The Grounded Theory Review:
An international journal

The Grounded Theory Review: An international journal

Editor-in-Chief

Judith Holton, Ph.D.

Charlottetown, PE, CANADA

Email: Judith@groundedtheoryreview.com

Publisher

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

Sociology Press

Cheri Ann Hernandez, RN, Ph.D., CDE
Associate Professor
Faculty of Nursing
University of Windsor, ON
Canada
Email: cherih@uwindsor.ca

Agnes Higgins, RN, Ph.D.
Associate Professor Mental Health
School of Nursing and Midwifery
Trinity College Dublin, IRL
Email: ahiggins@tcd.ie

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

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

Anna Sandgren, RN, MSc, Ph.D. Candidate
School of Health Sciences and Social Work &
Kronoberg County Research Centre
Växjö University, Sweden
Email: Anna.Sandgren@telia.com

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

Copy Editor

Carol Roderick, Ph.D.
Post Doctoral Fellow
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON
Canada
Email: croderic@unb.ca

The Grounded Theory Review: An international journal

Contents

The Grounded Theory Review: An international journal

From the Editor

This issue of the Review presents a new paper by Barney Glaser. **Jargonizing: The use of the grounded theory vocabulary** is the first chapter in Dr. Glaser's new book to be published later this year by Sociology Press. Using secondary analysis with a recent cache of published papers on various versions of grounded theory, Glaser has produced a grounded theory of the use of GT vocabulary to legitimate GT's remodelling as a qualitative method. Jargonizing most certainly helps to explain the multitude of references to GT in scholarly journals yet the seeming dearth of good classic grounded theory papers in these same journals!

This Issue also offers two new substantive theories. In **On-the-Job Ethics – Proximity Morality Forming in Medical School,** Hans Thulesius has used survey data to develop a GT that challenges the practice of 'teaching' ethics as part of the formal training in medical schools. 'Proximity morality forming' explains how medical students prefer to develop their ethical perspective in practice as they experience and respond to various moral and ethical dilemmas. While formal ethics training in medical schools can be helpful in providing students with a lexicon through which they can articulate experiences and reflect on perspectives, it is the realization through develops through practice that truly forms the ethics of professional practice.

Learning also features prominently in Virginia Crowe's theory of **Unprivatizing**. Crowe studied the experiences of those living with depression and discovered a theory that explains how learning about one's depression occurs over time and can serve as a process of transition and meaning making that aids individual awareness and development. Her theory explains the importance time progression as essential to absorbing knowledge of one's

depression and being able to integrate that knowledge through a process of individual learning.

We conclude this Issue with Svetlana Shklarov's methodological reflection on using grounded theory in cross-language and cross-cultural contexts. In **Grounding the Translation: Intertwining analysis and translation in cross-language grounded theory research**, Shklarow writes of her own experience in the dual role of theorist and translator. Given the global interest in GT, her experience will speak to many who read this journal, particularly in her perspective of how the intertwining of the dual processes of translation and theorizing aids conceptualization when doing GT in a language other than English

On a final note, it is my pleasure to advise that Sociology Press has recently signed an agreement with EBSCO that will soon see the Review included in EBSCO's on-line journal database services. This will enable online searching of papers, increasing access to and citing of work published through the GT Review. More on this as the details are finalized.

- Judith A. Holton, Ph.D.

Special Call for Papers

June, 2009. This issue will focus on the novice experience in learning and doing CGT (Classic Grounded Theory). We especially welcome papers that address the challenges, lessons learned, rewards and advice to others undertaking their first CGT study. **Deadline for submissions is March 31**

November, 2009. This issue will focus on writing and publishing CGT. The numerous remodelled versions of GT have resulted in many misunderstandings of the classic methodology, most particularly, the misconception that GT is a qualitative research method. The resultant confusion of CGT with qualitative methods is a frequent frustration – and sometimes obstacle – for CGT scholars seeking to publish in mainstream academic journals where the criteria for publication may be inconsistent with CGT methodology and where reviewers will often assess a CGT paper against established criteria for qualitative research. We welcome papers that address these issues and offer advice to others in successfully overcoming the obstacles to publication in mainstream journals. **Deadline for submissions is August 31**
 For both special issues, papers of 2000 – 4000 words are preferred.

In addition to this special call for papers, we continue to welcome papers presenting substantive and formal grounded theories from a broad range of disciplines.

Submissions

All papers submitted are peer reviewed and comments provided back to the authors. Papers accepted for publication will be good examples or practical applications of classic grounded theory methodology. Comments on papers published are also welcomed, will be shared with the authors and may be published in subsequent issues of the Review. See our website www.groundedtheoryreview.com for full submission guidelines. Forward submissions as Word documents to Judith Holton at judith@groundedtheoryreview.com

Jargonizing: The use of the grounded theory vocabulary[1]

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

> When in doubt, jargonize.
>
> When you wish to belong, network, be collegial or be 'a part of', jargonize.
>
> When you want to sound knowledgeable, jargonize.
>
> When you wish to sound experienced, jargonize.

Jargonizing is normal. All people, all human kind, jargonize in their lives to some degree or other. We use the vocabulary (jargon) of the area in which we act and talk. Jargon is a vocabulary of action by which to talk about what is going on. Most fields have their jargon. Few do not. Jargonizing cannot be stopped. It is needed. It can be very meaningful, properly so, for a field. In this book, however, I am writing about jargoning as just words with little or no real meaning, but sounding good and knowledgeable when talking about an area that one knows little or nothing about. In this way, jargonizing continually regenerates the GT (grounded theory) vocabulary wrongly as it is being applied to QDA (qualitative data analysis) concerns. Grounded theory is the buzzword in academic circles doing QDA research.

Even though jargonizing cannot be stopped, it can be explained and seen for what it is and its consequences in eroding and remodeling GT as originated. I hope to mute the remodeling of GT to a significant degree. Paradoxically, jargonizing continually sells GT to the unknowing with the consequence they are buying into QDA as if it was classical GT. The resulting favorable attitude toward GT is therefore not really GT, but QDA.

In this book, I shall deal with the jargonizing of qualitative data analysis (QDA) with the powerful grab of GT vocabulary in which jargonizing has lost the GT meanings behind the vocabulary. For most of the jargonizers, the true GT meanings of

[1] This paper is Chapter 1 of Dr. Glaser's forthcoming book, *Jargoning: The use of the grounded theory vocabulary* (Sociology Press, 2009)

its vocabulary were probably never there to begin with. For an extreme jargonizing example, see The Sage Handbook (p.510)[2]: "Grounded theory has proven useful in orienting and sensitizing several generations of ethnographers." Jargonizing seems to hide from the jargonizer as well as the listener, the fact that very often they simply do not know what they are talking about; especially when it is accompanied by a high degree of (unjustifiable) certainty.

Furthermore, GT jargonizing is very much needed by QDA methodologists, as they have no vocabulary by which to talk about their methodology, I, Barney Glaser, have become known for a QDA methodology view that I did not discover or generate. How paradoxical. The vocabulary contribution of classical GT clearly goes far beyond the contributions of method and of its substantive products.

Does jargonizing change GT as it remodels it? Absolutely No. It just remodels it for the people who jargonize QDA and do not know any better. The classical GT method may appear lost when talking about - jargonizing - QDA, but the classical GT method remains virtually the same and unchanged for its 40 years of existence. The remodeling of GT is actually a different, QDA method. Olavur Christiansen wants to stop the jargonizing but its grab will not let it happen, especially when it fills a vacuum (Christensen, 2007). Dropping original GT by QDA remodeling does not drop the classical method. Jargonizers do not realize this. Whoever might believe the jargonizing QDA as the "now" GT, does not know classical GT. Furthermore, jargonizing itself is accused as a jargon of "methodological rhetoric" (Hdbk, p.205). Jargonizing knows no bounds and turns on itself by self assuring and self confirming.

Not knowing GT doesn't seem to prevent jargoning. Rather, it seems that mastering GT jargon substitutes for mastering the method. Jargonizing commands respect, however wrong the meanings attributed to the tenants of classical GT. If one can sound knowledgeable by jargonizing without real knowledge or experience, it would seem one can skip doing the scholarship and experience necessary in learning the classic GT method. Studying

---

[2] This citation and others (cited as Hdbk) throughout my book refer to Bryant & Charmaz (2007). *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

the classical GT books is assumed. And of course, without being grounded in the experience and scholarship of classical GT, the jargon loses its relevance and drifts by association into QDA. If one doesn't use the classical GT method in a research project; if one doesn't continually read and develop his/her scholarship; a clear understanding of classical GT is not developed. Hence, it becomes much easier to drift out of the classical GT methodology and, as a result, not recognize the remodeling and erosion of classical GT into seemingly erudite, yet completely ungrounded papers and books on GT as if it was a QDA method.

One has to be doing classical GT to use the GT jargon correctly. Starting out in a research, the jargon can feel awkward. It takes time and research experience to really understand the meanings behind the GT jargon and leave behind the superficial notions of the concepts captured by the GT jargon. It takes time to develop the level of expertise – and associated comfort – with GT jargon so that one can explain to another the true meanings of its concepts. As Judith Holton said to me in an Email (4/08): "I got the concept of interchangeability of indicators intuitively, but it took me much longer with research experience and more reading before I could explain it to others with confidence and clarity." It is no wonder that jargonizing GT to QDA in the Handbook runs far ahead of its true meaning, since research experience using classical GT and studying such research writings barely occurs, if at all, among all but a very few of the Handbook authors.

The Handbook shows clearly that the GT vocabulary is a very, very powerful way of conceptualizing QDA with its categories every which way. GT jargonizing shows that it is the GT vocabulary that is a major contribution of GT and perhaps the main contribution. Some QDA researchers jargonize with some knowledge of GT and slightly remodel GT. Others are just not aware enough of classical GT procedures and mouth the jargoning as what they doing in their research and writing. But the most outrageous use is to wax on with jargonizing acting like an expert, when they really have no notion of classical GT methodology procedures. Thus starts the GT jargonizing of QDA everywhere and every which way when QDA procedures are discussed.

Bryant and Charmaz make assertions that seem to suggest a lack of currency in their own scholarship of classic GT. One is

that, "Glaser has recently changed his stance on the GT quest to discover a single basic social process (Hdbk, p.9)". They ignore my clear insistence in **Theoretical Sensitivity** (1978, p.96) that the BSP is but one type of theoretical code that may apply. Furthermore, they suggest (Hdbk, p.19) that I have distanced myself from theoretical codes, which seems absurd given my book, **The Grounded Theory Perspective III: Theoretical Coding** (2005). These two assertions seem to suggest jargonizing remodeling of classical GT erodes its power and undermines further scholarship to correct it, as evidenced by the predominance of remodeling among the Handbook contributions.

Barely 5% of the Handbook authors really use the GT vocabulary to talk about the experiential 'nitty gritty' of classical GT procedures. The rest just "chat up" QDA research every which way with GT jargonizing, as if talking GT which they really are not. They join the "sound legitimately knowledgeable" network as they remodel classic GT down to QDA.

The GT vocabulary is needed by QDA researchers since QDA has little or no vocabulary of its own, especially none with "grab". It fills a vacuum in QDA. It makes QDA sound sensible and then gives a sense of voiced mastery control. Classical GT vocabulary's true meaning is negligible. Jargonizing results in massive remodeling of GT to fit and be seen as any number of QDA methodologies. GT virtually becomes a QDA method. The remodelers have no experiential or procedural knowledge in classical GT research by which to correct themselves. They do not know they are doing QDA, while thinking it is GT, as they jargonize their research. They chat it up in their network to appear knowledgeable about GT and are none the wiser yet appear to understand what they do not. A knowledgeable GT researcher spots them immediately.

Since jargonizing GT is not correct in the first place, it easily leads to twisted, incomprehensible QDA methodologizing which then becomes the jargonizers' world view and frame of reference, filled with identity, which brooks no threat from negative evaluations. It helps jargonizers in getting published, joining a department and participating in a collegial network all of which empowers them from knowing or admitting its truer, neglected meanings. If someone is knowledgeable in GT, hence the falsity of jargonizing, they can easily be forced to jargonize anyway by these participations. Jargonizing QDA with GT concepts has

been going on for so long now that it has an unquestioned historical legitimacy. It seems to have solved the credibility envy for QDA which is required to get QDA accepted in leading journals which cater to quantitative research with its sure-fire jargon. That GT is a direct, simple inductive method to generate conceptual theory from research data is lost forever in the jargonizing verbiage wrestles over QDA issues. The lack of experiential knowledge leads to a superficiality of jargonizing which has many general implications for GT; some of which I will turn to in this book.

Keep in mind that in many fields, jargoning is necessary and totally meaningful. It is just in the use of GT vocabulary for QDA that the meaning of its words for GT have been mostly or totally lost, which meanings have been exchanged for and by QDA issues and problems. Jargonizing has legitimated the switching of classical GT to it becoming and to being a social construction data method, without giving one example of a "good" GT study based on social construction. Real understanding of GT as conceptual not descriptive is lost. GT procedures as originated are slighted, dismissed or changed to suit QDA problems.

Twenty-four of the Handbook authors indicate clearly they do not have classical GT research experience, which would generate clear, accurate meanings for the GT vocabulary. They also indicate they do not "read" substantive grounded theory papers or articles that use classical GT. I can tell since they do not buy my GT readers to see how conceptual substantive GT's are done. Not one article in the book analyzes a classical, substantive GT theory as an example. How else could they know what good substantive GT's look like, since such publications are few and far between in journals. Apart from Judith Holton's paper on coding (Hdbk, pp.265-289), the few example bits in chapters are QDA. There is not one critique of a classical, conceptual, substantive GT. So these authors not only have no classical GT research experience, but no product proof for scholarly study.

Apart from Holton's paper, not one author talks of the exciting experience of doing classical GT. The Eureka syndrome is never mentioned, nor the joy of discovery through emergence, or the intense motivations linked with each GT procedure. They do not mention the afforded autonomy given by doing GT and how it leads to originality. These misses are very apparent to

those who practice classical GT. The Handbook with its constant, incessant jargoning levels off these powers of GT and the GT experience to average or below routine QDA. The leveling denies the realization moments with their flushing out of GT power and inspiration. This jargonized leveling splatters to below a level of recognition, these exciting properties of GT; splattering conceptually productive ideas down to the descriptive level of QDA.

Jargoning is both deeply seductive for QDA and destructive of classical GT. Thus the remodeling alternative to GT is studying QDA articles and jargonizing them as GT. So the knowledgeability and joys of actual classical GT are bypassed and wiped out for, and by, jargonizing. The conceptual originality goal of classical GT is leveled to routine descriptive findings by the mistaken views by jargonizing the GT experience as QDA research. No wonder the flat research findings of supposed GT; they are not classical GT.

