THE MULTIPLE APPROACHES OFGROUNDED THEORY: JUSTIFICATION FOR STRAUSSIAN VERSION

Nor Syafini Mohd Muhaiyuddin
Universiti Malaysia Perlis, School of Human Development and Technocommunication, 02600, Jejawi, Perlis, Malaysia
syafiniemm@yahoo.com

Hanif Suhairi Abu Bakar
Universiti Malaysia Perlis, School of Human Development and Technocommunication, 02600, Jejawi, Perlis, Malaysia
hanif@unimap.my

Huzili Hussin
Universiti Malaysia Perlis, School of Human Development and Technocommunication, 02600, Jejawi, Perlis, Malaysia

Abstract

Qualitative researchers incline to develop a theory or seek for a formof meaning on the basis of data collection. They also do not build their research on pre-arranged hypotheses. Nevertheless, they obviously recognize a problem or subject they aim to examine. Qualitative research gives a flexible approach to researchers and using multiple sources to confirm results. This paper focuses on primary books review ofchronological grounded theory as one of qualitative research methodsin different versions, thenthe preference for Straussian version of grounded theory.

Keywords

Qualitative Research, Grounded Theory, Versions of Grounded Theory, Straussian Version

1. Introduction

Qualitative research ability to entirely describe a phenomenon because of in-depth information to describe the situation (Hoepfl, 1997) and practices collection of variety empirical materials (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). In the qualitative research, there are five qualitative approaches, namely biography, ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory and case study(McCaslin & Scott, 2003).Each of qualitative approaches has their own dynamic characteristics and strengths to ensure reliability and validity. The purpose of this paper is to emphasize the historical events, overview and significance of grounded theory for the qualitative research method.Different versions of grounded theory will be discussed and the decision to use the Straussian version.

The development of grounded theory was based on the condemnation of qualitative research as imprecise, unsystematic, prejudiced and disordered (Charmaz, 2006). Dunne (2011) believed that the beginning of grounded theory was affected by the domination of quantitative research during the 1960s.The supported qualitative researchers noticed the lack of qualitative inquiry systematic guidelines, but put effortto improve the quality of research and dispute quantitative tinkers' criticism (Dunne, 2011).

2. Versions of Grounded Theory

Grounded theoristsadoptmultiple philosophical and methodological settings that determine the application of a set of fundamental grounded theory methods. Different versions of grounded theory and variations in the use of the methods have been discussed and debated since the beginning of its development.Several pioneering works, including books produced by the founders of grounded theory have mentioned in the existing literature.Table 1 shows the groundbreakingand chronological works by grounded theorists.

Table 1: *Pioneering Grounded Theoryworks*

Year	Author	Book Title
1967	Glaser and Strauss	The discovery of grounded theory
1990	Strauss and Corbin	Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques
1992	Glaser	Basics of grounded theory analysis
1994	Strauss and Corbin	'Grounded theory methodology: An overview' in Handbook of qualitative research (1st Edition)
1995	Charmaz	'Grounded theory' in Rethinking methods in psychology
1995	Wuest	Feminist Grounded Theory: An exploration of the Congruency and Tensions Between Two Traditions in Knowledge Discovery
1998	Strauss and Corbin	Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques (2nd Edition)
2000	Charmaz	'Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods' in Handbookof qualitative research (2nd Edition)

In grounded theory, historicalevent and the pioneering grounded theory works indicated in Table 1, there are four types of approaches for grounded theory (Charmaz, 1995; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Wuest, 1995).

2.1 Classical Version of Grounded Theory

The development and introduction of grounded theory primarily is accredited to two American researchers, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in their 1967 book titled *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. In this book, Glaser and Strauss emphasized on the view of producing new theory from data nevertheless resisted applying existing theory.The data obtained and analyzed in social research. Glaser and Strauss (1967) recommended that a researcher can attain a theory that is important in certain contexts from observations and the observers' consent. Grounded theory as suggested by two researchers has two distinctiveaspects, namely constant comparative analysis and theoretical sampling (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Glaser's grounded theory is called as classical because of its supreme loyalty to the primary ideas published in 1967.

