph text, it has really meant a lot every time I have gotten something from Barney. Why? Well I guess it has to do with Barney's genius in combination with his honesty and generosity. He wants to help as many as possible and thus has to discipline time use. At the same time, ever since his dissertation on scientists' recognition, he knows how important recognition is in all types of human activity.

The importance of **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** since 1967 in the world of behavioral science is significant. In November 2007, the book got 8545 citation hits on Google Scholar. No other method book dealing with qualitative data analysis gets even half that many citations. The Strauss and Corbin book, **Basics of Qualitative Research** (1998), got 2957 and the Denzin and Lincoln (1994) **Handbook of Qualitative Research** got 3332. One of Barney's own comments on that comparison is - and this is a real e-mail quote - "Hans, as I have said, if nothing else, I gave the world a jargon that legitimizes. Barney".

-- November 18, 2007

Author:
Hans Thulesius, GP, Ph.D.
Kronoberg County Research Centre
Department of Community Medicine
Vaxjo, SE
Email: hans.thulesius@ltkronoberg.se

A Tribute to the Fortieth Anniversary of Classic Grounded Theory

Alvita Nathaniel, Ph.D.

This year celebrates the 40th anniversary of the groundbreaking text, **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** (1967)*,* which was co-authored by sociologists Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss. Funded by a Public Health Service Research Grant from the Division of Nursing, **Discovery** was at the forefront of the postpositivist era during which social scientists were beginning to develop new ways to conceptualize and predict human behavior. Glaser and Strauss broke new ground as they described an inductive method which "discovers" theoretically complete explanations about particular phenomena. Today, classic grounded theory is gaining popularity due, in large measure, to the continued leadership of Barney Glaser.

Grounded theory flows naturally from the co-developer's backgrounds. Glaser studied quantitative and qualitative math at Columbia University with Lazarsfeld, *explication de text* at the University of Paris, and theory construction with Robert Merton. Strauss studied symbolic interactionism with Blumer at the University of Chicago (Glaser, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Traces of each of these influences are easily identified in the method. Glaser, the first author of **Discovery**, has continued to clarify the grounded theory method as first described in 1967 (1978, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2007).

Since before the time of Aristotle, scientists and philosophers have debated the scientific method, placing greater confidence in either induction or deduction as methods trended in popularity. Grounded theory countered the dominant view in the 1960's that the only scientifically sound form of systematic social inquiry consisted of positivist methods. Classic grounded theory gave a new structure to inductive research and garnered respect because it took advantage of reputable mathematic quantitative and qualitative ideas. Although a number of people have attempted

to derive variations based upon the method as first described in **Discovery**, Charmaz (2002) agrees with Glaser (1998) that his is the pure version of grounded theory.

Glaser (1999) calls grounded theory a "total methodological package," providing systematic methods for collecting data and establishing theoretically complete, publishable theory, rich in "imageric concepts" and perceptual power. Glaser (1999) depicts grounded substantive theory as a "third perceptual-level theory," moving from empirical data to concepts that are then transcended to the core variables of substantive theory.

Glaser continually reminds us that theory represents truth only insofar as it systematically presents concepts and processes that are grounded in data from real-life situations. The goal of grounded theory "is to generate a theory that accounts for a pattern of behavior which is relevant and problematic for those involved" (Glaser, 1978, p. 93). Grounded theory is based upon assumptions that both knowledge and people are dynamic and that context facilitates, hinders, or otherwise influences human goals and social psychological processes (Benoliel, 1996). Frequently, the theoretical codes and categories in grounded theories are derived from one or both of the two types of basic social process. Widely attributed to Glaser, *basic social processes* "are theoretical reflections and summarizations of the patterned, systematic uniformity flows of social life which people go through, and which can be conceptually 'captured' and further understood through the construction of basic social process theories" (Glaser 1978, p. 100).

When done properly, classic grounded theory differs from other research methods in that it renders neither story nor description. It provides a conceptual representation of the world as it is. Grounded theory gives us a way of looking at the facts: of organizing, synthesizing, transcending, and representing them. Concurrent with its conceptualizations of empiric data, the logic of theory also serves as a device for interpreting, criticizing, and unifying established theories and modifying them to fit unanticipated data and to guide the discovery of new and more powerful generalizations. Thus as

Glaser suggests, "all is data."

This unifying view is unique in that it leads to theories that are easily modified as new data is encountered. As Kaplan stated, "Truth may be eternal, but science requires no more of a theory than it be sufficient unto the day (Kaplan, 1964, p. 315). Unlike the "results" of other methods, grounded theory culminates in an integrated set of tentative conceptual hypotheses that can be modified with further study. Grounded theories are symbolic representation of people's experiences. As the data are gathered, compared, conceptualized, and analyzed, patterns emerge. This is one of the unique and practical features of classic grounded theory: it is neither elitist nor rarefied; rather, it is a representation of truth as perceived by study participants.

Glaser reminds us that two elements of grounded theory safeguard against inherited dogma: empirical grounding and constant comparison. Glaser (1965) proposed constant comparison as a key intellectual strategy of grounded theory analysis. Theory emerges as the investigator goes back and forth in an iterative process constantly comparing sentence to sentence, incident to incident, incident to concept, concept to concept, concept to extant literature and so forth (Glaser, 1965, 1998). This method of constant comparison leads to the modifiable character of grounded theory. It also increases formal abstraction and corrects for poor data as it brings the theory into closer grounding (Glaser, 1965, 1999).