Since jargonizing GT far outruns the method and product, the latter cannot keep up with the former and thereby correct the distorted meanings of jargonizing. The procedural strength of classical GT is missed. Indeed, jargonizing QDA procedures with the GT vocabulary reflect on the classical GT procedures as a weakness, since they are misconstrued, but more on this in the next chapter on Data Worries.

In the bargain GT, as originated by me in 1965 in my paper, "The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis", (*Social Problems*, Spring 1965) and then further elaborated in **Discovery of GT** (1967) and **Theoretical Sensitivity** (1978), has been remodeled down to the descriptive level of QDA. The result is that GT, as originated, is lost to the readers of the Sage Handbook. In many other areas of academia, GT is alive, well and flourishing on the conceptual level. Its power cannot be stopped. Students flock to my seminars to get the genuine classical GT training.

This book is not an impression, not an epistemological fluff talk, not a conjecture. It is a GT based on one year's careful reading and constant comparison of the 27 articles, plus introduction and glossary, in the Sage Handbook (Bryant and Charmaz, 2007). It is a treasure trove of rich comparative data just waiting for a constant comparative analysis to generate a GT

of what is going on in the Handbook. My appreciation goes out the editors, Bryant and Charmaz, for offering such a unique wealth of data in one volume. The title itself has great "grab" as a jargonizing buzzword, since the GT methodology is a GT itself. I hope to mine this comparative data to the fullest by focusing on the core category - jargonizing. It even has a glossary of GT concepts, (with some concepts not suitable for classical GT), that the authors use and can use for jargonizing QDA with GT concepts.

As my constant comparisons of the articles in the Handbook continued, it became clear that qualitative data analysis lacked a vocabulary with grab by which to address its issues and research. And so the authors borrowed the GT vocabulary (which itself was a GT with great grab) to be used as a jargon by which to talk about QDA. The result for classical GT was its remodeling down to the descriptive nature of QDA and all its data problems, to lose the conceptual level of GT and to wrongly authenticate multiple 'versions' of GT, which are really only multiple versions of QDA. The one and only GT, as originated, was lost in the jargonizing of QDA with the GT vocabulary. GT became multiple versions of QDA.

After reading and assimilating this book, I trust that the reader will approach the Sage Handbook with a much different perspective, using the theory of jargonizing. To help the reader, I will list the pages in the Handbook from which I took the items for constant comparison and in generating the emergent GT of jargonizing. To repeat, one could not ask for a better treasure of data; there for the asking, from which to generate a GT. As Anselm Strauss would say, it is a superb cache of data just asking for analysis (Discovery, 1967, pp.167-168).

Yes, dear reader, the Sage Handbook, upon close examination, is 90% jargonizing distortion of GT as originated. If the authors could simply master the jargon, they did not have to do the scholarship or have the experience of a rigorous GT research. The authors just remodel GT at will with jargonizing legitimation to become part of the network of remodeling GT to multiple QDA's. Only about 5% of the authors really used the GT vocabulary with proper meaning when talking about the experiential, 'nitty gritty' of GT procedures. The 95% of authors remaining are just jargonizers chatting up QDA every which with the GT vocabulary, AS IF talking GT which they are really not.

Essential GT meanings are lost to the jargonizing. It seems that when in doubt about QDA issues, jargon it up with GT categories to sound legitimately knowledgeable -- to be in the loop. Jargonizing joins one to the network.

The jargonizers always forget or ignore or are not knowledgeable that GT, as originated, is just a simple, straight forward procedural method to induct theory from any type of data; that is, interviews, documents, observations, conversations, newspapers, books, magazines, videos, etc in any combination or alone. For GT "all is data". GT is just a simple procedural method to ground conceptual theory; a method among many methods. It is not all QDA methods; it is not descriptive. It is trite to say that all methods are grounded - they are in some way - but all methods are not GT. Jargonizers forget this trite knowledge.

Bryant and Charmaz say that GT has two major contributions (Hdbk, Ch.1). It gives a method and a product. They seem unaware of its third major contribution: a powerful research vocabulary with "grab", which to these authors is apparently its most important contribution when it is used to describe QDA issues and since QDA had little or no vocabulary before GT. I, too, was unaware of the power of the GT vocabulary. I just taught GT method and product when at the University of California Medical Center. It is only recently that I began to see the jargon of GT as being used far beyond its true meaning; that it was leading to more talk than research method and product as it jargonized virtually all of QDA.

These Handbook authors take the GT vocabulary far beyond its boundaries, to many different versions of QDA called GT, to competition with grand theory, and to ideal types of what is or ought to be data, to mutual use with other forms of methods, feigning mutual help problems, to remodeling GT according to QDA preconception, and to potential use as description and as it becomes used for it. The jargonizing of the GT vocabulary is used way beyond actual GT research as if all QDA research is GT or fits GT. The jargonizing starts with the grab of the very title, "grounded theory:" GT has become a buzz word for all QDA research.

I have written at length on the rigorous procedures of GT methodology in several books. I have published several readers

exampling the GT product. These are the two contributions of GT that Bryant and Charmaz focus and remark on. This books deals with the third and perhaps most pervasive contribution of GT methodology: its vocabulary. The grab is used to legitimate by jargon, QDA issues and research. The Handbook shows the power of conceptual jargoning of QDA every which way so its issues can be conceptualized and talked about and the people talking sound expert. They sound expert when they actually have no notion of the GT methodology procedures to which the vocabulary truly refers. The authors refer to uses that sound good, however unfounded in GT methodology as originated.

Truly the GT vocabulary is powerful with grab and is perhaps the most important contribution of GT thought. The vocabulary is itself a GT theory, which explains its power. It was a method generated and based on our previous very successful research (see **Organizational Scientists**, 1964 and **Awareness of Dying**, 1965). The GT method stands on its own and can be used for any research where the goal is a theory product. It does not need adoption to the preconceptions of other methods or research goals or areas. It just discovers the patterns in any data. Jargonizing GT to make it compatible with preconceived problems is not necessary for GT as originated. The preconceptions may not have earned relevance be emergence.

These Handbook authors are stuck mainly on data worries (see next chapter) as their experience. Their jargonizing gives no real examples of doing genuine GT research. They mostly do not go beyond data collection to get to the remaining procedures to get to a genuine GT, as originated. Their jargonizing is conjectural since they have none of the GT research experience of going through the GT procedures to get a finished GT product. They are stuck with jargonizing with little or no meaning of genuine GT in its use. GT vocabulary for jargonizing QDA approaches is destructive. It remodels GT to a QDA on the descriptive level. The jargonizers, by usage, are not aware they are doing it as they engage in their heavy talk to appear knowledgeable and to join likening colleagues and to further their careers through publications subject to peer review by these likening colleagues.

The jargonizers splatter their pages with non-relevant issues for classical GT leading to a bewildering complexifying of GT,

indicating they just simply do not know classical GT. It seems that all they need to do is jargon it up, QDA, that is and the result is a wrestle leading to nowhere, unsolvable non-relevant issues. All of which their lofty talk is certainly not helpful to any researcher who wants to do a classical GT and achieve a good product. And in the words of Judith Holton, the consequence: "And strangely, they always seem so pleased with themselves when they can convolute and confuse with their jargonizing wrestles which lead nowhere for solid classical GT research."(Email, circa 4/08). The true wisdom of classical GT procedures is simple, not complex.

The jargonizers adopt adapt and co-opt classical GT with structurally based possessiveness as they remodel GT to multiple QDA methods. The structure of their departments, books and journals give them an assumed authority, with little or no scholarly grounding. The intuitively based, natural predilection to do classical GT is lost to conjecture and scientism. Jargonizing feels like one is doing something, BUT NO, whatever it is they are achieving, it is not doing GT as originated to achieve a worthy substantive grounded theory. Emotions can run high among the jargonizers over the rhetorical wrestle, while denuding the joy that comes from simply doing a substantive GT.

In this book, I will discuss and illustrate the nature of this jargonizing with its little or no true meaning of the words, its use and multiple consequences and its remodeling of the classical GT methodology. It is impossible to stop the grab of GT jargonizing of QDA, many people are firm and fixed in their use of it. BUT, it is possible to help the reader realize the existence and use of the GT vocabulary so it can be realized for what it is, a major contribution of classical GT and not to be used to jargonize and therefore remodel GT by default, by its unaware use for talking about QDA issues.

Two of my PhD students reminded me that I realized the jargonizing pattern in the remodeling nature to QDA as early as 2003. Dr. Tom Andrews wrote in 2007: "GT continues to provide a strong rationale underpinning qualitative research. This may partially explain one of the most pressing challenges to grounded theory: the eroding and continuing rewriting 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 legitimate their studies but has in the process served to subvert

grounded theory, resulting in complexifying a simple methodology (Glaser, 2003)", (The Grounded Theory Review, Nov, 2007, p. 56). In the same journal (p.48), Dr Hans Thulesius, MD, in talking about the comparison of diverse books on qualitative research said: "One of Barney's own comments of these comparisons is - and this is a real Email quote in 2003 -- "Hans, as I have said, if nothing else, I gave the world a jargon that legitimizes." He continues: "The Discovery of GT book in Nov 2007 got 8545 citation hits on Google Scholar. No other method book dealing with qualitative data analysis gets even half that many citations" I can only hazard the hypothesis that one source of the spread in popularity of GT is the "grab" of the GT vocabulary, which easily runs far ahead of the method and actually achieving the product of classical GT research.

Furthermore, Judith Holton writes about the brief "brush with Barney" as a legitimation of jargonizing: "Yes, I saw his using you the first time I read the preface. He's used his brief brushes with you to infer that you are on the same page, and, to make it worse, he's dismissive of your stance" (Email 9/14/08). Tony Bryant used my legitimating name by saying in referring to the Handbook perspective as a resource: "This in turn evoked Barney's rejoinder, 'Your vision of the handbook is right on'." (Hdbk, p.xxx) which was a verbal brush with me. It legitimated the jargonizing to follow through the Handbook. Such claiming to doing GT and actually using it is a great discrepancy that remodels classical GT to QDA. Some have told me that remodeling is too mild a term. It should be termed a "take over" by jargonizing, which builds careers.

I teach frequently, so the brushes continue. I am told that the jargonizing remodeling effort is gaining more momentum in **Developing Grounded Theory: The Second Generation** (Morse et al, 2009). Be that as it may, this book will serve to maintain the integrity of GT as originated and as separate from QDA methodology, no matter how it is jargonized using GT vocabulary.

Judith Holton, an experienced GT researcher and teacher, comments on this book on jargonizing as follows: "Your use of the Handbook as data for the jargonizing book is brilliant – without a doubt the best use that will ever be made of it. You're setting the record straight with a truly scholarly response to another unscholarly bash of classical GT. I am learning a lot from your

transcending approach. In doing so, you may show them how to use the classical GT methods with any data – that is, if the reader is sufficiently open to seeing it. The jargonizing book may become as popular as **Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis**" (Email 9/7/08). I am not alone in realizing the core category as the pattern emergent in this Handbook.

Tony Bryant refers to jargonizing, though not realizing it. "Titscher et al. explain the predominance of GT in part by the enormous number of citations of Glaser and Strauss's, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory, Awareness of Dying* and *Time for Dying* books, whereas other approaches do not have such specific and widely acclaimed core texts. (Kearny, in Chapter 6, describes these three texts as 'the definitive GT tutorial'.) Yet, as Lee and Fielding note, "[W]hen qualitative researchers are challenged to describe their approach, reference to *grounded theory* has the highest recognition value. But the very looseness and variety of researchers' schooling in the approach means that the tag may well mean something different to each researcher'(1996:3.1)" (Hdbk, p.2). Recognition value is simply achieved by jargonizing QDA with the GT vocabulary that has "grab".

It is clear that jargonizing has been going on for many years. It is the power of classical GT which produced a vocabulary with a powerful "grab" yet to be equaled. It was needed. The Handbook in substantiating the attributes and contributions of GT as originated clarifies by jargonizing the ways in which researchers have developed by jargonizing adaptation of GT to QDA use. As the reader will see, this leads to much confusion unless GT is seen as its own conceptualizing, inductive method and the reader drops its jargonizing use for other QDA research methods. The Introduction and Chapter One of the Handbook are full of allusions to jargonizing as they discuss problems of QDA research techniques.

Vivian Martin, PhD, a very able grounded theorist, Emailed me: "The jargoning of GT is so vast and has become such a stand-in for actually doing the method, as you note Barney, so this is an important statement and intervention." Astrid Gynnild, PhD, another GT advocate Emailed: "Barney, your chapter on jargonizing opens up a new way of understanding and getting insights in strategies for imitation of GT that concerns most of us." (Email 10/8/08).

My intervention will only explain jargonizing's pervasive use and its remodeling of GT to another QDA. It will not stop it. For example, Bryant states, after referring to the large group of GT adherents using GT with vast global reach: "Far too many references to GT fail to get much beyond a few slogans or mantras supposedly corroborated by reference to key texts, as if the rich detail and complexities magically flow from the latter." (Hdbk,p.8). Clearly although apparently unaware, he is referring to jargonizing GT. This is just one more of the interchangeable indicators of jargonizing GT down to QDA which abound in the Handbook.

It is impossible to stop the GT jargonizing of QDA methods. People are firm and fixed in their use of it. But it is not impossible to explain and realize its existence and its use by QDA researchers, and its consequences for remodeling classical GT. Thus the classical GT conceptual vocabulary can be realized for what it is – a major contribution of classical GT and not to be used to remodel classical GT by its unaware use. I hope to forestall the pervasive nonstop jargonizing which fosters the disattendance to classical GT simple procedures used to conceptually generate theory based on patterns found in any data. I have certainly not relaxed my classical GT perspective as Bryant and Charmaz suggest in Chapter 1. That Charmaz was my student at UCSF 40 years ago does not excuse her jargonizing or give my support to it.

Colleagues have told me that classical GT has been virtually high jacked by so many who have not appreciated that classical GT is not a qualitative descriptive method; some simply because they do not know better and others because they think they do know – or know better. The confusion between GT and QDA consequences to a fading of boundaries between research methods with a resulting undermining of classical GT by jargonizing QDA while amplifying its spread as just another QDA method. I know, as the originator of classical GT, that the jargonizing in the Handbook is incorrect for classical GT.

In this book, I will discuss and illustrate the nature of jargonizing use, its multiple consequences and its easily almost imperceptible remodeling of classical GT methodology. I turn now discuss data worries; fit with other QDA approaches; conceptualizing; lofty talk; and then, multiple versions view of GT.