Constant comparative analysis requires a relating process of parallel data collection and analysis, which involves "the systematic choice and study of several comparison groups" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 9). Dunne (2011) viewed that this method is able to further the research process by utilized analytical thinking as during this process the researchers needed

to review on how existent knowledge and collected data can be joined into the developing theory. Classical version of Grounded theory in their book suggested theoretical sampling used not quantitatively but gets applied to explain behavior.

2.2 Straussian Version of Grounded Theory

The publication of Strauss and Corbin's book titled*Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*in 1990 spectacle split between Strauss and Glaser. The contents of the book display Glaser and Strauss's different perspectives on grounded theory in the literature. (Graham and Thomson ,2008) in their research have written about the difference between Classical Version and Straussian Version. The main concern between both versions is the applying of the literature on grounded theory.

In the book also presented major criticisms of the first generation of grounded theorists, both writers, Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin did not write about grounded theory as a methodological but several strategies, procedures and techniques (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), Glaser has expelled the applicability of any specific philosophical settings because of his faith that sustaining such a perspective lessenwider potential of grounded theory.

2.3 Constructivist Version of Grounded Theory

In 1995, Charmaz began to publish about constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 1995). Charmaz (1995) has used grounded theory to producenumerousvaluesafter the data has been obtained. Rendering to Charmaz, researchers need to go outside the shell in looking meaning in the data, seeking for and enquiringimplicit meanings about standards andprinciples.

Charmaz (2000) has came out as the leading proponent of the constructivist grounded theory. Charmaz in her book titled *Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods,* *"*Constructivist grounded theory spawns an image of a writer at a desk who tries to balance theoretical interpretation with an evocative aesthetic"(p.526). Charmaz in her work recommended that researchers need toengage themselves in the data in a way that inserts the description of the participants in the closing research result.

2.4 Feminist Version of Grounded Theory

The publication of Wuest's book titled *Feminist Grounded Theory: An exploration of the Congruency and Tensions Between Two Traditions in Knowledge Discovery*began the

introduction of feminist version of grounded theory. In her book, Wuest (1995) explained that feminist version was developed originally for nurses. An acknowledgement of the prejudice and unfairness towards women bringsfeminist grounded theory purposely to supportwomen's opinion wasunderstood and listened (Wuest, 1995).

Wuestcovered Feminist theory into three previous versions, the Classical, the Straussian, and the constructivist grounded theory. In her beliefs, Wuest promotes that "grounded theory is consistent with the postmodern feminist epistemology in the recognition of multiple explanations of reality" (Wuest, 1995, p. 127). Wuest also stated "feminism is not a research method; it is a perspective that can be applied to a traditional disciplinary method".Wuest blended each of grounded theory methodologies with Feminist theoryand explained its importance (1995, p. 129).

3. Grounded Theory Procedures

In grounded theory approach, Douglas (2003) stated that three core types of data collection, data collected from the field such as notes, data collected from interviews such as recordings, transcripts and notes and also beneficial remaining literature in the research. Corbin and Strauss (1990) suggested commencing data analysis soon after the data have been collected in order to obtain relevant issues in the study area, and integrate all seemingly significant issues into the next set of interviews and observations. The method of data collection and analysis must be conducted orderly and sequentially in order to broaden the research process to take all potentially appropriate aspects as soon as they are identified.

Grounded theory commences with a research situation in orderto understand what is happening in the incidents. Numerous instruments utilized through observation, conversation or interview. Researchers are about to understand the process of data collection and its important to note down the key issues. The raw data described in grounded theory are open ended responses based on interviews. The constant comparativemethod has been used in grounded theory in the process of collecting and analyzing the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Researchers compare the existing data and new data collected. The method used constantly in order to attain the objective of grounded theory. Identification of the theory denoted by the data.This method able to further the research process by utilized analytical thinking as during this method processes the researchers needed to review on how

existing knowledge and collected data can be joined into the developing theory(Dunne, 2011).