Since the publication of **Discovery**, Glaser has maintained intellectual curiosity and a belief in the value of the grounded theory method. He has written scores of books and scholarly papers about the method. Four decades after developing the classic grounded theory method with Strauss, Glaser published a long-anticipated follow-up monograph that details the method for generating formal grounded theory (2007). Although **Discovery** and Glaser's other books offer hints about formal grounded theory, this is the first definitive guide for researcher-theorists. This monograph should provide the inspiration and direction needed by researcher-theorists to generate formal grounded theory—new territory for grounded

theorists. Not one to rest on his laurels, today Glaser is in the midst of a new book outlining how GT can be used as a quantitative method.

Glaser is a prolific writer and also a vibrant teacher. Well into his 70's, he continues to conduct small group seminars to help PhD candidates from around the globe as they begin grounded theory research. During the seminars, Glaser's informal style encourages scholarly interchange as new researchers learn the intricacies of the method. Few universities have faculty with classic grounded theory expertise, so Glaser and a small experienced group of classic grounded theorists support and mentor PhD candidates. The seminars help participants to understand classic grounded theory, which is paradoxically simple yet complex. With the simple goal of understanding "what is going on" in people's lives, one must know the foundations of the *methodology* in order to understand each element of the *method*.

Glaser is patient and generous as he helps to move novice PhD candidates through the process of learning grounded theory. The method so captures participants, that many return to seminars to further develop expertise and later to share knowledge with upcoming novices. It is fascinating to watch participants as a seminar progresses. Seminars include diverse groups of people—nurses, mathematicians, business executives, physicians, journalists, educators, social workers, and others—who might ordinarily have little interest in research outside their own sphere. Yet during a seminar, participants truly engage with each other because grounded theory, by its very definition, describes conditions that are important and have "grab." Animated scholarly discussions continue through meals and late into the night and informal mentorship bonds are formed that often carry through the dissertation process. Seminar participants are making a difference in the scholarly arena as they take the classic method back to their countries, universities, and disciplines.

On a personal note, I will always be grateful to Glaser who mentored me as I learned grounded theory. I began theory development after attending one of Glaser's seminars. Later, he

mentored me through the dissertation process. His patient guidance helped me to have the courage to speak with my own voice and to develop an original theory. Had I not had the privilege of his mentorship, I might have succumbed to popular notion that students should join the ongoing research of faculty mentors and likely would have produced tentative, preconceived, "tiny topic" research of marginal importance.

In conclusion, we celebrate together the 40th anniversary of Glaser and Strauss's groundbreaking text, **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** and the untiring and generous efforts of Barney Glaser, the true "father" of the method. Theorists from around the globe prove that classic grounded theory provides a structured and rigorous means to discover theoretically complete explanations about phenomena that are problematic and important to those involved. This diverse community of classic grounded theorists acknowledges the responsibility to assist Glaser and to mentor upcoming generations of novice grounded theorists.

-- November 16, 2007

Author:
Alvita Nathaniel, Ph.D., DSN, APRN, BC
Director, Nurse Practitioner Track
School of Nursing
West Virginia University
Charleston, WV
Email: anathaniel@hsc.wvu.edu

References

Benoliel, J. Q. (1996). Grounded theory and nursing knowledge [Electronic version]. *Qualitative Health Research, 6*(3), 406-429.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems, 12,* 436-446.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory: Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (Ed.). (1996). Gerund Grounded Theory: The basic social process dissertation. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing Grounded Theory: Issues and discussion.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1999). The future of grounded theory [Electronic version]. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(6), 856-10.

Glaser, B. G. (2001). The Grounded Theory Perspective: Conceptualization contrasted with description. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2003). The Grounded Theory Perspective II: Description's remodeling of grounded theory methodology. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G. (2007). *Doing Formal Grounded Theory: A proposal*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Kaplan, A. (1964). *The Conduct of Inquiry.* San Francisco: Chandler.

Reflections on 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory'

Tom Andrews RN; B.Sc. (Hons); M.Sc., Ph.D.

The seminal book by Glaser and Strauss (1967) was a write up of how their study on awareness of dying was done, thus was grounded theory (GT) discovered and not invented (Glaser, 1978). To be able to appreciate the impact that the publication of **Discovery** has on research and qualitative research in particular, it is necessary to understand the context within which it was written. Since grounded theory has had the greatest impact on qualitative research, this paper will briefly discuss the state of this research method during this period.

Historically qualitative research was defined within the positivist paradigm where qualitative researchers attempted to do good positivist research with less rigorous methods and procedures. At this time researchers had limited methodologies to choose from and included experimental design and survey research. Field research methods had wanted and were viewed as a preliminary step in refining instruments for use in quantitative research (Charmaz, 1995). Methodology books focused on theory verification and as a result, there were very few sociological theories (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). By the 1960s qualitative research had lost credibility among an increasing number of sociologists, since they believed that it was not capable of verification (Strauss and Corbin, 1994). The resultant ascendancy of quantitative methodology led to a growing division between theory and empirical research (Charmaz 2000). The dominant sociological paradigm at the time was structuralism and its statistical hypothetical-deductive methods of data analysis (Stern and Covan, 2001)which Glaser and Strauss regarded as inordinately speculative and deductive in nature (Strauss and Corbin, 1994). it was a common practice to deduce theory which was seldom related to data (Glaser, 1998) resulting in an embarrassing gap between theory and empirical research

(Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Qualitative researchers wrote research reports that reflected the positivist paradigm and they were concerned with offering objective interpretations of their findings (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). With the publication of their methodology book "Discovery" this view was challenged. It also challenged the assumptions of qualitative research as preliminary; the quest for rigour made qualitative research illegitimate the separation of data collection and analysis; qualitative research could produce only descriptive case studies rather than theory development (Charmaz, 1995). Although there were attempts to formalise qualitative methods, they used the rhetoric and language of positivism (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994) and were not rigorous (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Glaser and Strauss were among the first to provide written guidelines for systematic qualitative data analysis with explicit analytical procedures and research strategies (Charmaz, 2000).