I would like to end this chapter with a quote from my colleague Judith Holton:

> "Here we are, fifteen years later, riding the wave of yet another epistemological fashion in constructivism. While each epistemological trend carries classic GT further from its foundations, the methodological vocabulary of GT persists. This persistence is clear evidence not only of its empirical grounding and imageric grab, but also of an obvious void within qualitative research for a similar vocabulary to explain and guide its methodological progression. Vocabulary devoid of its substantive meaning is empty. The subsequent lexical drift fosters the remodeling confusion that continues to position GT as a qualitative method. So this book by Glaser will serve to set the record straight again on the basics of classic GT, reclaiming its methodological vocabulary and challenging current qualitative scholars to transcend constructivist notions and acknowledge GT as a simple method using empirically grounded data to generate conceptually abstract theory." (Email memo 8/9/08).

References

Andrews, T. (2007). Reflections on 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory'. *The Grounded Theory Review*. Special Issue, November. p.56.

Bryant, A. & Charmaz, K., Eds. (2007). *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, Sage Publications, London.

Christensen, O. (2007). A simpler Understanding of Classic GT: How it is a fundamentally different methodology. *The Grounded Theory Review*, vol.6, no.3, pp.39-61.

Glaser, B. G. (1964). *Organizational Scientists: Their professional careers*. Chicago:Aldine.

Glaser, B.G. (1965). The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis, *Social Problems*, 12, pp. 436-445.

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

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory: emergence vs. forcing*. 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. (2005). *The grounded theory perspective III: Theoretical coding*. 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.

Holton, J. A. (2007). "The Coding Process and Its Challenges" in *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, Bryant & Charmaz (Eds.), Sage Publications, London, pp.265-289.

Morse, J.M., Stern, P.N., Corbin, J., Bowers, B., Charmaz, K. & Clarke, A.E. (2009). *Developing Grounded Theory: The second generation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

On-the-Job Ethics - Proximity Morality Forming in Medical School: A grounded theory analysis using survey data

Hans O. Thulesius, MD, Ph.D.

Abstract

On-the-job-ethics exist in all businesses and can also be called proximity morality forming. In this paper we propose that medical students take a proximity morality stance towards ethics education at medical school. This means that they want to form physician morality "on the job" instead of being taught ethics like any other subject. On-the-job-ethics for medical students involves learning ethics that is used when practicing ethics. Learning ethics includes comprehensive ethics courses in which quality lectures provide ethics grammar useful for the ethics practicing in attitude exercises and vignette reflections in tutored group discussions. On-the-job-ethics develops professional identity, handles diversity of religious and existential worldviews, trains students described as ethically naive, processes difficult clinical experiences, and desists negative role modeling from physicians in clinical or teaching situations. This grounded theory analysis was made from a questionnaire survey on attitudes to ethics education with 409 Swedish medical students participating. We analyzed over 8000 words of open-ended responses and multiple-choice questions using classic grounded theory procedures, but also compared questionnaire data using statistics such as multiple regression models. The paper gives an example of how grounded theory can be used with a limited amount of survey data.

Background

Medical ethics is different from other subjects taught at medical school and the importance of formal ethics courses has been questioned (Hafferty & Franks, 1994). Some medical schools combine instruction in bioethical principles with teaching of humanities programs (Andre, Brody, Fleck, Thomason & Tomlinson, 2003). The teaching of ethics varies in Swedish medical schools from interspersed lectures to formal ethics

courses. We designed a questionnaire survey in order to elucidate how Swedish medical students view the ethics education in medical schools (Thulesius, Sallin, Lynöe & Löfmark, 2007; Lynöe, Löfmark & Thulesius, 2008). Many students gave input to the ethics course curriculum: Should ethics be taught in lectures or learned through group discussions? Should the ethics course be a separate course among others, or should it be part of other courses with lectures and group discussions interspersed? Should it come early or late in the medical school curriculum? Should the literature be specific ethics literature or novels and short stories with relevant ethical content? From multiple-choice responses we found that strong ethics interest was associated with frequent experiences of physician teachers as good role models and an absence of poor role models (Lynöe *et al.*, 2008). In the present study we wanted to explore what was going on in medical schools regarding the medical ethics education by analyzing open-ended survey responses together with response data from multiple-choice items.

Method

We constructed a survey on attitudes towards the medical ethics education during 2005 as a request from the delegation of medical ethics of the Swedish Society of Medicine. Swedish medical students from the 1st, 5th and 11th (last) term participated. The survey consisted of 14 items, of which 10 had a total of 59 multiple-choice response options and generous space for open-ended comments, and 4 items were open-ended only, see Table 1.

The overall response rate to the questionnaire survey was 36%, and varied between different centers from 13% to 83%, with a total of 409 respondents, 308 women (75%) and 101 men (25%). More than half (220/409) of the respondents gave one or more written open comments amounting to >8000 words. These comments were transcribed into Word from handwritten text. "Walking survey" data from informal interviews with four physicians, of which two has been teaching medical ethics at medical school for many years, were also analyzed (Glaser, 1998, p 214).

At some centers a whole term would drop out since the responsible teacher failed to hand out the survey. Yet, the response patterns of the different questionnaire items did not

differ significantly between schools with low and high response rates when different logistic regression models were applied to the data (Lynöe *et al.*, 2008). The most comprehensive open responses came from last term students. Thus the most experienced students gave the biggest input to the analysis of the qualitative data - the main data source for this study.

We analyzed open-ended comments and multiple-choice responses by classic grounded theory (GT) procedures according to Glaser (1978; 1992; 1998; 2001; 2003; 2005; 2007). The GT dictum "all is data" was taken ad notam in this study. We thus compared both qualitative responses and quantified multiple-choice items in the same analysis. Multiple-choice results were dichotomized, analyzed in logistic regression models, and compared with open-ended responses. The GT analysis began with open coding trying to answer the questions "what is going on?" and "what concept does this data represent" or "what concept that explains what is going on catches the latent pattern in this data?" and most important: "what are the participants main concern and how are they continually trying to resolve it?" Theoretical memos were written, typed, or drawn in the comparative process as soon as open coding started. This paper was sorted and written up from more than 4000 words and many dozens of pages of typed and handwritten memos.

"Memos are the theorizing write-up of ideas about substantive codes and their theoretically coded relationships as they emerge during coding, collecting and analyzing data, and during memoing" (Glaser, 1998). Memoing is "the core stage of grounded theory methodology" (Glaser, 1998), and should be done at any time and place in order to capture creative ideas. The analytic procedures were done with experience from earlier GT studies (Thulesius, Håkansson & Petersson, 2001, 2004; Sandgren, Thulesius, Fridlund & Petersson, 2006; Thulesius & Grahn, 2007).

Discovery of Grounded Theory by Glaser & Strauss (1967) is the most quoted reference for any single method analyzing qualitative data according to Google Scholar search (12830 citations December 2008). GT has the inductive approach to generate hypotheses explaining how participants in a studied substantive area resolve their main concern. Thus, GT conceptualizes "what is going on" in the field of study by the "constant comparative method", another name for GT. This

indicates a constant comparison of data during an iterative research process, which involves open coding, memoing, theoretical sampling (data collection based on hypotheses from the ongoing analysis), selective coding (recoding data based on concepts from the ongoing analysis), sorting and writing up (sorting memos in piles based on concepts in the theory and then writing up the sorted piles into a paper or book). Classic GT analysis aims at conceptual theories abstract of time, place and people and differs from most methods using qualitative data by presenting explanatory concepts instead of descriptions. Many clinical research methods consider persons or patients as units of analysis, whereas in GT the unit of analysis is the incident not the person(s) involved (incident = a distinct piece of action, or an episode, as in a story or play). The number of incidents being coded and compared typically amounts to several hundred in a GT study since every participant often reports many incidents. When comparing many incidents in a certain field, the emerging concepts and the relationship between them are in reality probability statements and therefore GT should not be considered a qualitative method but a general method that can use any type of data. The results of GT are not reports of facts but an integrated set of conceptual hypotheses. Validity in its traditional sense is consequently not an issue in GT research, which instead should be judged by fit, relevance, workability, and modifiability (Glaser, 1978; 1998). Fit has to do with how close concepts fit with the incidents they are representing, and this is related to how thorough the constant comparison of incidents to concepts was done. A relevant study deals with the real concern of participants and captures attention. The theory works when it explains how the problem is being solved with much variation. A modifiable theory can be altered when new relevant data is compared to existing data. A GT is never right or wrong, it just has more or less fit, relevance, workability and modifiability, and readers of this paper are asked to try its quality according to these principles.

Proximity Morality Forming by On-the-job Ethics

In this study we analyzed student attitudes and "what was going on" in the medical ethics education and found that students learn ethics on the job. This can also be conceptualized as **proximity morality forming** since students practice medical ethics in close connection with colleagues and patients. This proximity morality forming also includes comprehensive ethics courses with tutored small groups. Proximity morality forming involves **learning ethics** where "ethics grammar" comes from selected high quality lectures. **Practicing ethics** is done when patient cases and clinical issues are discussed in interactive groups and in the clinical setting. This can also help students to deal with emotionally difficult situations. Attitude exercises using vignette reflections are done in "ethics labs". To desist negative role modeling is a function of the ethics courses where reflected professionalism is developed for diverse medical students in a heterogeneous world.

On-the-job-ethics in medical school - How? Forming physician morality by learning ethics takes place in quality lectures on ethics, preferably given by professional ethicists. These lectures provide students with a basic "ethics grammar" about ethical principles and concepts. This feeds the interactive group discussions and improves their quality concerning ethical issues.

"Professional lecturers from the faculty of arts (are wanted)" (first term student). Forming physician morality by practicing ethics is done in the interactive discussion groups, but also in the "ethics lab" where students work with practical, sometimes challenging attitude exercises and vignette reflections. These stimulate critical thinking about current ethical problems in clinical training. It requires that the participants position themselves ideologically, and for some attitude exercises also physically. Attitude exercises are often done in case studies.

"A case is presented and different opinions (re the case) represented by four different corners. One can go to any corner and argue against the other corners and eventually change corners" (last term student).

On the job morality forming in medical school is typically done in interactive discussion groups. In these groups the learning and practicing go hand in hand. The discussion groups also have a support network function allowing professional role growth within a permissive context where ethical and value-laden issues are discussed and tried. The structure ideally consists of tutored groups that repeatedly work with case study approaches, discuss ethical principles, and continue during internship (i.e. in Sweden this is the paid physician work that

starts after medical school at the University). Within a frame resembling the clinical setting students grow their own ethical attitudes and shape their individual physician morality. Group discussions provide good training for handling ethical difficulties since real world medical ethics consist of unique complex situations often involving several people. One goal of interactive ethics group discussions is to understand what appropriate physician behavior is.

"(we need) group discussions with teachers making sure that everyone develops decent ethical values as physicians" (fifth term student)

"ethics discussion forums should be based on tutored small groups (to prevent people with strong views from dominating)" (last term student)

"every section could end with ethical discussions related to the specific subject, psychiatry/internal medicine/surgery" (last term student)

On-the-job-ethics in medical school – Why?

Why would medical students want to form physician morality on the job? The deliberate forming of a physician morality seems necessary for various reasons, and several student responses dealt with arguments for ethics education in general and forming physician morality on the job in particular:

Professionalizing

Since professional identity requires moral reflection this is an important argument for on-the-job-ethics.

"An open discussion forum on difficult issues and professional identity conflicts would make us better physicians." (last term student)

"Small groups during clinical training - discussing the professional physician role and work issues" (last term student on suggested ethics education during internship)

Diversity handling

We live in a society with increasing diversity and multiple religious views and this is dealt with in everyday on-the-job ethics.

"What is it really like in our secularized country? How can we say something is right when we don't share the same values" (fifth term student)

Medical students are different. Some are ethically naive, or not interested in ethics, and others even described as socially "autistic". The importance of ethics education is obvious for these groups.

"Only autistic people need ethics education" (last term student)

Processing emotional difficulties

Medical school can be both emotionally and ethically difficult with life and death issues pressing on. On-the-job-ethics discussions involve processing tough experiences from the clinical part of the education.

"Good with special ethics courses when we deal with sensitive issues" (last term student)

"We underestimate the power of what we can do for each other... An open forum for discussing difficult issues and identity crises during the education would make us better physicians" (last term student on importance of small discussion groups)

"Small groups discussing everyday problems and ethical issues in the workplace" (first term student on suggested ethics education during later internship)

Desisting negative role modeling

By defying ethics suppression and politically corrected ethics the influences of physicians/teachers as poor role models may be addressed and negative role modeling dealt with in the interactive groups. Some teachers and physicians were described as being "masters of opinion control" trying to neutralize discussions about ethically sensitive topics by putting the lid on discussions, and defending politically correct opinions.

"I prefer a good (neutral) clinician instead of zealous, ideologically motivated people" (fifth term student)

"Teachers gave too little space for own views – there was a correct key for the discussion" (last term student)

In a statistical analysis of the survey presented elsewhere

(Lynöe et al., 2008) we saw a significant relationship between a low interest in ethics and frequent experiences of poor role models and the absence of good ones in all three terms. For last term students, there was a significant association between a high interest in ethics and experiences of good role models and a preference for discussions in small groups.

"Personally I'm always ready to learn, although I do not always like being taught." ~ Winston Churchill (1874 - 1965)

The quote illustrates the students' attitudes towards medical ethics education in this study. They want to form their own physician morality on-the-job rather than being taught ethics. This is an example of the proximity ethics that influences the health professions today where "personal relationships and partiality override impartialist and universalist ethical considerations" (Nortvedt & Nordhaug, 2008). The present analysis suggests **proximity morality forming** as a name for what is going on when medical students learn ethics while becoming physicians. Another informal name for this concept is "on-the-job" ethics. This ideally takes place in comprehensive ethics courses where tutored groups openly discuss and reflect on difficult ethical topics and moral dilemmas. **Learning ethics** is done through high quality lectures supplying an *ethics grammar* that provide default ethical principles. These are used when **practicing ethics** in group discussions together with attitude exercises and vignette reflections in *ethics labs*. These interactive discussion groups also have a support network function. Here students process ethical problems in an environment where physician morality is allowed to form and grow on the job. Hence, rather than being served ideologically stained opinions students prefer to reflect and discuss different ethical attitudes.

To summarize its consequences proximity morality forming, or "on-the-job" ethics develops professionalism, deals with diversity issues, helps in processing difficulties, and desists negative role modelling in clinical teaching.