4. Justification for Straussion Version of Grounded Theory

According to Dunne (2011), the differences between Classical and Straussian Version isthe applying ofexisting literature review in the practical research process. Glaser opposed utilized literature review in the concern thatthorough literature may impurity the data collection, analysis and theory development. The process mislead the researchers to executeremaining frameworks, hypotheses or other theoretical ideas upon the data, which would in turn destabilize the concentration and validity of the grounded theory research. Classical version disputes that grounded theorists should not engage with existing literature. However, in the several studies by scholars mentioned that the usage of literature helps researchers, especially novice researchers to know if the proposed study has been performed earlier, as reference refining the research questions and methodological fundamental to step ahead (Caelli, Ray & Mill, 2003; Dunne, 2011).

Based on Strauss and Corbin (1990) book titled *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques,* Straussian Version of grounded theory introduces coding procedures and phases, namely open coding, axial coding and selective coding. Strauss and Corbin worked enforcement view for grounded theory. The keychanges they integrated were the coding procedures on how tocode and build the data. Corbin andStrauss (1990) in their work emphasize basic techniques in the development of theirmethod, such as data collection and analysis, concepts and categories, theoretical sampling, constant comparative method, theoretical memos, hypothesis about the relationships among categories and the development of categories. The coding procedures are new fundamental in grounded theory based on Strauss and Corbin (1990).

According to Charmaz (2000), in her book titled *Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods,* there are no in depth explanation for each category. Constructivist version also lack of providing examples of their method, and ways of application. The book does not appropriately explain the criteria used in grounded theory. Nevertheless, in Straussian version principles, the guidelines for researchers are completely provided. Finally, feminist version was developed originally for nurses and has lack of procedures to study the

social phenomenon.In view of that, the decision to utilize Straussian version was the correct decision. Justification and explanation of the strength is continued in the subsections.

4.1 Previous Literature Review

Existing literature review assists researchers, especially novice researchers to understand the subject and as an indicator whether the subject has been carried out before. Literature review also helps researchers to improve research questions and as a primary practice to move forward. In addition, Straussian version has a particular system and procedures that guide researchers to organize and analyze data collections. The procedures have comprehensive method that researchers can rely which started from the preparation before interviews until to develop a new hypothesis or theory. The Straussian version is more organized, leading to a much firmer codingtechnique for data analysis. The procedures also emphasized on the reliability and validity of data, that can be shown in three types of coding techniques.

4.2 Conceptualization

Conceptualization is a necessary step in the grounded theory method. However conceptualization in grounded theory, unlike phenomenology or narrative research, cannot be complete until after the data has been collected. This returns us back to the element of grounded theory were the theory is created by the data as opposed to other forms of research methodology, which the theory comes first. Therefore conceptualization in grounded theory research, although a necessary component, occurs later in the research process than other research methods. This however does not preclude the grounded theorist from hypothesizing prior to the collection of data. It does, however, push justification of the hypothesis to a later time in the research process (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

4.3 Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyses the data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop the theory as it emerges. The process of data collection is controlled by the emerging theory, whether substantive or formal. Beyond the decisions concerning the initial collection of data, further collection cannot be planned in advance of the emerging theory. Only as the researcher discovers codes and tries to saturate them by theoretical sampling in comparison groups, do the successive requirements for data

collection emerge—both (1) what categories and their properties to be sampled further and (2) where to collect the data. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998)

4.4 Coding Procedures

Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) in their book enlighten that coding in grounded theory research is a three stage process,there are open coding, axial coding and selective coding. It allows the analyst to see the direction in which to take the study oftheoretical sampling before become selective and focused on a particular problem. Open coding includes a previously discussed process of constant comparison. As previously defined in the constant comparative process the categories which are created by the concepts are compared to each other and interlinked. Constant comparison needs the researcher to explore the process of coding and decide if the data being analyzed is consistent with previous data categorizing. Constant comparison forces the researcher to ask himself if, during coding the data is being applied in the same manner as previous data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998).