What is not fully appreciated in the research literature is that **Discovery** was meant to be a beginning, implying that it should form the basis for further development of the methodology (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This has of course subsequently happened with the publication of several methodology books further explicating the method, beginning with **Theoretical Sensitivity** (Glaser, 1978) and continuing with **Doing Formal Grounded Theory** (Glaser, 2007). It continues to provide a strong rationale underpinning qualitative research (Strauss and Corbin, 1994). This may partially explain one of the most pressing challenges to grounded theory: the eroding and continuing re-writing of the method. This may in part be explained by the fact that it has given qualitative researchers a ready made language that they can use to legitimise their studies but has in the process served to subvert grounded theory, resulting in complexifying a simple methodology (Glaser, 2003). In recent writings there have been attempts to reclaim and emphasise the conceptual nature of grounded theory in order to counter the re-writing of the methodology (Glaser, 2003) by reclaiming and emphasising this erosion of the method. A positive challenge for classical grounded theorists is the generation of formal theory.

Currently there are very few examples of such development. This will have the effect of further developing this underrated potential of the method as well as emphasising its conceptual nature, helping to differentiate it from qualitative methodologies.

In my own profession of nursing, grounded theory has been very influential being the second most popular qualitative research method used (Morse, 2001). When I first started my PhD, I was influenced by a sociologist who directed me to read social constructionism. It was only later that my supervisor suggested that my area of study might be better served by using GT. While reading **Discovery**, I realised that this method was unlike the grounded theory that I had been taught during methods classes. This highlights the importance of reading primary sources. Initially I found **Discovery** a sometimes difficult read. This may be because (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) were intent on stating their position rather than providing clear-cut procedures. Also Glaser (1998) admits that some of his writings can be dense and difficult to understand! I read other papers on the methodology, but while they helped me to understand GT, they seemed to me to deviate from how it was originated. I read studies that were based on the work of Strauss and Corbin but they were largely descriptive and some were critical as this particular interpretation of GT generated too many categories. Having read **Theoretical Sensitivity** I dipped in and to of **Discovery** during my period of study. It helped me greatly to understand GT and is a book that I continue to read. It keeps me focused on GT's conceptual nature and its power for generating theory. There is no doubt that **Discovery** requires persistence and study in order to fully appreciate it as the seminal text of GT. In using classical GT, I found that it liberated me from the difficult and sometimes circular debate about realism versus relativism that is central to understanding social constructionism. I was attracted by its pragmatic approach, its emphasis on discovery rather than on issues of ontology and epistemology. The idea of understanding and conceptualising the main concern of participants appealed to me. The method was very well suited to the real world of nursing and the issue I was researching.

There is no doubt that **Discovery** has made a unique contribution to advancing research methodologies. In making explicit how the "Awareness" study was done, it ensured the discovery of a new methodology. There was nothing like it previously and as a result it was at the forefront of the qualitative revolution (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). It was simply a new and very different way of thinking and researching. As a result, qualitative methodology was advanced at a time when it was dominated by the positivist paradigm and provided credibility to a largely discredited methodology. Its influence has extended far beyond sociology into such diverse areas as business, management, medicine and nursing. Moreover, it continues to be the basis for the refinement and extension of classical grounded theory. Personally, it delivered on its promise of guiding me from when I entered the field until I left, with a study that was original, ensuring that I was able to generate a theory of relevance and significance. With the challenge to generate formal theories from substantive ones and further explication of its use with quantitative data, the full potential of GT is at last being realised. It has made such an impact that it is impossible to visualise a world without **Discovery**.

-- November 10, 2007

Author:
Tom Andrews, Ph.D.
School of Nursing and Midwifery
University College Cork, IRL
Email: t.andrews@ucc.ie

References

Charmaz, K. (1995). Grounded Theory. In: Smith, J., Harre, R., and Van Langehove, L. (Eds.), *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*. Sage, London.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory objectivist and constructivist method. In: Denzin, N. and Lincon, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oakes, pp. 509-535.

Denzin, N. and Lincon, Y. (1994). Introduction. In: Denzin, N. and Lincon, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 1-17.

Glaser, B. (1978). Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory. Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing Grounded Theory: Issues and discussions*. Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Glaser, B. (2003). The Grounded Theory Perspective II: Description's remodelling of grounded theory methodology. Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Glaser, B. (2007). *Doing Formal Grounded Theory: A proposal*. Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Aldine De Gruyter, New York.

Morse, J. (2001). Introduction. In: Schreiber, R. and Stern, P. (Eds.), *Using Grounded Theory in Nursing*. Springer Publishing Company Inc., New York, pp. xvi-xvii.

Stern, P. and Covan, E. (2001). Early Grounded Theory: Its Processes and Procedures. In: Schreiber, R. and Stern, P. (Eds.), *Using Grounded Theory in Nursing*. Springer Publishing Company, New York.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory Methodology. In: Denzin, N. and Lincon, Y. (Eds.),

Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage Publications, Thousand Oakes, pp. 273-285.

In Honour of Barney Glaser: A man of many contrasts – innovator, mentor, and snappy dresser!

Antoinette M. McCallin, Ph.D.

I first met Barney Glaser in 1996 at one of the earliest troubleshooting meetings at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand. About forty people from all over New Zealand, plus a couple of Australians attended that meeting. People had travelled very long distances for the privilege of hearing one of the originators of grounded theory speak about the methodology, and how it should be used.