The students hoped for more interaction between students and teachers in a British study of university students' expectations of teaching (Sander, Stevenson, King & Coates, 2000). They also suggested that groups provide effective learning, and this view was most prominent among medical students. Those findings resemble the present study when it comes to

preferences for teaching structures. In a Swedish study the authors suggested that interactive lecturing was a stimulant to a problem-based learning (PBL) program (Fyrenius, Bergdahl & Silen, 2005). This is in line with the need for good quality lectures to feed ethical discussions with ethics grammar and input from ethics labs in the present study. In a review of medical ethics teaching (Hafferty & Franks, 1994) the authors were nihilistic about its effects and suggested that critical determinants of physician identity operate not within the formal curriculum but in a subtler, less officially recognized "hidden curriculum". Also, medical education could be seen as a form of moral training of which formal instruction in ethics constitutes only a small piece. In a study investigating the effect of ethics education on physician morality it was concluded that moral development and ethical confidence were unaffected by ethics education (Gross, 1999). The goals of ethics education was conceptualized as having cognitive, behavior and attitudinal dimensions. Ethics was supposedly studied for its own sake contributing to "one's all around character". We agree with this author's conclusions, and our analysis suggests that instead of an emphasis on teaching, ethics and morality has to be learned on the job as discovered in a neonatal unit study of proximity ethics (Brinchmann & Nortvedt, 2001) As a reference to one's own morality, Levinas (1969) talks about "the other". Similarly, "the others" (fellow students and teachers/physicians) are necessary for understanding the suggested "on the job" morality development in our study.

Most data used for the GT analysis in this study are limited to written open comments to survey items and multiple-choice survey responses. We did not theoretically sample data outside of the survey apart from data from our own experience, both as medical students, physicians and teachers (all four authors of the paper by Thulesius *et al.* (2007) are physicians and two authors have experience of teaching medical ethics at medical school). Thus the constant comparison was done mainly with cross sectional written data, though "walking survey" data were also used (Glaser, 1998, p 214). Yet we conceptualized a tentative explanatory model of how 220 medical students want their education in medical ethics. This suggests relevance enough for generating a preliminary core variable GT. This theory is, according to the GT paradigm, not right or wrong. It is just a set of probability statements from which hypotheses are generated by constantly comparing available data. When presenting this

proximity morality forming model of on-the-job-ethics to physician colleagues and ethics teachers (both in Sweden and in the USA) the reactions have been positive with some exceptions. The model makes sense and seems to fit with experience. This indicates a certain workability, at least for Swedish and North American contexts.

Limitations

This paper proposes a model showing how medical students want their ethics education in medical school, but does not take into account their teachers' views. Also, our study is limited by the qualitative data being mostly written comments (O'Cathain & Thomas, 2004) in an otherwise multiple-choice survey with a partial response rate. As for the low response rates, the centers with the highest response rates (83%) had the same attitude pattern as those with low response rates (13%) (Lynöe *et al*., 2008). Thus the data seems generalisable enough to fit the requirements for an inductive study. The 11th term students gave the largest quantitative input of qualitative data and thus had a comparatively larger impact on theory generation. Whether this was a limitation is questionable. In our view it gave us more valuable longitudinal data. To use interview data by theoretically sampling outside of the survey might improve the model. We tried to compensate for this by also sampling dichotomized multiple-choice survey data analyzed by different statistical methods including multiple regression models (Lynöe *et al*., 2008). Thus, we also used quantitative data according to the GT maxim "all is data". Furthermore, we used as data four physicians' experience as "walking surveys". For possible future application in medical schools we intend to refine and modify the model and develop it through interaction with medical students and teachers.

Acknowledgements

Author

Hans O. Thulesius[1,2]
[1]Department of Clinical Sciences Malmö,
Division of Family Medicine
Lund University, Sweden
[2]Research and Development Centre
Kronoberg County Council
Växjö, Sweden
Email: hans.thulesius@ltkronoberg.se

References

Andre, J., Brody, H., Fleck, L., Thomason, C.L., & Tomlinson, T. (2003). Ethics, professionalism, and humanities at Michigan State University College of Human Medicine. *Academic Medicine*, *78,* 968-72.

Brinchmann, B.S., & Nortvedt, P. (2001). Ethical decision making in neonatal units--the normative significance of vitality. *Medicine, Health Care & Philosophy, 4,* 193-200.

Fyrenius, A., Bergdahl, B., & Silen, C. (2005). Lectures in problem-based learning--why, when and how? An example of interactive lecturing that stimulates meaningful learning. *Medical Teacher, 27*, 61-5.

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

Glaser, B.G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G. (2001). *The grounded theory perspective I: Conceptualization contrasted with description*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

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

Glaser, B.G. (2005). *The grounded theory perspective III: Theoretical coding.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gross, M.L.(1999). Ethics Education and Physician Morality. *Social Science & Medicine* 49:329-42.

Hafferty, F.W. & Franks, R. (1994). The hidden curriculum, ethics teaching, and the structure of medical education. *Academic Medicine, 69*, 861-71.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity*. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lynöe, N., Löfmark, R.,& Thulesius, H. (2008). Teaching medical ethics: What is the impact of role models? Some experiences from Swedish medical schools. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 34,* 315-6.

Nortvedt, P., & Nordhaug, M. (2008). The principle and problem of proximity in ethics. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 34,* 156-61.

O'Cathain, A., & Thomas, K.J. (2004). "Any other comments?" Open questions on questionnaires - a bane or a bonus to research? *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 4*, 25.

Sander, P., Stevenson, K., King, M., & Coates, D. (2000). University students' expectations of teaching. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*, 309-323.

Sandgren, A., Thulesius, H., Fridlund, B., & Petersson, K. (2006). Striving for emotional survival in palliative cancer nursing. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*, 79-96.

Thulesius, H., & Grahn, B. (2007). Reincentivizing – a new theory of work and work absence. *BMC Health Services Research, 7,:*100

Thulesius, H., Håkansson, A., & Petersson, K. (2003). Balancing: a basic process in end-of-life cancer care. *Qualitative Health Research, 10,* 1353-77.

Thulesius, H., Sallin, K., Lynöe, N., & Löfmark, R. (2007). Proximity morality in medical school--medical students forming physician morality "on the job": grounded theory analysis of a student survey. *BMC Medical Education, 7*, 27.

Table 1

Survey items 1-14	Number of multiple choice items	Number of open-ended responses*	Open-ended responses, word count
1. The general outline of the ethics education was valuable	5	36	251
2. The following modes of education were valuable	6	13	76
3. The education was valuable within the following specific fields	18	34	468
4. The education was valuable within the following general fields	7	22	252
5. Which specific or general areas were valuable? Please give examples!	0	55	410
6. This is my general attitude to ethics education	3	66	960
7. Have you experienced the following (regarding physicians/teachers)	4	24	238
8. Have you encountered (good and/or poor role models/situations that affected you)?	2	27	289
9. The following forms of examination were valuable	8	15	108
10. What was your required course literature (in the ethics education)?	0	94	560
11. How important was medical ethics education for you?	6	46	685
12. Please offer suggestions for changes of the design of the ethics course that would improve it	0	110	1352
13. Should ethics education continue during internship and residency? If yes, then how?	2	156	1422
14. Please supply further comments to the questions above.	0	38	1135
TOTAL	59	736	8206

The survey items and numbers of multiple-choice options and open-ended response word count.
*Total number of responders to open-ended items: 220

Unprivatizing: A bridge to learning

Virginia Leigh Hamilton Crowe, RN, MS, Ed.D.
Jeanne Ellen Bitterman , MA, MA, Ed.D.

Abstract

Depression is a complicated condition situated in a cultural environment that often impedes learning. The purpose of this grounded theory study was to better understand depression from the perspective of those who are living with depression. Data were collected from many sources including document review and autobiographical literature; however, the primary data were collected through in-depth interviews. Fifteen individuals, thirteen women and two men, who felt they had learned both about and from their depression volunteered to participate in the primary interview process. Analysis of the data generated categories, properties and the core concept of unprivatizing. Through theoretical coding a process of learning about one's depression emerged which suggests that learning about one's depression can be experienced as a transitional and meaning-making process that occurs over an extended period of time and facilitates development.

Background

> The disease of depression remains a great mystery. It has yielded its secrets to science far more reluctantly than many of the other major ills besetting us. (Styron, 1990, p. 11)

Depression, or depressive illness, is often referred to as a constellation of disorders that depict a condition or disease which disrupts a person's mood, behavior, physical well-being, and thought (National Institute of Mental Health Depression Brochure, 2000; O'Connor, 1997; Thompson, 1996). Depressive illness is most often attributed to a complex interaction between physiological, psychological, and sociocultural factors (Mazure, Keita, & Blehar, 2002; Murthy, 2001; Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health, 1999). Depression is not a rare phenomenon nor is it without significant cost.

According to the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) (2000), in any given 1-year period, 9.5% of the population will suffer from a depressive illness. The World Health Organization

(WHO) notes that major depression presents the greatest burden of disease for women and is a leading cause of disability globally for both males and females (Lopez et al., 2006; Murthy, 2001). In the United States, Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) is a leading cause of disability and produces one of the highest medical costs of all behavioral conditions (Goldman, Nielson, & Champion, 1999; Hasin, Goodwin, Stinson, & Grant, 2005). It is most difficult to calculate the significant personal and family costs associated with depressive illness, specifically given that one of the most indefinable and devastating of these costs is suicide (Dumais et al., 2005; Goldman, Nielson, & Champion, 1999).

The Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health (1999) states that more than 80% of people with depression can be treated successfully with medication, mental health therapy or a combination of both (Goldman, Nielson, & Champion, 1999; Mazure, Keita, & Blehar, 2002; Murthy, 2001; O'Connor, 1997). The difficulties dealing with depression include the under-diagnosis and cultural stigma associated with mental illness; the complex interaction between physiological, psychological, and sociocultural factors; and the numerous yet often elusive and compounding contributors and triggers to depressive episodes. Thus, to become aware of, acknowledge, and continue learning about depression and how it interacts with one's life are daunting tasks (Beck, Tush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979; Burns, 1999; O'Connor, 1997). And while much is known about what the experts believe is important to teach the depressed individual (Beck, Tush, Shaw, & Emery 1979; Burns, 1999; O'Connor, 1997), little is known or understood about the essential process of learning about depression from the perspective of those living with and learning about their own depression. The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of those who are living with and learning about their own depression and better understand their process of learning about depression as it unfolds over a continuum of time.

Methodology

This study was situated in the constructivist interpretivist paradigm aligned with the "goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live with it" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 221). The rigorous and emergent analytic characteristics of grounded theory were especially applicable to the process of learning about depression,

which is embedded in social situations and influenced by individuals as well as organizational structures. A basic tenet of grounded theory is that "all is data" (Glaser, 1998, p. 8). In alignment with this tenet, data for this study were collected from several sources, with the foremost source being interviews with individuals who have experienced depression. Other data sources included document review (depression information available to individuals online or in physician's offices), autobiographical literature, from which the original themes developed, and two data collection instruments used with interview participants - a Demographic Data Sheet and Learning Audit Tool, both developed by the authors for the study. The primary participants were 15 individuals who, by design of inclusion criteria, had experienced more than one episode of depression, who were not in an acute stage of depression, who had access to help if needed, and who felt they had learned from and about their depression. The participants were obtained through self-identification, referrals, and snowball sampling.

The Theory of Unprivatizing

Individuals with depression often veil their symptoms and keep their experience private. Recognizing and learning about one's depression is difficult and inhibited by privatizing influences. These privatizing influences, such as the near normal characteristics of depression, familial beliefs, and societal minimizing, are many, varied, and often synergistic. Furthermore, these privatizing influences are embedded in and supported by a cultural and societal stigma against mental illness. As the individual's symptom veil begins to weaken, the medicalization of depression provides a language and access to support the unprivatizing process; leading to learning and development.

The core variable of the theory, unprivatizing, is identified by specific changes in the individual's actions and attitude. Behaviors such as obtaining an outside view, seeking consistent discourse, and developing the ability to critically reflect are noted. In addition, an attitudinal awareness and acknowledgement of the limitations and weaknesses of the culture emerges. These changes appear to happen initially in a sequence (stages) which occurs over time and becomes iterative. This process greatly facilitates the individual's awareness and understanding of their own relationship with depression. In addition, growth and

development in frames of reference often occur, making these frames more useful for living and decision making. The individual often outstrips the care professional in their ability to understand their depression.

The transition to integrating is identifiable by specific changes in the individual's actions and attitudes. Behaviors such as an unbending intention to persevere, reflect, learn, and unlearn habits of mind and patterns of behavior that no longer serve are noted. In addition, an attitudinal awareness and acknowledgement of the limitations and weaknesses of the clinicalization or medicalization of depression emerges. These changes appear to happen in an overlapping and iterative process which occurs over time and further facilitates the individual's awareness and understanding of their own relationship with depression, as well as, their personal understanding of being and living. Transformative learning is a characteristic of this period; individuals identify and critically scrutinize long-held and previously unexamined beliefs and assumptions supporting further growth and development.

Privatizing

> I was still holding everything together so well that the people around me had no clue. (primary participant, 2006)

The condition of privatizing is characterized by the intentional or unintentional veiling of one's depressive symptoms from self, from others or from both. It is also characterized by very little learning related to one's depression other than unintentional—for example, content knowledge related to symptoms and treatments from advertisements on numerous television and radio commercials and programs. Privatizing occurs within the generalized context of cultural and societal stigmas of mental health issues. As noted previously, this stigma is deemed by many as a key factor inhibiting ones awareness and further learning. However, many other covariant privatizing influences, such as the characteristics of depression and familial beliefs, are identifiable as well. Unprivatizing influences are also recognized in this phase. These influences, specifically symptom veil weakening and the medicalization of depression, support the beginning of transition from the privatized state.

Privatizing Influences

Personal shame or embarrassment of one's depression is common as is cultural disgrace Through acts of actual, observed, or experienced societal punishments such as job loss, rejection or exclusion. Together, these pragmatic and specific influences support privatizing of the individual's depressive symptoms and symptom veiling; thereby inhibiting awareness and acknowledgment of depression. In addition, less overt variables are also significant privatizing influences. These include societal minimizing of depression (as when people offer "simple" solutions like increase exercise) and depression guilt, which can originate from either oneself or can be stimulated by others (or both). This guilt may be epitomized in disguised-advocacy inquiries such as, "You have such a beautiful family and home. Why are you depressed?"

Individual and family beliefs or assumptions, perhaps more hegemonic in nature than not, may also support symptom veiling in more subtle, yet equally effective, ways. Examples of collusion with depression to veil symptoms and privatize pain include the exuberant individual embedded in a stoic and quiet familial culture, a young mother who perseveres diligently beyond her physical strength to support her family, or the family that loves each other but does not share private matters.

Characteristics of depression then compound the situation. As noted in the Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health Issues (1999) and experienced by many, depression is extremely complex and has no singular identifiable cause. Yet the symptoms of depression are described as ordinary feelings such as sadness, fatigue or loneliness. In addition, for many individuals, depression has been a long-term partner, bringing a normalcy to this state of being. Together, these factors inhibit discernment of depression by creating a "haze" that makes it difficult to identify when normal ends and depression begins.