Axial coding is the process of locating connections among categories and subcategories.It describes how the categories relate to subcategories and have in terms of their properties, dimensionsthenviewfor a phenomenon. As for categories, subcategories have answers concerning the phenomenon such as what, when, where, who, why and how(Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Douglas, 2003). In view of the fact that categories are coded from phenomena, they are able to describe by paradigms that consist of conditions, actions or interactions and consequences. They are examined by the queries how and by whom, responses which are made by groups or persons to incidents which take place under those conditions(Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The purpose of the selective coding procedure is a revision of the categories of the dimensional level with the aim of determining a theory, validate the connection between concepts, and distinguish any categories which require refinement.Selective coding is the method of mixture and alteration of the emerged theories. Categories recognized in the open and axial coding procedure are representations of data and not the theoretical framework, various categories have to be integrated to build up the theoretical framework (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

5. Conclusion

In the text by Strauss and Corbin (1988), the approach encouraged the researchers not to follow the guidelines meticulously but freeing using their own common sense. "Sometimes, one has to use common sense and not get caught up in worrying about what is the right and wrong way. The important thing is to trust oneself and the process. Students should stay within the general guidelines… and use the procedures and techniques flexibly according to their abilities and the realities of their studies" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998 p. 295).Researchers can learn the importance of being flexible in all aspects of the research pursuit. Straussian Version organizedatacollection and analysis ina simultaneous process.

Firstly, interviews and observation are important instruments of data collection. Researchers learn how to code data and categorized using the constant comparative method of analysis. The emergence of a core category connects the categories and subcategories together to provide a storyline that explains what is happening in the social positioning. Secondly, theoretical sampling assists researchers to unearth theory, for instance memos provide a record of the process for analysis. Thirdly, refers to the recommendations by Strausssian version, the researchers should adopt literature review into the revision of data.

In addition, Straussian version also presents examples of grounded theory that has been used before in social positioning. Numerous beneficial examples from the authors work that acknowledge to be applied to the grounded theory framework(Strauss and Corbin, 1998).The systematic exampleshelp researchers generating completely new theories regarding particular phenomenon.

It was previously mentioned that Strauss and Corbin in their book suggested researchers to utilize a set of methods for doing grounded theory. They also emphasized the researchers to utilize their method flexibly. The authors in overall not command researchers to follow strictly in their procedures, but researchers are advices to use general guidelines and have flexibility according to their ability and common sense. Straussian version offering very useful procedures for novice researchers in terms of data collection and analysis.

References

Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as mud': Toward greater clarity in generic qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2*1-24.

Charmaz, K. (1995). Grounded theory. In J. Smith, R. Harré, & L. Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-65). London: Sage.http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446221792.n3

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London: Sage.

Douglas, D. (2003). Inductive theory generation: A grounded approach to business inquiry. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods.* 47-54.

Dunne, C. (2011). The place of the literature review in grounded theory. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 14*(2). 111-124. Dublin, Ireland: Routledge.http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2010.494930

Glaser, B., Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Aldine Publishing Company, Hawthorne, NY.

Graham, B. & Thomas, K. (2008). Building knowledge – Developing a grounded theory of knowledge management for construction. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 6*(2), 115-122.

McCaslin, M.L. & Scott, K.W. (2003). The five-question method for framing a qualitative research study. *The Qualitative Report,8* (1), 447-461

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wuest, J. (1995). Feminist Grounded Theory: An exploration of the Congruency andTensions Between Two Traditions in Knowledge Discovery. *Qualitative HealthResearch,* 5 (1), 125−137.http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/104973239500500109