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This is an ‘Artefact’... Research it Please!
Material: Wood

Length: 52 cm

Weight: 139 grams

Other Features:

- Handle on top compatible with a human fist
- Can be disassembled in 3 parts (presumably for easier transportation)
- Carved (presumably by humans for decoration)
Literature Review

Looking for testable hypotheses

H1: This is a walking stick for children

H2: This is part of hiking equipment
Googled: “Short wooden stick”...

- A Shillelagh (Club) – “Used to settle disputes in a gentlemanly manner”
- A ‘shit stick’ – “Used instead of toilet paper”
- A ‘Milinillo’ – “Used for extra frothy hot chocolate”

H3: This is a weapon used for self-defence

H4: This is an environment-friendly toilet utensil

H5: This is a kitchen utensil
Now we can test our hypotheses, based on validation criteria... Or come up with a ‘Grand Theory’

Grand Theory

- Humankind is ingenious and can utilise sticks in a variety of ways. Everything can be used as a tool

Positivistic Empiricism

- We select a representative sample of respondents and ask them to evaluate the different used of the stick (or to experiment with it)
- We collect their evaluations and conduct statistical testing to see which of the hypotheses are significant
- Now we can say with a certain degree of confidence what the stick is for!
This artefact is a parent’s best friend. Children can utilise it to play and defend themselves, whilst enabling an organic personal hygiene and finally topped up by extra frothy hot chocolate drink.
UNDERSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF POSITIVISM
(Plato’s Cave Allegory)
Plato’s Cave Allegory:
- Prisoners in a cave – only being able to look at shadows of things – for them the shadows are real -> That is their knowledge...
- Until they are freed and realise that they have thought to be reality... was nothing more than shadows!

Epistemology
- The term refers to the philosophy of knowledge
- What do we know? Can we know at all?
- Are the shadows reality? Is there reality?... Or just shadows?

Methodology
- The term refers to the philosophy of methods used to acquire knowledge
- How do we know? How can we understand our word better?
- How do we free ourselves from the cage?

The ‘theory of knowledge’...

... The ‘practice of knowledge’
Research: Towards a Valid Meaning of Applied Science?

Research is Practice... Not Theory!

Doing a task repeatedly, without re-searching your assumptions or principles

Is like

Observing the shadows in the cave and knowing by heart in which order they appear

Learning by doing!

It Works... Like Living imprisoned in a cave!

Research is the practice of acquiring knowledge, which we can use to improve our lives... Similar to Business and the Economy!
A hypothesis is nothing more than a:

- Claim
- Assumption
- Belief
- Opinion

Such claims or beliefs can refer to:

- Average (mean) values (e.g. A tourist spends an average of €500 for their holidays)
- Proportions (e.g. The majority of cruise guests are over 50 years of age)
- Cause-&-Effect Relationships (e.g. Reducing prices increases reservations)
- Differences between sets of the above (e.g. Cruise guests are more likely to spend more money than packaged tourists during their holidays)

“Feel lucky? Make my Hypothesis…Punk!”

“Hypotheses are like a...s, everyone has one!”
### The Problem with Traditional Hypothesis Generation: Potentially Rigorously Irrelevant Research Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency vs. Effectiveness:</th>
<th>‘Hostage of Linearity’</th>
<th>Lack of transparency</th>
<th>Problem-Solving / Practicality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Scientific rigour in statistical testing of hypotheses does not necessarily ensure relevance of the results</td>
<td>- Literature-generated hypotheses are dependent on past and existing research, which in turn is dependent on existing ‘disciplinary traditions’ and ‘publication cartels’</td>
<td>- The process of hypothesis-generation is neither transparent nor systematic</td>
<td>- Grand theories and high-level of abstraction are difficult to transfer to practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- When extracted from literature it cannot really be traced back to its origins and / or it involves an ‘invisible interpretation’ process

- Human perception, interpretation, symbolism, social dynamics need to be considered
LET'S COME BACK TO THE ARTEFACT...
(Another Approach!)
First... Assume Nothing, Read Nothing!

► Interview me on the artefact...
► ....In an unstructured way!
► Simply ask me to talk about it...
► Take notes of what I say and try to code it (extract keywords)
Keep collecting data and coding it...
While you are doing this keep notes of your thoughts and ideas while you are coding (selecting keywords)
Do you see natural groupings of keywords?
Can you see any categories emerging?
... Check your previous memos again!
Third... Do you think you talked to enough people?