Further confusing this situation is the negative reinforcing cycle inherent in many depressive symptoms and described by some individuals. For example, one is fatigued with depression, which leads to lack of movement, which leads to increased fatigue; or an individual feels sad, which leads to withdrawal, which leads to isolation, which leads to more withdrawal and more sadness.

Unprivatizing Influences

Suppression or veiling of symptoms, from self or from others, for a long period of time becomes increasingly difficult. Often individuals experience an increased intensity of their symptoms with a resultant inability to control symptoms, such as tears or anger, in desired situations. These periods of increased intensity of symptoms or unexpected loss of control indicate a weakening of the symptom veil and are often a significant factor that leading to recognition of depression—a recognition coming both from within and without, from self as well as from family or friends.

The current cultural medicalization or pathologizing of depression—such as classifying of depression as a disease, successful recent pharmacological treatments, and increased knowledge of depression pathophysiology—has provided an alternative perspective and unprivatizing influence upon the pervasive context of the cultural stigma surrounding depression and mental illness. In addition, increased public awareness and knowledge of depression through public health education and medical marketing have given the public a common language to discuss depression. As a result, it has become easier to talk about symptoms and successful treatments, and to build awareness of relatively easy access for help via the primary care physician.

Transition

There is no singular path or means by which an individual can become aware of and acknowledge his or her depression. It goes without saying, however, that finding a path is necessary if one is to learn about depression. Although not always an identifiable event at the moment, or even similar for all individuals, the experience of conceding and recognizing depression appears to occur within a definable range of conditions over a continuum of time, and is eventually identified as central to the transition from privatizing to unprivatizing.

For some individuals, detecting symptoms and identifying them with depression occurs almost concurrently and can often be associated with a very specific and memorable moment in time. For some individuals, the concurrent experience is driven by individual self-reflection and awareness. For others, the awareness comes more as a surprise and is sometimes first recognized by someone with an outside view (e.g., a healthcare worker or a family member).

Others become slowly aware of depressive symptoms and depression over a period of time. Individuals are less able to pinpoint awareness and connect it with acknowledgment because it is more of an unfolding process. Rather, the individual experiences a slow dawning of awareness that the sadness, aloneness or pain one consistently feels might be depression.

For some individuals, the unfolding process is a linkage of trends, such as inappropriate crying on the way to work, fatigue and laziness. For others, the unfolding is an unlinking of often interdependent and confounding symptoms. Over time, individuals begin to unlink their depressive symptoms from other simultaneously occurring symptoms, events or illnesses, such as unlinking depression from anorexia. This can be a tedious and difficult process, and the unlinking does not negate the interdependence or synergistic nature of the other concerns.

Unprivatizing

> I think there's something incredibly valuable about talking about depression openly and learning to articulate your own depression and having somebody with empathy listen to you and be gentle with you. And I think that does help you to judiciously share. It helps you to understand when it's appropriate, when it's safe. (primary participant, 2007)

Unprivatizing also occurs within the generalized context of cultural and societal stigma toward mental health issues; however, the stigma appears to be less influential in this phase, which is clearly characterized by engaging an outside view. In addition, an acute awareness of the limitations and weaknesses of the culture emerges and is given voice.

Actual societal barriers within the culture, often enhanced by an unchallenged appreciation for individualism, are acknowledged and noted as impediments to mental health and wellness. Limited mental health access and reduced therapeutic visits (e.g. 10 minutes a visit) are examples. Unprivatizing involves three stages: Start Talking; and, Self-knowing. Although the stages are depicted as being linear and described as almost stepwise, they become somewhat fluid and recursive. The first stage, Start Talking, occurs initially either before or concurrent with Help-finding. Self-knowing follows after both Start-Talking and Help-finding. After initial experience of all three stages, the stages become iterative and flexible.

During unprivatizing, individuals value outside views, seek out discourse, and are able to critically self-reflect. Primarily during the first two stages, individuals gain much depression knowledge, mostly through informal self-directed learning. This general knowledge pertains to the medical model of depression as a disease, common symptoms associated with depression, and current medical standard interventions, such as talk-relational therapy and medication. The third stage, Self-knowing, is distinguished by increased learning which occurs primarily through experiential learning and is centered on one's knowledge of his or her unique personal experience with depression.

Start Talking

The beginning of the start talking stage, for most (although not all) individuals is recognized as a clearly defined moment in time. At such a moment, the subject of depression is broached, either directly or indirectly, with another individual or individuals and an outside view received. The movement toward unprivatizing and sharing one's story can be on the continuum ranging from either a very linear direct approach or a very circuitous indirect approach. The direct approach straightforwardly recognizes and situates one's depression. The indirect approach involves first talking about another issue, condition or situation and eventually turning to the issue of depression or depressive symptoms. For example, this might occur while talking about another condition, such as Adult ADD, or describing a related symptom, such as anxiety. The setting of the stage for disclosure appears to require establishing a safe environment and most often occurs with a professional or trusted friend or family member.

Help-finding

The Help-finding stage is characterized by discovering a method to support continued awareness and initial learning about one's depression and also involves an outside view. The healthcare system is the most likely—although not the only—place to find help. Primary care providers, mental health professionals, and specialists are common supports in the Help-finding stage. However, friends, family or religious leaders, separately or in conjunction with each other and the healthcare system, may also be utilized for support.

Although Start Talking and Help-finding differ, they may coincide. The time in which individuals begin to talk and obtain an outside view of their experience might overlap with their pathway to help. Others find a gap, and so the experience becomes much more of a hunt or journey to find supports for learning about depression. One reason for this gap, other than the individual's desire for it, is that depression can easily become entwined or linked with other conditions and hence hidden. Therefore, the depression is not easily identifiable, creating a gap between expression, recognition, and help-finding.

Another reason for the gap comes from the healthcare system, which can unfortunately be experienced as an impediment that thwarts and delays oft times by misdirection, mistreatment or misdiagnosis. Other impediments from the healthcare system include lack of access (i.e., inability to schedule a timely appointment), poor service experience, and insurance limits or rejections. In worst-case scenarios, the healthcare system might even cause harm as a direct result of medical intervention.

There is a noticeable "fit factor" within the Help-finding stage. This "fit factor" appears to have three aspects: a fit with personal beliefs, a fit with an individual's specific situation and desired characteristics, and a fit with wanted structure. A good fit corresponds with an individual's personal religious or philosophical beliefs and is also compatible with the unique situation and desired characteristics of the individual. For example, if one is part of a bi-cultural family living in different countries, a multi-national awareness might be desirable. Or if one is a professional, then an understanding of professional needs and requirements would be essential. Overall, a non-condescending and supportive, yet also challenging, environment is most desired. In addition, the type of structure favored is related to fit. Help-finding might be short-term, as in meeting with someone once or twice, or long-term help over several months. Structure needs might be acute and episodic or continuous and systematic. A bad fit can inhibit learning and cause delay, if not damage.

Self-knowing

Self-knowing is characterized by the individual's growing knowledge of the unique manifestation of depression in their lives, as well as the specific characteristics of their relationship

with depression. Environmental, relational, and meaning precipitants are explored. These precipitants or contributors are multiple, non-hierarchical, and converging. Symptoms are more clearly identified; physical, emotional, and self-worth symptoms merge into a distinctive and unique symptom complex. For some individuals, symptom progression is eventually recognizable. An individual, personal, and unique "depression footprint" emerges.

Interventions are created, analyzed, and adapted. These individualized interventions range from minor changes in diet and exercise to major lifestyle changes, from learning specific skills to situational avoidance, from creating a life history to psychodrama . One's own physiology, in relation to and apart from depression, is studied and becomes more understandable. Others, also become more acutely aware of the unintended aftermath of their depressive episodes, such as damage to their relationships, may seek to learn about healing this damage.

Transition

Although the phase of unprivatizing is distinguishable from integrating, the actual transition between the two is less clear. Since integrating is a more inclusive, overlapping, and iterative, then perhaps the transition is as well. Three characteristics, however, do appear evident in individuals who move to the third phase. First, the clinicalization or medicalization of depression becomes insufficient to contain and describe the entire lived condition. Second, transformative learning (Mezirow, 1991, 2000), at least at the process level, becomes evident. Third, the individual characteristic of an unbending intention to persevere, reflect, learn, and unlearn habits of mind and patterns of behavior that no longer serve is asserted as a coherent commitment.

Integrating

> Part of it was learning for me…learning that I had gifts and I had
> things to contribute. Learning that they were worthy, and that
> they're notable and that they should be used instead of shrugging
> them off and not believing in me or them or truly the outcome of
> what they could do.(primary participant, 2007)

Integrating is much less influenced by the ever present cultural and societal stigma of mental health issues and characterized by an acknowledgment of the limitations of the medicalization of depression. This phase is further distinguished by the entrenched

value of and developed structure for personal reflection and for obtaining a consistent outside view. Integrating also consists of three stages: Self-discovery,Self-caretaking, and Meaning-making. These stages overlap and are integrated. In addition, they are distinguished by profound personal awareness. The learning in integrating, however, is centered not on depression as much as on the individual's being in the world—situating his or her essence, nature, personality, and behavior, both healthy and unhealthy, in context.

Self-discovery

In the stage of Self-discovery, participants identify their own patterns of behavior that often exacerbate or contribute to their depression, such as unrelentingly self-judgment, striving for perfection, over accommodation and minimizing hurtful behavior. Furthermore, assumptions and beliefs that can contribute to depression, or drive unhealthy or uncomfortable behavior patterns, are surfaced and examined; for example, changing from a dichotomous thinking of "I either succeed or I fail—there's no in between" to a more understanding and compassionate stance with oneself; or, the realization that laziness is not experienced fatigue and resting, nor love expressed by over-accommodating in relationships.

In addition, individuals in this phase become more aware of what they value and from where they draw energy. For example, being aligned in "heart, mind, and body," deriving energy from being creative or spending time with nature or animals. Finally, although not lastly, individuals in this stage often seek and learn about their worth and purpose; for example, becoming aware that unfulfilled dreams and goals were related to, although not the total cause of, ones depression; or learning to not only to recognize one's gifts core to one's being, but also to appreciate (and act on) their worth.

Self-caretaking

Learning in the phase of integrating is not solely focused on depression (as it is in unprivatizing); however, in the stage of self-caretaking, a profound learning occurs about one's relationship with and sharing of his or her depression. Individuals in this stage learn to disclose their experience with depression more thoughtfully—a "wise" unprivatizing. This wise unprivatizing contains two aspects. First, there is a judicious management or

"being strategically authentic" and acknowledging the potential effect of cultural stigma against mental heath issues, while not deciding to disclose solely on that issue. The other aspect of "wise unprivatizing" is related to the oxymoron-like characteristics of depression as both complex and near-normal, both common and unique. Individuals who learn about their depression know the insipid nature of the condition, how common it looks, how complex it is, and how easily it can be missed. They also know well their unique "footprint" and share it wisely with others who love them and help them feel safe. This wise unprivatizing creates a vigilant comrade, who willingly shares the responsibility with the individual to continually observe for that "footprint." It is quite contrary to the phenomenon of co-dependency.

During this stage, individuals also move from a depression focus to a "being" focus, and learn to change personal and ingrained patterns of behavior or habits of mind, often becoming more comfortable with joy and embracing more compassion toward their own selves. While the old habits might have served the individual well in the past, they no longer do so. Synergistic to this learning of changed behavior is learning to recognize one's physiological, psychological or social needs independent of depression, and then to take actions to fulfill them.

Finally, individuals learn to consciously challenge assumptions and then purposefully choose to hold, revise, and even abandon them. These assumptions or beliefs might be personal, such as beliefs about one's unique ability, intelligence or core being; or they might be cultural, related to one's being or place within the culture. They might also be familial or societal beliefs about appropriate behaviors or patterns of contemplation: such as reflection on one's heterosexuality, examination of dichotomous thinking patterns, or a critical investigation of the traditional beliefs of one's profession or practice. The assumptions may or may not be associated intimately with the experience of depression, but they are all associated with the matter of living.

Meaning-making

The meaning-making stage of integrating consists of two approaches: making sense of depression and reaching out. Individuals struggle to make sense of depression in their lives often by utilizing multiple frames. Some individuals make sense

of the experience by identifying the individual benefits of self-discovery. For example, identifying that self-knowledge stems from one's experience with depression or that depression, although not wishing it on anyone, can be a great teacher. Other individuals make sense of depression in a socio-cultural or familial context, identifying cultural oppression and suppression of emotions as contributors to depression, along with trauma such as physical or sexual abuse, neglect, and abandonment.

In addition, many individuals make sense of depression in a physiological manner, such as the familial tendency associated with depression. Others understand their depression, at least initially, through the use of the medical model of depression—describing it as a "disease of distortion"—as "treatable" but not "curable." Finally, some individuals describe a religious or spiritual approach to making sense of their depression. Some use a more traditional religious frame, describing both God and the devil in depression; others assume a more undefined, less traditional spiritual perspective.

Reaching out to others about the depressive experience is identified as a significant second dimension to meaning-making. Two reasons surface the desire to share. First, sharing one's story with individuals who also appear to be experiencing depression seems driven by compassion. It is highly personal, and most often occurs with family members or close friends. Second, helping to increase awareness of depression and mental health in one's culture and society is more akin to social action, which may challenge and change the prevalent paradigm of mental health. Neither reason is done carelessly; both spring from the mindfulness of cultural and societal stigmas, as well as one's own health. Although reaching out publicly is characterized by concern, caution, and forethought, it is also noted as empowering.

Discussion

A significant discovery of this study was the transitional learning process that the participants underwent as they learned about their own depression. This transitional process fits and is relevant to the literature and research on the phases and transitions within the experience of depression (Amankwaa, 2000; Beck, 1993, 2002, 2006; Regev, 2001; Schreiber, 1995, 1996). The discovery of the phased learning process expands current theory on the experience of depression by making more

visible the less understood perspective of "how people actually go about understanding and organizing their recovery from depression" through learning (Ridge & Ziebland, 2006, p. 1038).

In privatizing, awareness and acknowledgment of depression by the participants in this study were inhibited by multiple confounding psychological, physiological, sociocultural, and depression-specific factors, which are also noted in the depression literature (Amankwaa, 2000; Beck, 1993, 2002, 2006; Beck et al., 1979; Burns, 1999; Goldman, Nielson, & Champion, 1999; Kessler et al., 2003; Murthy, 2001; O'Connor, 1997; Pignone et al., 2002; Regev, 2001; Schreiber, 1995, 1996; Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health, 1999). Learning about one's depression is boxed in by these forces and does not effectively begin until privatizing ends. This inhibiting of learning by lack of awareness and engagement in experience is recognized and supported in the adult learning literature (Boud, Cohen, & Walker, 1993; Brew, 1993; Jarvis, 1987, 1992; Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1991, 2000). Specifically, the research of Jarvis (1987, 1992) on meaningful and meaningless experience and non-learning helps explain this evident lack of learning in the participants.