A couple of memories stand out for me. The first was the revelation that Dr Barney Glaser, the author of the seminal works on grounded theory, was such a snappy dresser! He was beautifully turned out, arriving one day in a warm rose cashmere pullover, and beautifully cut traditional dark blue blazer and slacks. The outfit on the second day was the country tweed theme and was just as exquisite. The man looked magnificent! And, while it might be argued that Carolyn's unfailing eye for design and beauty was evident there, what surprised me most was how well he had read the context of the day. As an old Cantabrian, brought up Christchurch, I had been well schooled in the "correct" behaviour and dress, as per the norms and values handed on down from the first four ships that arrived in New Zealand with English settlers for a new colony and a city that was to become more English than the English itself. Barney read that social context unerringly. That picture contrasts with another view of Barney seen on a recent trip to San Francisco earlier this year. Encountering Barney on his home territory was rather different. One day I was sitting in the hotel lobby when a little red mini, the latest model I believe, zipped into the car park, and out leapt a man in what can only be described as "comfortable" grey sweats. Yes, Barney Glaser no less, sporting the "relaxed look", as was appropriate in California and Mill Valley, where he informed me, most people work from home.

You may well ask what this has to do with the more serious topic of classic grounded theory. It possibly reflects Barney Glaser's innate ability to change with the times, adapt sensitively to the context, and to read what is needed in any situation. When that is combined with an insightful personality, a tireless energy, and the willingness to share his expertise nationally and internationally, the calibre and sheer magnitude of this man begins to emerge. Barney's ongoing questioning and lively critique of the world we live in is perhaps typical of the inquiring mind that asked so many questions about traditional research methods in the 1960s. This was trail-blazing work at a time when long-standing research approaches did not explain the practical realities of a rapidly changing socio-cultural context.

Producing **The Discovery of Grounded Theory** forty years ago, and articulating strategies for qualitative researchers to develop theoretical explanations of the world, was ground breaking in a scientific world where positivism dominated. Since then grounded theory has become the most used qualitative methodology internationally. Barney's commitment to travelling the world and his willingness to work with novice grounded theorists everywhere, to coach researchers to develop a clear, unadulterated understanding of grounded theory, is impressive. The message is simple: Move beyond description! Conceptualise! Conceptualise! Conceptualise! Trust in emergence!

As a workshop attendee, several things stand out about Barney Glaser. Firstly, his unpretentiousness about who he is, always makes an impression. Newcomers to a workshop often enter nervously, shy about being "in the presence of the great man". Barney unfailingly puts people at their ease, working alongside individuals respectfully, recognising just how far to challenge, always gentle, forever patient. Secondly, Barney's ongoing enthusiasm for classic grounded theory never flags, and is integrated with a thoughtful sensitivity to the struggles of students often working in isolation in remote areas of the globe. Encouragement is offered, tempered with a deep wisdom about human nature, and a quick sense of humour to lighten the situation, if needs be. The result is that those of us who

have been fortunate enough to attend workshops come away feeling empowered to follow the methodology, to learn more about the methodological challenges, and overall, to develop ourselves as rigorous researchers, generating knowledge as it was intended all those years ago in 1967.

Returning from whence we began - when I met Barney Glaser in 1996, he signed my copy of **Theoretical Sensitivity** with the caption "To Antoinette, who *feels* the method!" Apparently, my face is somewhat expressive, and shows interest, excitement, not to mention "time for a break" and "where's the coffee?" Unknowingly, I had been the responsiveness gage for the group, helping Barney pace his workshop. As he continues to "pace" classic grounded theory development people like myself, welcome the chance to join with other like-minded researchers, to gather together in hotels, lobby's, pubs, in all manner of eating places, on the Internet of course, not to mention airport lounges, and even airport shuttles, happy to settle down for a discussion of what has come to be known as "GT". In many diverse settings, with people from different countries we share our insights, experiences, trials and tribulations, so we can all move forward as worthy representatives of our mentor, Dr Barney Glaser. I for one have come a long way in the last decade. Two grounded theories later, pluralistic dialoguing and humanistic guidance I have finally learned how to conceptualise! The next challenge is formal theory development. *Feeling* the method has been fun, exciting, and challenging, it has opened up the creative part of scholarliness that I did not expect to find in research. I do not think any of that would have been possible without the inspiration from Barney himself. On behalf of all New Zealand grounded theorists, I salute you and thank you for your original contribution to science.

-- November 11, 2007

Author:
Antoinette M. McCallin, Ph.D., RN
Head of Research, Division of Health Care Practice
Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences
AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand
Email: amccalli@aut.ac.nz

Tribute to Barney Glaser

Mark Rosenbaum, Ph.D.

If one understands the tenets of Glaserian grounded theory, then one understands the process of knowledge creation. Indeed, the greatest "seed" that Barney Glaser implanted in my mind is that knowledge is not created via empirical verification, but rather, it is simply validated as being extant. When researchers combine theory A and theory B, to generate a new relationship, which I'll refer to latent variable C, they are not creating knowledge—they are merely verifying what is already known. Even if one wants to argue that latent variable C is novel, then consider this reality. Consider the situation when a researcher states that Author A developed theory A and that Author B developed theory B. This author, Author C, argues that knowledge was created because s/he thought it novel to simultaneously draw upon Authors A & B to create theory C. Had Author A and B met for lunch, then Author C would have no reason to exist. Researchers who combine extant theories may create a "better recipe," however; these researchers are falling prey to "theoretical capitalism." As Glaser would say, theoretical capitalism provides researchers with a false sense of security and with research that lacks theoretical grab. Author C is simply verifying what is already known—*interesting but boring*.