- Other contexts where this artefact may appear?
- Can you think of other types of people interacting with it?
- Who else would you talk to?
- Do you have enough groupings to say a story?
- What is the central theme connecting all the groupings?
GROUNDED THEORY
(Overview & Background)

‘The discovery of theory from data – systematically obtained and analysed in social research’
(Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 1)
The Background of GT...
Legitimation of Qualitative Research in Scientific Community

Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) work:

• Bridged the gap between ‘grand theories’ and practical, problem-specific theory creation
• Underlined the validity of qualitative research as stand-alone (i.e. not as a mere complement to quantitative research)
• Provided rigor in qualitative research (systematic, consistent, transparent approach – repeatable method)
• Supported the production of theory (rather than the mere descriptive analysis of case studies)

Development of an Explorative - Inductive Methodology

‘Grounded’ on empirical evidence = Acceptance in the scientific community
The word “Methodology” originates from Greek (Μεθοδολογία), which etymologically stands for: “Which-way principles”

Rationale for Methodologies (“Map for action”)
- Transparency
- Repeatability
- Consistency
- Education & Training

“Map Analogy”
- Philosophy => Direction and purpose of map
- Guidelines => Setting Waypoints
- Tools & Techniques => Navigation system, compass, walking shoes, backpack with supplies
- Direction & Organisation => Time plan, supplies checklist
Grounded Theory vs. Traditional Research

**Iterative vs. Linear Knowledge Development Approach**

1. Question formulating
2. Theoretical sampling
3. Interview transcribing
4. Coding & Memoing
5. Developing conceptual categories
6. Constant comparison
7. Growing theories

**“Diving Exploration Logic”**

1. Research domain choice
2. Theoretical Background & Literature Review
3. Hypothesis formulation / extraction
4. Statistical Sampling
5. Data collection
6. Result Analysis and Interpretation
7. Theory testing

**“Waterfall Surfing Logic”**

Aim known early on, concrete result expectation

Aim fuzzy, expectation of any results
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Key GT Guidelines

Now Imagine... A Map for a Trip to the Unknown!

‘Empty Head’
- No preconceptions about the research domain
- Refrain from literature research (at least for the initial phases of the research effort) – To minimise ‘contamination’ from ‘sensitizing concepts’

“Start walking without an idea where you are going... If possible also unconsciously!”

‘All Data is Relevant’
- Collects whatever data is available and seems appropriate

“Take every road and every path that feels right!”

‘Theoretical Sampling’
- Continue collecting data as patterns / concepts emerge

“Continue walking back and forth, until you feel you are on the right way”

‘Theoretical Sensitivity’
- Coding is dependent on the researcher’s experience and exposure to literature
- It determines what data is considered relevant and guides their interpretation

“At some point you will start seeing your destination (even though you had no idea where you were going)”

‘Theoretical Saturation’
- Keep collecting and revisiting data until they reach a point of which sufficiently addresses the question

“You will know when you have arrived”
### Gläser (1978) – The ‘Purist’

**Focus on Philosophy & only general guidelines to avoid ‘Forcing the Data’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choosing Data Sources</th>
<th>Theoretical Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• (Researchers) will go to groups which they believe maximise possibilities of obtaining data and leads for more data on their question. They will also begin by talking to the most knowledgeable people to get a line on relevancies and leads to crack down more data and where and how to locate oneself for a rich supply of data’ (Glaser, 1978 – p.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Groups are chosen as they are needed rather than before the study begins” (Glaser, 1992 – p.102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysing Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantive codes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed ad hoc &quot;open coding” focused on the empirical substance of the research domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Theoretical codes** |
| • Pre-defined toolkit of meta-models to help organise and relate the substantive codes (i.e. 18 coding families) and integrate them in a causal model |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validating Results</th>
<th>Theoretical Saturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Not about complete coverage or description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theoretical stability accounting for changing situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is done by saturating categories that emerge and seem to have the most explanatory power around a core category (which accounts for most of the variations in the data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing Data Sources</td>
<td>Theoretical Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Researchers) will go to groups which they believe maximise possibilities of obtaining data and leads for more data on the empirical substance of the research domain.</em></td>
<td><em>(Researchers) will go to groups which they believe maximise possibilities of obtaining data and leads for more data on the empirical substance of the research domain.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Groups are chosen as they are needed rather than before the study begins)</em> (Glaser, 1978 – p.45)</td>
<td><em>(Groups are chosen as they are needed rather than before the study begins)</em> (Glaser, 1978 – p.45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysing Data</th>
<th>Substantive codes</th>
<th>Theoretical codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Developed ad hoc “open coding” focused on the empirical substance of the research domain.)</em></td>
<td><em>(Pre-defined toolkit of meta-models to relate the substantive codes (i.e. 18 coding families) and integrate them in a causal model)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validating Results</th>
<th>Theoretical Saturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Not about complete coverage or description)</em></td>
<td><em>(Theoretical stability accounting for changing situations)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(This is done by saturating categories that emerge and seem to have the most explanatory power around a core category (which accounts for most of the variations in the data)</em></td>
<td><em>(Theoretical stability accounting for changing situations)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gläser (1978) – The ‘Purist’**

*Focus on Philosophy & only general guidelines to avoid ‘Forcing the Data’*

---

**Choosing Data Sources**

*Researchers* will go to groups which they believe maximise possibilities of obtaining data and leads for more data on the empirical substance of the research domain. Groups are chosen as they are needed rather than before the study begins* (Glaser, 1978 – p.45).