Although a difficult process, all individuals in the study transitioned from privatizing into unprivatizing. The transition was often stimulated by a disjuncture in their experience and supported by their exposure to the widely available and medically reliable information on depression. This disjuncture in experience and interaction with an extant body of knowledge initiated help-seeking, provided an alternative perspective, enhanced communication, and facilitated learning. The impacts of such disjuncture is well documented in the adult learning literature (Boud, Cohen, & Walker, 1993; Brew, 1993; Jarvis, 1987, 1992; Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1991, 2000) as well as in the depression literature (Hanson-Lynn, 2005; Karp, 1994; Moreta, 2007).

In the Unprivatize phase, individuals began dealing with the complex and problematic issue of their depression by interacting with others, engaging their emotions, and acting on their experience. All individuals in the study utilized a self-directed, informal, experiential learning which is described in the adult learning literature as well (Boud, Cohen, & Walker, 1993; Jarvis, 1998; Kolb, 1984; Marsick & Watkins, 1990). The result was deeper learning and a more expanded meaning perspective entailing a reconstructed and more useful frame for making

meaning of their experience with depression (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Mezirow, 1991, 2000).

Not all individuals in the study transitioned into integration, which is characterized not only by a challenge to the clinical pathologized view of depression, but the ability and practice of the participants to reflect on perspectives, both theirs and others, associated with depression and worldviews. The depth of this self-directed, informal, experiential learning led to a profound personal awareness centered not only on the individuals' experience with depression, but with their constructed being in this world; this then supported transformations of their prior meaning perspectives. This perspective reflection is noted in the depression literature associated with recovery (Granek, 2006; Ridge & Ziebland, 2006; Schreiber, 1995, 1996) and noted in adult learning literature related to transformational learning and development (Brew, 1993; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999; Mezirow, 1991, 2000).

Merriam and Caffarella (1999) note that "to extract deeper and more expanded learning from some of our most difficult times, adults often need an extended period of time and the active support and caring from others" (p. 108). That was the case for the individuals in this study as their learning occurred in phases over time, was supported by a safe environment, and facilitated by an outside view. The result was a profound and more complex learning through difficult times.

Limitations

This exploration into a number of personal experiences of individuals with depression yielded not only information on how these individuals became aware of and acknowledged their depression, but also on what and how they continued to learn about their depression over time and about the factors that facilitated or impeded their learning. Both privatizing and unprivatizing emerged rather early as conceptual categories of importance with many related sub-categories and properties. The concept of "unprivatizing" was not recognized as the core variable until late in the coding process. This led to further theoretical sampling to develop concepts and categories related to the continuing learning process of integrating. This concept is perhaps not as well developed, or saturated, as unprivatizing, yet it is sufficiently developed to be included in the emerging theory.

Conclusion

> I would say my whole life has transformed in the last seven years, where I felt I was living life from an ocean of depression and able to get to the surface periodically—and now I feel like I live my life in the sunshine and periodically I step into some deep pool and go [laugh] whoops, I need to get myself out of this. So it's been a lifelong sort of transformation of the way I experience myself within it. (primary participant, 2007)

This study contributes to the small but growing body of grounded theory research using qualitative data which is focused on the relevant issue of personal meaning that people attribute to depression and how they understand and organize their experience of living with and recovering from depression. Merriam (2004) notes that the link between development and learning is clear in transformational learning theory and that growth and development are recognized outcomes of transformational learning. The growth and development of all the participants in the present study were evident by the reconstructed manner in which they made meaning of their relationship with depression. For some, the development also entailed a deep shift in their frame of reference, a transformation to a more developed meaning scheme which was more useful and complex, more connected to self and to others, and more reflective of assumptions—both personal and cultural, both prescriptive and paradigmatic.

The contribution of this study provides an enlarged framework from which to view learning about one's depression as a progression over time verses a quantitative knowledge dumping. It provides actionable items which could be used to assist learning, such as the unique foot print and the fit factor. However, to the authors, the most valuable contributions are encouragement to providers and adult educators, as well as individuals who are experiencing depression, and their families, to take hope that learning matters, meaning can be found, recovery can happen, and growth can occur. Life can be worth living.

Authors
Virginia Leigh Hamilton Crowe, RN, MS, Ed.D.
Principal, Hamilton Consulting, LLC
Email: VLHC@HamiltonC.org

Jeanne Ellen Bitterman , MA, MA, Ed.D.
Lecturer, Teachers College, Columbia University

References

Amankwaa, L. C. C. (2000). *Enduring: A grounded theory investigation of postpartum depression among African-American women.* Ph.D. dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Beck, A. T., Tush, A. J., Shaw, B., & Emery, G. (1979). *Cognitive therapy of depression.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Beck, C. T. (1993). Teetering on the edge: a substantive theory of postpartum depression. *Nursing Research, 42*(1), 42-48.

Beck, C. T. (2002). Revision of the postpartum depression predictors inventory. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing,* 31(4), 394-402.

Beck, C. T. (2006). Postpartum depression: It isn't just the blues. *The American Journal of Nursing,* 106(5), 40-51.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Walker, D. (Eds.). (1993). *Using experience for learning.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Boud, D., & Walker D. (1993). Barriers to reflection on experience. In D. Boud, R. Cohen, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Using experience for learning* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, pp. 73-86.

Brew, A. (1993). Unlearning through experience. In D. Boud, R. Cohen, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Using experience for learning* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, pp. 87-98.

Burns, D. (1999). *Feeling good: The new mood therapy.* New York: HarperCollins.

Depression.com. (2006) *http://www.depression.com/types_of_depression.html*

Dumais, A., Lesage, A. D., Alda, M., Rouleau, G., Dumont, M., Chawky, N., Roy, M., Mann, J. J., Benkelfat, C., & Turecki, G. (2005, November). Risk factors for suicide completion in major depression: A case control study of impulsive and aggressive behaviors in men. *The American Journal of Psychiatry,* 162, 2116-2124.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory.* 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. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G. (2004). Remodeling grounded theory. *The Grounded Theory Review*, 4(1), 1-22.

Goldman, L., Nielson, N., & Champion, H. (1999). Awareness, diagnosis, and treatment of depression for the Council on Scientific Affairs, American Medical Association. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 14, 569-580.

Granek, L. (2006). What's love got to do with it? The relational nature of depressive experiences. *The Journal of Humanistic Psychology,* 46(2), 191-208.

Hanson-Lynn, J. A. (2005). *Help-seeking with postpartum depression: A retrospective analysis of women's experiences of PPD and their help-seeking process.* Psy.D. dissertation, Argosy University, Seattle, WA.

Hasin, D., Goodwin, R., Stinson, F., & Grant, B. (2005). Epidemiology of major depressive disorder: Results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcoholism and Related Conditions. *Archives General Psychiatry*, 62, 1097-1106.

Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: Towards an analysis of learning from life. *Adult Education Quarterly, 37*(3), 164-172.

Jarvis, P. (1992). *Paradoxes of learning: On becoming an individual in society.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Karp, D. A. (1992). Illness, ambiguity and the search for meaning: A case study of a self-help groups for affective disorders. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 21(2), 139.

Kessler, R., Berglund, P., Demler, O., Jin, R., Koretz, D., Merikangesw, K., Rush, J., Walters, E., Wang, P., et al.

(2003). The epidemiology of major depressive disorder: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *Journal of the American Medical Association,* 289(23), 3095.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as The Source of Learning and Development.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lopez, A., Mathers, C., Ezzati, M., Jamison, D., & Murray, C., (Eds.). (2006). *Global burden of disease and risk factors.* Washington, DC: The World Bank, and New York: Oxford University Press.

Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace.* New York & London: Routledge

Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 89, 25-34.

Mazure, C. M., Keita, G. P., & Blehar, M. C. (2002). *Summit on women and depression: Proceeding and recommendations.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association. Available online at *www.apa.org/pi/wpo/women&depression.pdf*

Merriam, S. B. (Ed.). (1993). *An update on adult learning theory.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (Ed.). (2001). *The new update on adult learning theory.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2004). The role of cognitive development in Mezirow's transformational learning theory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 60-68.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Heuer, B. (1996). Meaning-making, adult learning and development: A model with implications for practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education,* 15(4), 243-255.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moreta, F. (2007). *The initial help seeking experiences of women with depression.* M.S. dissertation, Long Island University, The Brooklyn Center, NY.

Murthy, R. S. (Ed.). (2001). *The World Health Report: 2001: Mental Health: New understanding, new hope.* Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). (2000). *Depression brochure.* Bethesda, MD: http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/depression/summary.shtml

O'Connor, R. (1997). *Undoing depression.* New York: Berkley Books.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pignone, M., Gaynes, B., Rushton, J., Burchell, C., Orleans, T., & Mulrow, C. (2002). Screening for depression in adults: A summary of the evidence. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 136(10), 765-776.

Regev, M. (2001). *The experience of postpartum depression: A grounded theory study.* Ph.D. dissertation, The University of British Columbia, British Columbia, Canada.

Ridge, D., & Ziebland, S. (2006). "The old me could never have done that": How people give meaning to recovery following depression. *Qualitative Health Research,* 16(8), 1038-1053.

Schreiber, R. S. (1995). *(Re)defining my self: Women's process of recovery from depression.* D.N.S. dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY.

Schreiber, R. (1996). (Re)defining my self: Woman's process of recovery from depression. *Qualitative Health Research,* 6(4), 469.

Styron, W. (1990). *Darkness visible.* New York: Random House.

Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health. (1999). *Mental health: A report of the Surgeon General*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Surgeon General's Report on Mental Health. (2001). *Mental health: Culture, race and ethnicity—Supplement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

Thompson, T. (1995). *The beast: A journey through depression*. New York: Penguin Putnam.

Grounding the Translation: Intertwining analysis and translation in cross-language grounded theory research

Svetlana Shklarov, MD, RSW, PhD Candidate

Abstract

Grounded theory research in cross-language, cross-cultural context is associated with the challenges of linguistic sensitivity of conceptualization. The author, a bilingual researcher, offers reflection on her experience of doing grounded theory research, assuming a dual role of a theorist and a translator. The reflection is based on self-observations. Grounding the translation is shown to be acheived through the strategy of intertwining the activities of translation and conceptual analysis, performed by one person. The two activities are inseparable in time and take place along with constant comparison across language boundaries. Intertwining requires that theoretical sensitivity of the researcher be enriched with the sensitivity to linguistic and cultural meanings. Intertwining, through revealing differences between linguistic meanings or language structures, facilitates the emergence of concepts and theoretical categories from the very act of translation. Combining the functions of translation and analysis and using the strategy of intertwining worked effectively for this researcher.

Introduction

Translation has been so much a part of qualitative research in multicultural settings that we rarely give heed to the depth of processes involved in cross-language data collection and analysis. Certain aspects are better understood than others. The most common, traditional concern is the accuracy and equivalency of information transferred from one language to another – the quality and ethics of translation (e.g., Houbert, 1998; Hunt & Bhopal, 2004). More recently researchers began to analyze the challenges of representation across languages, multiple interpretations, reflexivity, and the integral role of the translator (e.g., Friedrich, 1992; Mc Laughlin & Sall, 2001; Muula, 2005; Temple & Edwards, 2002).

In this article I present a reflection on my experience of conducting grounded theory research, as a sole bilingual researcher with monolingual participants. Through analyzing my self-observations in this project, which I was conducting for my PhD, I examined the aspects of translation in cross-language grounded theory study. In this study I explored life stories narrated by Russian-speaking Holocaust survivors, recent émigrés from the Former Soviet Union. My research design involved a full combination of translation and analysis, in which I assumed the position of a bilingual investigator who performed both functions. In such setting, a theory emerges from the data written (or spoken) in the language of monolingual participants that is unknown to the audience (the *source* language). Research results are presented in the language of the audience (the *target* language).

There are no specific prescribed procedures for translation in the context of grounded theory research. Therefore, I experimented in my study with some patterns of working in cross-language area, using my previous experiences in translation. I applied more systematically those patterns that worked for me, and observed how these patterns fit into the analysis. In my research, I have found that doing cross-language grounded theory involves strategies that differ from those involved in traditionally understood translation. My experimenting led me to the discovery of a strategy that emerged naturally in my work, namely, the *intertwining* of the activities of translation and conceptual analysis. Both translation and conceptual analysis were activities, or acts, which I performed as a bilingual person (in that, these were both my functions). Intertwining these activities was the strategy that I used to achieve better grounding of my translation in cross-language data, while discovering a grounded theory.

In this article I analyze some properties of the strategy of intertwining, and reflect on the relevant features of language translation in this context. In my attempts to reflect on my experiences doing this research, I intend to ground my conclusions in thorough self-observations, but also recognize the limitations of these conclusions, which are based on one person's practices. Therefore, I do not aim at developing an integrated theory on the basis of my limited reflections. The purpose of the hypotheses presented in this article is only to begin to understand

the complex patterns that are associated with cross-language grounded theory research, and to invite further exploration of this area.

Conceptual Analysis and Translation - The Intertwining

Conventionally, any form of cross-language exchange implies the need for text translation, which is most naturally understood as conveying the full textual message verbatim from one language to anther. By *text* I understand a unit of analysis, any set of verbal qualitative materials, whether written or spoken. Traditionally, the original text is expected to be presented in the target language, before the analysis begins and before the findings can be reported (Glicksman & Van Haitsma, 2002; Temple, 2006). However, the expectation of full, verbatim translation and its separation from the analysis does not always match the grounded theory research objectives, when both functions are performed by one bilingual person. The interplay between the two activities – translation and conceptual analysis – involves the strategy of intertwining, which includes analytical efforts that take place before, in parallel to, or independent of the technical textual translation. Intertwining the two activities (which are the two functions of one researcher) can also yield additional emerging concepts that would be missed otherwise. To explore the strategy of intertwining and try to understand what it involves, we might begin with comparing some strategies involved in language translation and discovering a theory.

Translation and GT: The Parallels

Generating conceptual theory from empirical data, as a cognitive act, has some similarities with language translation. Both activities are rooted in discovering and conveying conceptual meanings: the former from descriptive data into general patterns and a theory, and the latter – across texts written in two different languages. The direction of translation cannot be presented as a one-way vector. The constant search for a suitable word involves the reiterative comparison between words and textual contexts that flows in both directions to balance the equivalency of meanings. By analogy, in search for working concepts, the procedures of grounded theory require continuous comparison that is carried out across the data and the emerging concepts.