Grounded theory is a methodology that should be utilized by researchers who want to be original and who have the intellectual stamina to offer respective disciplines original theoretical ideas that may be controversial. A grounded theorist does not relish the comfort of drawing upon extant works in the hopes of yielding a minor contribution or of finding new correlations between established theories. A grounded theorist is a risk taker who believes that s/he can generate original knowledge by offering the discipline novel theories that not only organize a set of disparate articles but also transcend them. A grounded theorist offers the world theoretical frameworks that grab attention from researchers in a variety of

fields as well as research propositions that can be empirical verified in future or current studies.

Indeed, I can personally attest to the fact that researchers from America, Philippines, and Singapore have personally asked me whether they can develop scales for my "Theory of Third Places" and whether they can verify my theory in future studies. On the one hand, I'm honored that my grounded theory has garnered international attention. On the other, I cannot help to think that these researchers are merely validating the theory in other contexts. Rather than validate my theory, I try to encourage researchers to transcend it or to expand my substantive theory to a general theory. In fact, one of my students applied my theory to her hospital and developed an off-site "third place" for Hispanic women that combines coffee and medical knowledge. Clearly, taking a grounded theory to a new context, to a new population, and to offer new dependent relationships to the core category, is more original and transcendental than creating scale items for a proposed theory (interest vs. boredom).

I salute Barney Glaser for teaching me how to create knowledge and how to transcend original thought. I salute him for teaching me to be aware of falling prey to theoretical capitalism and to assume the challenges inherent in creating new knowledge. I salute him for teaching me how to use theoretical grab to create interesting theories. I salute him for giving me the courage to generate novel frameworks that organize disparate works, but, more importantly, which transcend extant knowledge. I salute him for teaching me how to understand the movement from theoretical induction to theoretical verification. Lastly, I salute Barney Glaser for helping me become a successful academic.

Author:
Mark S. Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
Northern Illinois University
College of Business, Department of Marketing
DeKalb, IL
Email: mrosenbaum@niu.edu

Atmosphering for Learning
Astrid Gynnild, Ph.D.

When reflecting on the impact of Barney Glaser and classic GT, the first concept that comes to mind is Barney's own "atmosphering". And I think I'd like to add "for learning". After studying Barney Glaser's GT books, going to many GT-seminars and getting to know Barney personally, it strikes me that atmosphering for learning is a continuous challenge when exploring the potentials of the methodology. The more I learn, the more humble I get towards this, in many ways, "taken-for-granted" aspect of doing research.

Atmosphering for learning concerns both the researcher and the researchees involved in a study, and also students and the audience. Atmosphering for learning is about toning, creating a mood in oneself and others that opens up for new ways of seeing, hearing and experiencing. The great challenge is for the researcher to create a climate that makes everybody feel well to the extent that they too let go of presuppositions, scepticism, anxiety and other thoughts that block free thinking. Consequently, atmosphering for learning also concerns research credibility, relevance and fit. It's a way of building up trust in relations and a way of establishing full contact with others in a minimum of time. In one way, the four levels of data operant in grounded theory simply reflect the researcher's closeness to his human sources. Thereby, feedback is also provided about the researcher's own atmosphering skills.

Atmosphering for learning includes writing and teaching as well as informal face-to-face-settings. Since Barney long ago has identified many facets of atmosphering, I will restrict myself to four aspects of his embodied seminar approach that have been particularly important to me. These are aspects that are transferable to all arenas of life where the goal is to connect trustingly with others.

The first is informal socializing as a warm-up to hard and concentrated work. Informal socializing can for instance be done by inviting people out for dinner the day before the

formalized part of the event starts. The second is the use of warm-hearted irony, in Barney's own terms reversal humor. Approaching people with reversal humor is quite a risky business, actually. But when you succeed, it's an incredible mind opener because it creates a feeling of being on the same wavelength, of being understood and having something special in common. Reversal humor is both intensifying and relaxing. It certainly keeps you awake and in particular, it provokes reflection.

The third aspect that fascinates me is the dressing down approach. I remember the first time I actually met Barney Glaser face to face. He was wearing an old college sweater, a pair of Levi's jeans and grey jogging shoes. I'm not sure what I had expected beforehand but there is little doubt that the dressing down code contributes to demystifying a person's expertise, talent and fame. Symbolically, the relaxed dress code signalizes that in spite of exceptional research contributions, Barney's still one of "us" so students don't have to keep themselves back; and since he is trustable, they can open up. Dressing down also demonstrates that doing research of importance doesn't depend neither on a specific dress code nor need it be done only within traditional organizational frames; it can be done anywhere, on a smaller or larger scale by all kinds of people, as long as they are abstract thinkers who know how to conceptualize.

I'd also like to mention the practicing of inclusiveness – "there is no such thing as a silly question", and the practicing of caring curiosity and supportive clarity. As Barney says himself, he easily gets along with people. He is concerned about helping as many students as possible getting their GT PhDs and does so by being open and direct and clear. Nobody should be in doubt about his opinion!

On a walking-survey-level of analysis, I believe that Barney's main concern is contributing to spreading classic grounded theory methodology all over the globe, in all ways possible, in order to help people grow and raise their levels of skill and understanding, and thereby developing society as a whole. The good will that radiates through all his professional

work is supported by a lifelong devotion to idealistic research values, manifested through non-profit books, seminars, individual supervising and the running of the website.

His liveliness and playfulness displays itself side by side with empathetic curiosity, serious research efficiency, and an inner motivation so thoroughly grounded that the methodology is taken a step further for every new book, which in practice means almost every year. The quick switching between modes and roles makes Barney an intuitive expert in theoretical discovery as well as exploration and development.

In my view, most of his talents are synthesized in an atmosphering for learning approach to tasks and people. After 40 years of GT and hundreds of new theories I think we may say that the recipe has proven to be quite successful!

-- November 20, 2007

Author:
Astrid Gynnild, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Head of Department
Centre for Relational Development
Bergen, NO
Email: agynnild@gmail.com

The Flocking Process

Walter D. Fernández, Ph.D.

We all know of Barney Glaser's brilliance and academic contribution; however, in this brief note, I would like to reflect on some of the properties that enabled a brilliant person like him to become the great person he is.

My first real encounter with Barney Glaser was over a short number of emails. I was then finishing my PhD dissertation for which I adopted the classic grounded theory methodology and I had a question for him. Of that particular interaction I would like to highlight the manner in which Barney Glaser responded to my query. Not only was Glaser kind, understanding and reassuring, he also displayed his immense generosity by volunteering to review my methodology chapter. I felt honoured and also a bit anxious; I was one of those PhD candidates who "learned" the method from books and convincing my advisers of the virtues of grounded theory was *interesting*, to say the least. My first exchange with the master was a crucial and very positive experience from which I received far more than a technical answer to a question. Glaser gave me the confidence to complete and defend my dissertation and a practical lesson in collegiality. However, it would take some time before I was able to see a pattern in his actions, a discovery that occurred during my second significant encounter with Glaser.

Our second meeting was in Mill Valley, California, in 2005. I was invited to observe one of Glaser's great "troubleshooting workshops" and jumped at the opportunity. After the workshop, I wrote that the seminar was a truly remarkable experience "where people who are passionate and learned about the grounded theory method enacted an instance of a *flocking process*." We were researchers from many different fields, a truly cross-disciplinary group of scientists from different continents. Yet, these differences were irrelevant, we were united by a way of thinking and doing research, we had the common language and rituals of the

grounded theory method. Sharing our beliefs, experiences and values made us a flock. The flocking process is a *becoming process* where people form a single congregation in relation to their teacher-pastor.

Glaser was the "pastor" of the flock, playing a pivotal role in the flocking process. As the properties of the pastor emerged, we could see Barney Glaser as a gentle, good humoured, wise person who combines a brilliant intellect with the best of human nature and kindness. Barney Glaser is the ultimate teacher, to whom we are indebted not only because of his discovery, with Strauss, all those years ago, but because he is the core variable that makes the process possible.

Grounded evidence of the flocking process exists in my data. For example, reflecting on the seminar, Antoinette McCallin stated that she felt specially privileged as "part of the international grounded theory community of scholars" and that the experience "was like coming home to my research family." Antoinette's sentiment was echoed in correspondence from every participant. Being part of the *family*, sharing values, concepts and approaches unifies the flock. Furthermore, the concept of family is linked to two other important elements, identified as key enabler in this brief theory of scholarly flocking: *generosity* and *humility*.

After comparing evidence from this core event with evidence from previous and subsequent grounded theory events, I can assert without trepidation that the theme of *generosity* runs strongly not only in Barney Glaser but also in his family and in the grounded theory community. Glaser teaches us that generosity coupled with humility allows us to learn and teach, to remain open to evidence and to try to understand *what is going on*. In other words, the ability to put aside preconception demands both generosity and humility.

We know that words are important teaching tools and they are necessary, but also that they are not sufficient to teach generosity or humility. What makes Barney Glaser such a great teacher of uncommon concepts is the power of enhancing his well-timed words with the absolute congruence of his actions. Barney Glaser is grounded theory enacted; after forty

years he remains open and committed to a way of investigating reality, to teach and to learn. His commitment, his generosity and his humility make the flocking process possible, benefiting our research community and helping us to try to understand what is going on in our lives.

Reflecting on the workshop allowed me to think about the properties I admire in Barney Glaser, the great teacher of our diverse flock. After that week in Mill Valley I returned to Australia reinvigorated and enlightened by this friendly and smiling sage, who can simultaneously be a recognized figure of the 20th century's sociology and the most humble and charming of human beings.

-- November 12, 2007

Author:
Walter Fernández, Ph.D.
Co-Director, National Centre for Information Systems Research
School of Accounting and Business Information Systems
ANU College of Business and Economics
The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200
Email: walter.fernandez@anu.edu.au

Thank You for the Method

I'm nothing special, in fact I'm a bit of a bore,
If I tell a joke, you've probably heard it before.
But I generate grounded theory,
It fits and it works and it's relevant too.
I'm so grateful and proud,
All I want is to sing it out loud, so I say...

Refrain:
Thank you for the method, for Grounded Theory,
Thanks for all the joy it's bringing.
Who can live without it, I ask in all honesty,
What would life be, without a method to use what are we.
So I say thank you for discovering and giving it to me.

I know a method I trust in and it's not a bore,
When you start to use it, you need to go strait to the core.
And if you have wondered, how did it all start?
Who found out that nothing can capture a heart
Like a grounded theory?
Well, it's Barney and I am a fan, so I say...

Refrain:
Thank you for the method, for Grounded Theory,
Thanks for all the joy it's bringing.
Who can live without it, I ask in all honesty,
What would life be, without a method to use what are we.
So I say thank you for discovering and giving it to me.

In Honor of Anselm Strauss: Collaboration[1]

Barney G. Glaser, Ph.D., Hon. Ph.D.

I have known and collaborated with Anselm Strauss for about twenty-seven years, and I would like to summarize this collaboration by citing its most important properties. In doing this, I hope to evoke in the reader a feeling for the meaning, the appreciation, and the love of what it has meant for me to work with and be associated with Anselm for these years. Until Anselm taught me several related aspects of such an enterprise, I never realized that people could truly collaborate. Collaboration so often fails in a cloud of mutual distrust and hatred. It can be treacherous, and dangerous business.