A given concept is often signified in two languages by words

that have similar meanings but bear different subtle nuances and cultural connotations (Hunt & Bhopal, 2004; Tsai et al., 2004; see also Schopenhauer, 1800/1992). These differences have to be captured in the translation. Often it is impossible to express a complex concept in different languages with precise equivalency, and the translator has to settle for the most effective compromise. The settling for a compromise involves elements of theorizing.

Translating is challenging when complex, contextually foreign words are under consideration. For example, in my research, it was difficult to find a Russian equivalent to the English word *resilience*. I tried to translate this word into Russian in the beginning of my data collection, because I intended to present the concept of resilience to my participants in our interview conversations.

In English-language psychology, the meaning of r*esilience* is metaphoric: "Resilience, according to the dictionary, means recoiling or springing back to the original shape after bending, stretching, or compression. Psychological resilience implies a similar springing back after having been subject to severe stressors." (Valent, 1998, p. 517). There are a number of Russian words that can express the concept, but none have this metaphoric meaning, and each of the translation options has a connotation that is somewhat different from other versions (Muller, 1990). Occasionally, authors use the metaphor of *elasticity (эластичность)* (Pearce, 1997), but this translation is an exception. Most common translation choices in the available Russian-language academic literature have a meaning close to *hardiness* or *[life-] steadiness*. (In an English presentation, I can only give the closest literal translation of the Russian words.)

The contextual connotation of the concept is also controversial: in western academic discourse, it is often associated with the psychology of trauma, vulnerability, and posttraumatic sequelae. This connection is very weak when the concept is used in the Russian cultural context, because historically the notion of psychic trauma has been suppressed in Soviet academic and public discourse until the recent decade.

The word that I used in my conversations with the Russian-speakers was not a literal reflection of the English metaphoric concept. Therefore, I often employed more than a single word. I added background explanations and frequently invited my interview partners' input by asking about their understanding and interpretations of the phenomena.

In this example, a routine translation, through analysis and comparison, became a micro-theory development, with an outcome expressed in a set of working and fitting words, together with a context-specific interview strategy and data collection technique. According to my observations, translation is associated with constant comparing of the concepts, the words' meanings, and their properties in the contexts of different cultures.

Translation and GT - The Intertwining

An ability to conceptualize and a commitment to constant comparison are paramount for good translation, to the same extent as these qualities are important for building a grounded theory. Therefore, combining the functions of a researcher and a translator is most natural for a bilingual theorist.

Because one bilingual person carries out both translation and conceptual analysis, these two functions become intertwined. According to my self-observations, the intertwining involves the following properties. *First*, the two functions (the activities of translation and analysis) are inseparable in time and happen simultaneously. *Second*, constant comparison, which is an essential tool of analysis, takes place across language boundaries, transcending the technical stage of isolated translation. *Third,* theoretical sensitivity of the researcher needs to be enriched with the sensitivity to differences in language meanings and its implications for the emerging theoretical concepts. The analyst takes an active role engaging in the interplay, reiteration between the two activities. And *finally*, data for conceptual analysis can be collected from the very act of translation, and the differences between meanings or language structures can become a source of important concepts and theoretical categories. I will now review and illustrate these properties.

Inseparability in time.

The first property (the simultaneousness of translation and analysis) is implied by the intrinsic similarity of the two activities and interplay between them, which prevents one from separating them in time. My experience has demonstrated that when I work with texts across languages, the acts of translating and analyzing literally become intertwined in one cognitive act of

conceptualizing, regardless of cross-language textual boundaries, or any intentions of scheduling time for translation separately. It would be a simplification to expect that the two functions of translation and analysis be performed by the researcher in sequence (e.g., translation first, coding and analysis next), because by translating the text one will inevitably engage in conceptualizing the ideas that emerge from its content.

I have noticed that analysis, coding, and memoing cannot be delayed until the full translation is completed. Most grounded theory researchers are familiar with the emergence of ideas during the interviews or shortly after, before the formal, technical and written implementation of coding or other procedures. In a similar way, my cross-language mindset became tuned into the subtleties of cultural meanings early in the data collection stage. I could not separate translation from analysis.

When I first attempted translating my transcribed interviews in the early days of my research, concepts began to emerge as soon as I started translation, even prior to creating the written target-language text. I decided to change the tactics. I transcribed the interviews fully in Russian, and then proceeded with open coding and writing my memos in English, without prior full translation of the source texts. I skipped the stage of translating my transcripts verbatim. This strategy proved useful, and allowed me to avoid the distortion of the original source-language words before their conceptual meaning became evident through the analysis. I realized that premature language translation could have influenced the consequent coding, and decided to preserve all my raw data in Russian.

Constant comparison across language boundaries.

In my research, the simultaneous undertaking of translation and analysis led to the simultaneous work with texts in both languages. The second property of intertwining, which is the constant comparison across the languages, helps ensure the link between data and emerging concepts. For example, during selective and theoretical coding, I continued working with concepts signified by English words, constantly comparing the meaning of English words with the meanings embedded in source language data. Thus, the comparison between concepts, data incidents, and emerging theoretical hypotheses, expressed in theoretical codes and memos, occurred and was constantly

reiterated across languages, transcending cross-language boundaries.

I translated selected excerpts of the interviews into English. This verbatim translation usually occurred at the time of writing memos that were grounded in the particular data excerpts – the indicators of the conceptual categories that were central in these memos. Writing such memos, accompanied with translating related data excerpts, enriches the memos with concepts emerging as a result of deeper focusing on source data through translation.

Working across languages is reiterative, and is not limited to one separate procedure, such as open, selective, or theoretical coding. Constant comparison requires returning to the source language, if the need for it emerges, at any time of the analysis, for example, when writing a theoretical memo or at the stage of writing up the theory. Consistent with general grounded theory procedures, in the early stages of research comparative working across languages happens at the level of data incidents, or between data incidents and emerging concepts. In later stages of theoretical coding and writing, language comparison is applied to ideas expressed in the two languages, rather than only data.

I found that, with the intertwining of translation and analysis, reiterative returning to the source language does not always mean referring to source data texts, but often also pertains to working with concepts and theoretical ideas, through fitting them in both languages. For example, the researcher can create source-language memos in parallel with the ones in English, or check emerging concepts for their fit in both languages upon their emergence. The purpose of such activities is not verification by back translation, but rather deepening the analysis through cross-language enrichment of the emerging categories.

Association between language ability and theoretical sensitivity.

While intertwined in time and in constant comparison across the texts in both languages, the activities of translation and analysis remain the functions of one person: the bilingual theorist. The qualities of this person, such as her ability to conceptualize and her theoretical sensitivity, are essential in research. According to Glaser (2002b), the researcher's position,

in general, is "a vital variable to weave into the constant comparative analysis" (para. 11). The researcher's language knowledge is, thus, an important part of such a variable in cross-language setting. This leads us to the third property of intertwining, which I observed in my study: the significance of the researcher's sensitivity to differences in language meanings for her overall theoretical sensitivity, and the use of these associated qualities in performing both functions.

In grounded theory research, the discovered theory is expected to carry features of the individual researcher's theoretical sensitivity and creative ability to conceptualize. As a researcher, I was constantly aware that my theoretical sensitivity was partially dependent on my ability to conceptualize the subtle linguistic and cultural differences. Having been involved in multiple projects that required both translation and analysis, I was not new to language translation. In more than ten years of my work with multicultural projects prior to initiating this study, I had extensive experience of oral and written translation in different settings and disciplines, ranging from client information in services to seniors, to international teaching situations, and to professional publications in mental health and psychiatry. These experiences have sharpened both my sensitivity to language differences and my skills necessary for achieving cultural relevancy in translation. I discovered that these skills significantly enriched my theoretical sensitivity and ability to conceptualize. In addition, remembering Glaser's (1978) recommendation of "reliance on the social psychology of the analyst" (p. 2), I could rely on my intimate connection with Russian as my first language, using this connection and my knowledge of the culture within the constant comparison mode.

Emergence of concepts from the act of translation.

In my research, the intertwining allowed capturing the differences between linguistic meanings, which facilitated discovering patterns implied by these differences. In doing so, I discovered the fourth and final property of intertwining: the emergence of concepts from data collected as a result of the very act of translation. Important ideas can originate from capturing the differences between meanings or language structures.

A single word and its context in a participant's utterance can provide data for discovering a significant category or a number of

interconnected categories. An analysis of the following interview episode illustrates my statement. One of my interview partners referred to herself in our conversation as a "victim of the Holocaust." My first reaction was to ask a probing question, "Do you consider yourself a victim?" The interviewee's answer was, "Yes, I am a victim." No further explanations followed, and she continued her story as if uninterrupted, without giving much notice to the issue. I understood that for her, this was not a question worth discussion (L.Y. transcript, 2006).

I knew the difference between the cultural connotations of the word *victim* in the two languages, and sensed the potential discrepancy. In English, and in particular in the context of traditional conversations with the Holocaust survivors, the word *victim* bears a somewhat negative, inferior connotation that makes it relatively uncommon in the contemporary vocabulary of western-educated survivors. The connotation relates to the western discourse, in which this word is paired with the word *survivor*. The common victim-survivor dichotomy implies the victorious nature of survivorship, and the triumph of the human spirit over life adversities. Within this binary opposition, *victim* would be the negative polarity, and *survivor* – the positive one (for reference on binary opposition in social contraction and language, see Gergen, 1999). It is possible that a Holocaust survivor who is used to western listeners would have recognized the prompt in my question ("Do you consider yourself a victim?") and responded to it differently. Conversely, for my research participant, in her language context of a former Soviet citizen and a Riussian-speaker, there was no conflict between the two categories. My probing question and the conceptual connection I was trying to imply appeared irrelevant.

The Russian word *victim*, although a precise equivalent of the English word, does not always bear the same contextual nuances. In many contexts it has a somewhat heroic connotation (it also has a meaning of *sacrifice* that is stronger than in English). Conversely, a precise structural and grammatical equivalent of the word *survivor* does not exist in the Russian language. This makes it difficult to find a literal and grammatically accurate translation of the common word combination *Holocaust survivor*. In Russian, one would use such words as *victim*, or *[former] inmate*, or a combination of several words in an awkward grammatical form.

It is worth noting that historically, Soviet social and political attitudes towards the Holocaust have been ambiguous, rooted in denial, almost taboo associated with the Holocaust memory (Altman, 2005). One can draw comparative parallels between historical and social processes in Russia, the conventional language related to the Holocaust, and the meanings that people attribute to their experiences. Formulating and integrating my hypothesis required additional data and further analysis, but the categories that emerged from this episode sensitized me and concurred with my other data. Analyzing the nuances of this word's meaning had direct relevance to my emerging theory.

Having discussed the properties of intertwining, it is important to explore the features of the act of translation, when, together with conceptual analysis, it becomes an integral part of discovering a grounded theory.

Transforming Translation Paths: Interferences and Adjustments

When research is performed by a single bilingual theorist, translation as a pure, isolated process is not relevant. In turn, conceptual analysis does not exist in isolation from language translation. Therefore, although the title of this article includes the word *translation*, I believe that this term, in its classical meaning, does not ideally describe the activity that is so closely intertwined with conceptual analysis in cross-language grounded theory work. When translation becomes such an inseparable part of research, the act of translation loses some of its traditional properties and acquires other features. Pure, isolated traditional translation can potentially become a source of interferences, lead to a clashing of strategies, and create a misfit between analytical goals and language relevance.

What are the interferences between pure translation and conceptual analysis that require such change? What are the adjustments that can enhance cross-language analytical strategies? In this section, I review the properties of translation that do not fit into the context of discovering a grounded theory, and therefore have to be adjusted. These adjustments have to be made to the act of translation, to balance the interferences between its traditional properties and the demands of grounded theory research.

Conceptualization versus Description

Text analysis in grounded theory is based on conceptualizing, as opposed to full and exhaustive portrayal of the area under study. Grounded theory ascends to the abstract level of concepts, which are grounded in the empirical descriptions – the text.

Conversely, conventional translation aims at complete, full, and accurate equivalence between the source and the target texts, so that they convey the same details of the message. As opposed to a traditional devoted translator, a grounded theorist is not concerned about the exact and accurate presentation of the source text, and therefore can transcend an accurate verbatim translation. The descriptive fixation on textual details can become interference to conceptualization, if translation is used in a traditional way. Therefore, in grounded theory research, the adjustment is made to the conventional act of translation: Translation loses its worrisome fixation on literal details or concrete words, but rather aims at conveying the conceptual, abstract meaning.

Technically, this means that while coding, the analyst can draw conceptual categories from the source text and formulate them in the target language, providing that the discovered concepts and theoretical patterns emerge directly from the data and fit the area under study. The researcher can also refer to partial full translation for illustration or other purposes defined by the objectives of the analysis.

To ensure that the findings are grounded in data, the researcher needs to remain faithful to conveying conceptual meanings emerging from the text, the meanings expressed by participants. One of the major properties of grounded theory, constant comparison, is paramount for such grounding, and takes the form of continuous cross-language comparison, as it happens with the intertwining of translation and analysis. The relevancy of translation, therefore, requires the abandonment of the quest for descriptive accuracy, but remains rooted in the principles of constant comparison and conceptual equivalency.

Emergence versus Verification

Traditional translation is widely used in multicultural settings of conventional quantitative research. Most of the

commonly accepted standards and criteria of the quality of translation were developed in traditional, verificational research (Hunt & Bhopal, 2004; Roberts, Kent, Prys, & Lewis, 2003; Yu, Lee, & Woo, 2004). In such research, the initial hypothesis needs to be verified through developing operational indicators and measuring them (i.e., using deductive logic). Accordingly, in cross-language setting of traditional quantitative research, the initial hypothesis (conceptualized in English) is routinely operationalized, and then translated into the source-language indicators, or measures, which are applied to monolingual research subjects (e. g., verified translations of questionnaires, assessment scales, or surveys into the language of participants). In traditional research, translation commonly requires verification. Verification can be accomplished through a number of technical means, such as comparing translations by two or more independent translators, committees, or analyzing back translation (a "round-trip" translation technique).

Conversely, in grounded theory, the logical process of research is reverse, mostly inductive, and so are the translation processes. Grounded theory is based on emergence and induction, and is explorative rather than focused on verification (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 2002a; Stebbins, 2001). The researcher-translator uses conceptualization and constant comparison method. My observations led me to believe that when translation is intertwined with conceptual analysis, and the translated message emerges from the source data, no verification is needed. The rigorous procedures of the grounded theory method ensure that the translated findings are already grounded in the source text.

When translation is undertaken by a bilingual grounded theorist, cumbersome verification of such translation can become interference in research. Target language meanings as a result of translation, which is intertwined with the conceptual analysis, are inherently emergent. Trusting the emergence of conceptual meanings expressed across the languages is an important adjustment to the act of translation, when it is performed within the grounded theory method.

Fidelity and Transparency: Shifting the Balance of Translation Criteria in GT

The properties of translation function become transformed,

when the researcher is using the strategy of its intertwining with conceptual analysis. Translation loses its fixation on verification and its descriptive properties. Instead, it becomes focused on conceptualization and emergence. However, the principles of conceptual equivalency and constant comparison remain indispensable. To explore the criteria of good translation, when its properties are adjusted in such way, I refer to the classic criteria of translation quality that have naturally "earned its way" (Glaser, 1978) into my reflection: *fidelity* and *transparency* (Tianmin, 2006). *Fidelity* is defined as the extent to which the translation accurately renders the meaning of the source text, without adding to it or subtracting from it, and without intensifying or weakening any part of the meaning. *Transparency* is the criterion of the extent to which the translation conforms to the target language's grammatical, syntactic, and idiomatic conventions. The text is expected to appear fluent and natural to the native speakers of the target language.

According to my self-observations, the criteria of fidelity and transparency in translation used in grounded theory remain relevant, but the adherence to these criteria is balanced in a way that is different from conventional translation. As we shall see, in grounded theory it is necessary to adjust translation criteria, so the balance is tilted towards the favouring of fidelity over transparency.

The criteria of fidelity and transparency can be conflicting, because the meaning can be expressed not only through words, but also through language structures, style, grammatical form, underlying context, and culturally rooted metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Al-Hasnawi, 2007; Whorf, 1956). Maintaining fidelity is practically impossible in a transparent translation that conforms to the target language structural elements. Ideal transparency can be achieved only at the expense of changing subtle nuances embedded in the natural structures of the source, which means that "infidelity is built in translation" (Tianmin, 2006). Therefore, the translator traditionally is required to find a working compromise between fidelity and transparency.

However, in the grounded theory analysis the working compromise is not acceptable. Fidelity cannot be compromised, because the theory needs to be grounded in the unchanged source language data. Transparency cannot be stressed at the expense of the full equivalency of meanings.

In case of a bilingual speaker conducting both translation and research, the conflict is almost irrelevant. When I skip the stage of creating a fluent target language text, I can avoid the necessity of presenting wordings that are transparent (smoothly flowing and natural) for a potential reader. By doing so, I have the advantage of remaining faithful to the source while analysing my data and bringing it to the higher, abstract level of theoretical conceptualization. Other bilingual researchers suggested similar strategies. For example, Temple (2006) recommended allowing "foreignization of the text" (p. 10; this concept was first used by Venuti, 1995). The "foreignized" text of translation is not necessarily fluid in style (which assumes a compromised transparency), but effectively preserves the meaning of the original (the maximized fidelity). The strategy of adhering to a relevant (minimum intelligible) level of transparency and the maximal level of fidelity can be used effectively in the context of intertwining translation and conceptual analysis.

In grounded theory procedures, the process of foreignization has an analogue: the "freedom afforded in memo writing" (Glaser, 1978, p. 85). When we write memos, grammar and correctness of the text are irrelevant, because the priority is given to recording ideas, "getting them out." In a similar way, when a bilingual theorist works to convey the meaning of the source text in translation, she does not have to follow the criteria of full transparency, but rather should focus on the conceptual meaning of the message.

The bilingual theorist can achieve the transparency goal on the conceptual level, rather than on the descriptive level of creating a full, accurately transparent data text in the target language. The intertwining of translation and conceptual analysis is a naturally occurring and instrumental strategy for balancing the opposite trends of achieving fidelity and relevant transparency in the cross-language generation of a theory.

A Theory Back-Translated: Linguistic Fit, Relevance, Workability, and Modifiability

In the final stages of a grounded theory project, when the cross-language researcher engages in theoretical writing, the work concentrates within the target language (English). The focus on writing in English is natural, because the intended audience of theory presentation, in most academic cases, is the

English-language audience. How can the researcher make sure that linguistically, in relation to the source language, the resulting theory still has sufficient fit, relevance, workability, and modifiability? For a cross-language theory, how can the general judging criteria apply to its cross-language nature and linguistic quality?

In my research, I experimented with some patterns of the application of grounded theory method to cross-language setting. One of such experiments was back-translating my theory. The following conclusions emerged from my experience of theoretical writing, and in particular, from the incident of back-translation.

At the later stages of my work, I found myself impelled, by the emerging need of cross-language comparison, to translate a summary of my theory back into Russian. I intended my Russian text to be highly transparent, to enable me to present it to Russian-speakers (partially because the participants in my study were curious and kept asking me about the results). Fidelity to my written theoretical text was also very important, to convey the meaning of the theory. My criteria of transparency ascended to the level of conceptual constructs, rather than to the data details. A few questions emerged. Would my theory read as smoothly in Russian as in English, would the theoretical concepts fit and work in both languages? Would my theory naturally fit into the source language structure, lexicon, and grammar, or would Russian become a foreign language for the concepts initially born in it?

According to my observations, the reverse translation of a written English text into the source language can help the researcher evaluate how easy it is to achieve the fidelity and transparency in the source-language version of the presented ideas. I considered this ease as an indication of the first classical requisite property of grounded theory, the *fit,* as it appeared relevant in its linguistic aspect. If the linguistic fit is achieved, the categories, expressed in back translation, smoothly fit the source-language conceptual meanings. Such fit is a direct outcome of the systematic application of the strategy of intertwining, from the early stages of the research. Because throughout the investigation, translation was intertwined with conceptual analysis, the resulting categories fit the natural structure of the source language and cultural context, smoothly and automatically flowing into the back translation.

The linguistic *workability* and *relevance*, in my experience, mean that in both languages, the theory should read smoothly and sound right. It should be understood by monolingual research participants, as well as by the English-speaking audience. The theoretical concepts should sound relevant, have the "grab," and work in both languages equally. Source-language words have to "make sense" to monolingual native speakers, without lengthy explanations or footnotes explaining English-born wordings.

Linguistic workability and relevance are also emergent properties, in that they are ensured throughout the analysis, from its initial stages, in which the linguistic expressions of concepts have initially emerged. Workability and relevance are guaranteed by the systematic intertwining of translation with conceptual analysis. For example, the researcher should abstain from choosing English codes that use too specific, language-based imagery, or peculiar idiomatic forms that would sound awkward in the source language. Such issues have to be built into the analysis, through using the strategy of intertwining and its properties. It might be too late or too difficult to adjust the possible linguistic flaws, if the researcher only discovers them in the final stages of theoretical writing, with an isolated attempt of back translation. Fit, work, and relevance have to be ensured through the systematic procedures specific to the cross-language setting.

If the linguistic indication of *modifiability* is to be found in cross-language research, I would interpret it as a property that pertains to making the texts transparent in both languages, with its conceptual nature remaining equivalent, while the writer is able to modify and adjust some grammatical structures and language peculiarities. For example, there is no such grammatical form as gerund in the Russian language. Therefore, some of my one-word English signifiers of categories had to be creatively transformed into corresponding Russian grammatical constructs, at the time of their emergence. At times, these modifications involved creative translation into Russian, and in other cases, it required changing English constructs, to achieve better equivalency. It often happened that sociological constructs born in English needed modification for their expression in the source language. Conversely, source-language *in vivo* categories needed to be evaluated or modified for their fit in translation.

I believe that all experienced translators are familiar with

these or similar challenges. However, in the context of grounded theory, these challenges apply not only to the pure act of translation, but also to the emergent analytical ideas. Once again, the strategy of intertwining continues to be relevant. It is through the systematic use of intertwining that the bilingual grounded theorist can achieve both linguistic and conceptual fit, workability, relevance, and modifiability of the discovered theory.

Discussion

The hypothetical patterns presented in this article are based on my self-observations in conducting cross-language grounded theory research. Therefore, presented hypotheses are limited to one person's experiences and relate to one particular research situation.

In practice, the reflections presented in this article most closely relate to the work of bilingual researchers. The dual position of a bilingual researcher in cross-language grounded theory is unique because of the binocular conceptual vision, the intimate knowledge of both languages and cultural discourses, and the general familiarity with cross-language experiences.

However, employing a bilingual analyst is not the only possible strategy of undertaking cross-language research. For example, effective research is often carried out by a team of people who are not necessarily fluent in two (or more) languages relevant to the area of study (Glicksman & Van Haitsma, 2002; Nguyen et al., 2008). In such cases, complete and seamless intertwining is not possible, because the analysts receive second hand, translated data, and the translator mediates all communications.

The concept of intertwining and its properties might be relevant to research situations other than the work of a sole bilingual theorist, but further data collection and research are needed to understand whether my conclusions can be extended or generalized to the work of other researchers in other settings. My concepts might have to be modified and further integrated to fit a broad range of research situations. Such analysis is beyond the scope of this article.

Conclusion

Cross-language grounded theory research involves processes that spread beyond the traditionally understood translation, and

can also include altering the conventional analytical techniques of the theorist. In my sole work as a bilingual theorist, the strategy of intertwining translation and analysis proved to be effective and natural. I performed myself all the functions associated with my project, without involving a translator, interpreter, or transcriber, and found it most appropriate. Using the advantage of intimate sensitivity to the languages that I know well, I could work across languages on my own, following Glaser's (1978) notion that "grounded theory is a do-it-yourself methodology" (p. 116). The functions of translation and conceptual analysis, thus, became intertwined in my research, technically and strategically.

According to Glaser & Holton (2004), "Classic GT is simply a set of integrated conceptual hypotheses systematically generated to produce an inductive theory about a substantive area." (para. 7). All the classical principles of grounded theory apply to the cross-language strategies involved in theory development. Translation adds complexity to data analysis, but does not change any essential properties of the method. In fact, in my reflections I have not discovered anything that has not been conceptualized as part of the fundamental principles of the grounded theory method. Rather, I made an attempt to explain, primarily for the purposes of my own or similar research, some aspects of what is going on in the substantial situation of cross-language data analysis with the purpose of discovering a theory. I conclude that the essential elements of grounded theory, such as emergence, conceptualization, and constant comparison, naturally fit into the cross-language setting, in which translation and analysis are intertwined.

Author
Svetlana Shklarov, MD, RSW, PhD Candidate
Interdisciplinary Graduate Studies Program
University of Calgary, AB, Canada
Email: shklar@shaw.ca

References

Al-Hasnawi, A. R. (2007). Cognitive approach to translating metaphors. *Translation Journal, 11*(3). Retrieved on September 3, 2007 from http://accurapid.com/journal/41metaphor.htm

Altman, I. (2005). Мемориализация Холокоста в России: история, современность, перспективы [Memorializing the Holocaust in Russia: History, modern times, perspectives] [Electronic Version]. *Неприкосновенный запас*, 2-3. Retrieved April 15, 2006, from http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2005/2/alt28-pr.html

Friedrich, H. (1992). On the art of translation. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, p. 11-16.

Hunt, S. M., & Bhopal, R. (2004). Self report in clinical and epidemiological studies with non-English speakers: the challenge of language and culture. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 58, 618-622. Retrieved September 15, 2005, from http://jech.bmjjournals.com/cgi/content/full/58/7/618

Houbert, F. (1998). Translation as a communication process [Electronic Version]. *Translation Journal, 2*(3). Retrieved on September 3, 2007 from http://accurapid.com/journal/05theory.htm

Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Glaser, B. G. (2002a). Conceptualization: On theory and theorizing using grounded theory [Electronic Version]. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), Article 3. Retrieved October 1, 2005, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/

Glaser, B. G. (2002b). Constructivist grounded theory? [Electronic Version]. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *3*(3).

Retrieved October 1, 2005, from http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-02/3-02glaser-e.htm

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodeling grounded theory [Electronic Version]. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 5*(2), Article 4. Retrieved July 24, 2005, from http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-04/2-04glaser-e.htm

Glicksman, A., & Van Haitsma, K. (2002). The social context of adaptation to traumatic events: Soviet Jews and the Holocaust. *Journal of Clinical Geropsychology, 8*(8), 227-237.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mc Laughlin, F., & Sall, T. S. (2001). The give and take of fieldwork: Noun classes and other concerns in Fatick, Senegal. In P. Newman & M. Ratliff (Eds.), *Linguistic fieldwork* (pp. 189-210). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Muller, V. K. (1990). *English-Russian dictionary*. Moscow: Russky Yazyk.

Muula, A. M. (2005). What should HIV/AIDS be called in Malawi? [Electronic version]. *Nursing Ethics, 12*(2), 187-192.

Nguyen, G. T, Barg, F. K., Armstrong, K., Holmes, J. H., & Hornik, R. C. (2008). Cancer and communication in the health care setting: Experiences of older Vietnamese immigrants, a qualitative study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 23*(1), 45-50.

Pearce, J. (1997). Последствия злоупотребления и пренебрежения ребенком для его развития [Consequences of abuse and neglect in child development]. In N. K. Acanova (Ed.), *Руководство по предупреждению насилия над детьми* (pp. 91-106). Moscow, Russia: Владос.

Roberts, G., Kent, B., Prys, D., & Lewis, R. (2003). Describing chronic pain: towards bilingual practice. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 40*(8), 889-902.

Schopenhauer, A. (1992). On language and words (P. Mollenhauer, Trans.). In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 32-35). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1800)

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). *Exploratory research in the social sciences* (Vol. 48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Temple, B., & Edwards, R. (2002). Interpreters/translators and cross-language research:

Reflexivity and border crossings. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1* (2), Article 1. Retrieved October 15, 2005, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/

Temple, B. (2006). Representation across languages: Biographical sociology meets translation and interpretation studies. *Qualitative Sociology Review, 2*(1), 7-21. Retrieved on June 3, 2007 from http://www.qualitativesociologyreview.org/ENG/Volume3/QSR_2_1_Temple.pdf

Tianmin, J. (2006). Translation in context [Electronic Version]. *Translation Journal, 10*(2). Retrieved on September 3, 2007 from http://accurapid.com/journal/41metaphor.htm

Tsai, J. H.-C., Choe, J. H., Lim, J. M. C., Acorda, E., Chan, N. L., Taylor, V., & Tu, S.-P. (2004). Developing culturally competent health knowledge: Issues of data analysis of cross-cultural, cross-language qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(4), Article 2. Retrieved October 28, 2005 from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_4/html/tsai.html

Valent, P. (1998). Resilience in child survivors of the Holocaust: Toward the concept of resilience. *Psychoanalytic Review, 29*, 517-535.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation.* London, UK: Routledge.

Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, Thought & Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yu, D. S. F., Lee, D. T. F., & Woo, J (2004). Issues and challenges of instrument translation [Electronic version]. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 26*(3), 307-320.