1. When I started to collaborate with Anselm in 1960 on the dying studies, he generated in me a "high" for doing sociology that has never left me. I am always turned on by thinking, writing, talking, and reading sociology and by sociological research. I can hardly wait to get back to whatever task I am into. It may not seem obvious, but I do sociology every day although its product in the last few years has not taken the usual forms of lectures or writing. It is, however, very visible in the everyday world of work and action because the applicability of grounded theory is incredibly powerful.

2. I learned both the fruitfulness of collaborating with and a way of working out collaborative activities with Anselm, who I was easily at odds with because that's the nature of this business. We are always better at criticizing others than appreciating them. It was wonderful learning to deal constructively with differences in thought and theory. Anselm taught me the skill to appreciate these differences and work them into the writings to increase insights, formulations and richness. We used the constant comparative technique to

---

[1] This essay originally appeared as Chapter 8, *Grounded Theory, 1984-1994,* (Barney G. Glaser, Ed.), Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press, 1995, pp.103-109

transcend our difference with underlying uniformities.

3. Anselm taught me the art of juggling. He used to say, "For God's sake Barney, juggle! Juggle people, juggle time, juggle courses". It was hard for me to juggle, when we first started, but now it is easier; it even comes naturally at times. I juggle, sometimes with one hand behind my back, as they say. I think it was Anselm who communicated to me the juggling formula by his example. One juggles ten things at once. If you are called upon to answer for two of them, and you are only obliged to fix one, nine have succeeded. So why worry?

4. Anselm taught me relevance in sociology. He taught me many kinds of relevance but I will only cite two: One was the true relevance of data in research. When I first met Anselm I had just come straight out of the world conjectural of sociology, very little of which was born out in reality. The second was the relevance produced by qualitative research using methods developed at the University of Chicago, principally field work. He showed me how to do research and analysis to find out "what is really going on." In doing this he taught me that data comes first, then the theory. One does not force preconceived theory onto the data. To wit, we developed a methodology, which we called Grounded Theory. This was theory, which was not stuck in the mud, but was an elegant form of integrated conceptualization inducted from systematic research.

5. Along with the notion of deriving concepts from data, Anselm taught me another facet of conceptualization. It is the "idea" that is carried away from a research writing, not the detailed data. Anselm showed me clearly that the reader usually ends up remembering and telling others the basic ideas of the work. Facts are easily forgotten, ideas are not. And in the bargain, he taught me that ideology (or ungrounded theory) is data, too, a fact in and of itself, a perspective that people act on. So he started me off on the quest to develop conceptualization as the product of sociology. I added to this the notions of integration and formulation of theory I had bred into me at Columbia University--or as I wrote about in **Theoretical Sensitivity**, theoretical coding and theoretical connections through sorting into a framework. I also learned, in presenting research and concepts to others, that a listener may consider your data something one could find out by being his or her own

sociologist. To put it another way, laymen can produce good data, but only a good sociologist can produce a good integrated conceptualization of it.

6. In the very early stages of our work together Anselm taught me how to view other sociologists' work in several important dimensions. Just look at the kind of data they use to produce a given kind of product. Study the way they researched it and how they conceptualized it --forced, inducted, elaborated and/or deducted. And, very importantly, try to grasp their conceptualization not as something to believe, but as the author's perspective on the data for a historical or "school" point of view, and see this perspective as data itself! Also beware of the writer's need for immaculate conceptions as a prime source of distortion of obtaining theory from data. And be humble about the "holes" in the writer's theory: they are yet to be theoretically sampled for. Thus Anselm taught me to see other's work for what it is, not for what it purports to be and not as something to be idealized. So I became very quickly a "critiquer" rather than a "criticizer". And that critique should be based on the discoveries of grounded theory, which helps us to get at what is actually going on in other's work, what another's paper is actually telling us. Anselm expresses this notion quite often, to help us ward off the need to force what we want but rather discover the true emergent in the data.

7. The preceding ideas clearly lead to honesty in research. Most researchers feel that total honesty is an assumed, obvious and unstated value in their research. But a form of "nonhonesty," you might say creeps in: conceptualizing the data using pre-existing or premature ideas, before enough research collection of data and comparative analysis have been done so one can really know what he or she has. This subtle forcing easily becomes a track of thought with many branches that may never get undone, even though the researcher may eventually do enough collection, coding and analysis of each data to be able to find out what he or she really has. The theoretically sensitive reader will see that the writer has simply missed what he or she really has while pursuing a premature grounded conceptualization which has not been properly refined and modified, has no "fit" and no explanatory power. Honesty in research requires persistent openness and

patience until saturation sets in.

Thus, in my work with Anselm I developed a devotion to what "end results" can be obtained by sufficient collection of a variety of comparative data, the saturation of the concepts and properties that come from its coding and analysis and thus the core processes that emerge to make the data all come together in an integrated conceptual framework. The notion of core categories as prime movers of all the other variables involved came from the Columbia school of theory generation and survey research. It was what was needed for the conceptualization that Anselm did so well.

It follows then that one of the major insights that emerged from our collaboration was that if the researcher hangs in there long enough he will truly become honest and conceptualization will not be forced. So in the bargain I relearned the old adage again that truth is stranger than fiction and that it takes time and stamina to cross the line between the two, inspite of how fast our lively minds will tell us the true ideas long before the line is crossed to best fit theory. One has to sit on the "need to know" and take on a "not-knowing" attitude and stay open and questioning and juggling of how ideas fit and work until the constant comparative process saturates the varieties of data. Then the researcher-theorist can honestly say he knows best how to render the data theoretically within the confines of his voluminous, theoretically sampled data.

8. To accomplish the above, Anselm taught me autonomy in all facets of research and associated career work. If the researcher achieves autonomy by taking her work out of the hands of teachers and colleagues and by developing her own plan of research with its own pacing, this is an immeasurable contribution to the honesty and theoretical richness and results of her work. He should provide his own training, and see himself as someone who still learns and has to be self-trained, because he is going in a different direction. Then later, when the analysis is finished, she should bring the work back to the sociological fold as a contribution. Anselm taught me the value of taking ideas out of the hands of theoretical capitalists, especially pet ideas, and then demanding of oneself even more grounded conceptualization, using all theoretical and data sources to do one's own sociology.

Our autonomy started at the outset of working together. Collaboration does not mean losing one's identity, one's right to think and write singularly or to rework the work of the other. Working together simply means doing what works to produce the product and this can vary quite a bit. Sometimes we wrote together, sometimes we wrote different chapters as we felt the impulse, sometimes we rewrote each other's work, sometimes one would write up the other's memos and so forth. But in the end we would both agree on the outcome, however we had arrived at it, and the route was never the same way twice. We always maintained the myth that the other could have written the chapter he did not write. I say myth because we never had the time to test this hypothesis.

On the first day I collaborated with Anselm, we met for lunch to discuss the awareness of dying data. Fran, his wife, called to "see how it was going with Barney". Anselm said that it was going well for himself, which meant that he knew, I would do my own work and that I would let him do his. He knew that we could do our own work without losing our own identities, styles and creativity by giving in, pleasing, nonexposing oneself for fear of nonappreciation or disparagement and for seniority (Anselm had many collaborators before me.) Anselm was wonderful and encouraging, and I was less so but young. Our initial work all came together -an emergent- in a book called **Awareness of Dying** that is still popular 25 years later and is translated into three different languages. Our mutual biographies and careers were launched.

9. Another crucial aspect of autonomy that Anselm taught me was that once you create your own career plan, and sociological program with autonomy and honesty, no matter what others may say about a draft or a book, if you feel it is good, then publish it. Anselm taught me, and lived it to the fullest, that a book is simply a part of a larger program that requires several books - no one being the greatest. It will be over a period of twenty to thirty years that one's books congeal into a "program" or a "work" that itself will be evaluated as a whole and perhaps even a "school." The program evaluation will transcend any one of its books, which people may use, discard or ignore.

Of course, our program - theory development and medical sociology has transcended time and place with appropriate modifications. The use of our work grows constantly. Anselm's programs include other areas and thrusts and other collaborators, which we can remember more easily than all the books. His notions of a programmatic approach to sociology has made many of us productive, contributing sociologists. Thus we are all a part of the books in which we have collaborated with Anselm and not collaborated with Anselm, because we have all been part of the even more general program of producing a sociology that fits, works and is relevant-- a grounded sociology.

10. By encouraging me in the autonomy and honesty that generated a methodology that was highly productive for writing monographs and publishing them, Anselm confronted me with the true nature of the sociological audience we were reaching, the one-third, one-third, one-third concept. One-third will read our work and love it. One-third will dislike it and criticize it according to their own canons. And one third will simply ignore it. But one third favorability among colleagues is ample for career and recognition and for attracting students and friends all over the world.

11. Another vital property of our collaboration is that we are all teachers, but who teaches us. From the beginning, Anselm teaches his collaborators a lot and in very subtle ways. But this is a mutual process, since Anselm's openess keeps him learning from his collaborators, as well as students and other colleagues. Thus, crucially, the collaboration tends to be a symmetrical exchange among presumed equals, which is intensely gratifying and gives one tolerance for the give and take of collaboration. The final conceptualizations and their connections came from equality in agreement on what has emerged from the data.

12. As a matter of fact Anselm is so open to others that it is impossible to close him down. It keeps him young and going on to the next book with the next collaborator. But Anselm teaches his collaborators very clearly that even though the story goes on, there is a time when enough is enough and it must be written up or it is wasted. In our write-ups we usually found out we had too much for one book, and probably enough for two books. Before going on with the program he always

takes the time to publish a slice of grounded theory to share with colleagues and students. At this point, each collaborator works under his or her own set of conditions which will foster his productivity, and which most likely are very different from his co-workers. Perhaps the one rule is that collaborators almost never can work together in the small office. Where, when, and for how long each writer is always different. Manuscripts fly back and forth, each collaborator waiting for the reading of his or her work by the other. It is almost impossible for one to demand pacing of the other.

13. Anselm taught me two cardinal rules of taking credit when writing is finished. First, no one wrote the whole book and both wrote the whole book together. This is the concept of jointly and severally. Thus it is impossible to pin on one and not the other for anything in the book. Also each one is responsible for everything in the book. The simple reality is that one name has to come before the other.

In closing, I wish to mention that my list of properties is long, but not exhaustive. Others may find different properties in their own collaborative relationships. My collaboration with Anselm was never that easy as work, but was always rich and fulfilling. At times, we stopped working together to write our own books, and at times we even wrote other books at the same time we were working and writing together. Collaboration never dominated our writing careers.

I have only begun to touch here on the gift that Anselm has given us all, in colleagueship and collaboration. Our assumption is that the program will continue for years to come, as in fact, so many of us will continue the general program in our own writings along with Anselm, as the general reciprocity he has taught us all continues.

Thanks Anselm, you have taught me that the "sociological word" is seldom received from on high: It is discovered in the data.