*Groups are chosen as they are needed rather than before the study begins* (Glaser, 1978 – p.45).

**Analysing Data**

*Developed ad hoc “open coding” focused on the empirical substance of the research domain.*

*Pre-defined toolkit of meta-models to relate the substantive codes (i.e. 18 coding families) and integrate them in a causal model.*

**Validating Results**

*Not about complete coverage or description.*

*Theoretical stability accounting for changing situations.*

*This is done by saturating categories that emerge and seem to have the most explanatory power around a core category (which accounts for most of the variations in the data).*

---

**How do I know who I need?**

**How do I group the codes?**

**When is my theory ‘stable’?**
### Choosing Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open sampling – Richness &amp; Availability</th>
<th>Relational and Variational sampling - Diversity</th>
<th>Discriminate sampling - Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘sampling those persons, places, situations that will provide the greatest opportunity to gather data on the phenomenon under investigation’ (Strauss &amp; Corbin, 1990, p. 181)</td>
<td>‘to purposefully choose persons, sites, or documents that maximize opportunities to elicit data that demonstrate what happens when changes occurs’ (Strauss &amp; Corbin, 1990, p. 186).</td>
<td>‘the sites, persons, and documents that will maximize opportunities for verifying the story line, relationships between categories, and for filling in poorly developed categories’ (Strauss &amp; Corbin, 1990 p. 187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysing Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding (Activity / Process Focused)</th>
<th>Selective Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>scrutinizing the fieldnote, interview, or other document very closely line by line</td>
<td>Phenomena (related to the domain under study), Causes, Context, Conditions, Action strategies, Consequences</td>
<td>Categories are unified around a central category and are described in more detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim is to produce concepts that seem to fit the data</td>
<td></td>
<td>The core category represents the main analytic idea summarising the research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Validating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon fit</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Generality</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It should fit the phenomenon (with precondition data diversity)</td>
<td>It should provide understanding, and be understandable</td>
<td>It should provide generality (i.e. derived theory applicable to a variety of concepts)</td>
<td>It should provide control (i.e. reasonable basis for action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strauss (1990) – The ‘Pragmatist’

**Adding Guidelines and Techniques to the Philosophy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choosing Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysing Data</th>
<th>Validating Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open sampling – Richness &amp; Availability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open Coding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phenomenon fit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sampling those persons, places, situations that will provide the greatest opportunity to gather’</td>
<td>scrutinizing the fieldnote, interview, or other document</td>
<td>It should fit the phenomenon (with precondition data diversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational and Variational sampling - Diversity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Axial Coding (Activity / Process Focused)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to purposefully choose persons, sites, or documents that maximize opportunities to elicit’</td>
<td>Phenomena (related to the domain under study), Causes, Action strategies, Consequences</td>
<td>It should provide understanding, and be understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selective Coding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selective Coding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Generality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories are unified around a central category and are described in more detail</td>
<td></td>
<td>It should provide generality (i.e. derived theory applicable to a variety of concepts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discriminate sampling - Confirmation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the sites, persons, and documents that will maximize opportunities for verifying the relationships between categories, and for filling in developed categories’ (Strauss &amp; Corbin, 1990 p. 187)</td>
<td></td>
<td>It should provide control (i.e. reasonable basis for action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How do I collect data? What do I do With it?

- **Open sampling – Richness & Availability**
  - ‘sampling those persons, places, situations that will provide the greatest opportunity to gather’

### How do I document my findings?

- **Phenomenon fit**
  - It should fit the phenomenon (with precondition data diversity)

### How do I incorporate literature?

- **Generality**
  - It should provide generality (i.e. derived theory applicable to a variety of concepts)
Back to Methodology…

The ‘Right Balance’ between Philosophy & Method!

The GT researcher’s dilemma…
GROUNDING THEORY RELOADED
(Meta-Model for Methodology Customisation)

Take the philosophy... Make it yours!
Dealing with peer-reviews in non-GT journals:

No literature review section = Rejection by Reviewers

Addressing the question why GT (as opposed to a quantitative approach)

**Incorporation of Literature in a GT Paper:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction / Background Context:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing the relevance of the topic / area of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why is the area worth exploring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimise ‘Forcing risk’ by focusing on explanatory / quantitative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Methodology Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Utilisation of standard GT texts (e.g. Glaser, Strauss &amp; Corbin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilisation of GT Adaptation papers supporting your choice of GT Variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results &amp; Discussion Section:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• After Open Coding discuss Categories / Axial Codes using literature as enrichment and elaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The idea is to extract tentative hypotheses from the resulting model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please remember... Literature can also be treated as data!!! Systematic literature review as a research paper?
Briefing

Preparing & instructing:
• Click through and explore the offers until you reach a clear preference
• Assume that all holiday offers are relevant and affordable
• Express your thoughts orally while scrolling through each offer (‘Think Loud’)

Observing & probing:
List of questions encouraging the respondent to ‘think loud’. Sample questions:
• “Does this offer come into question for you?”
• “What is it that you (dis)like about it?”
• “Is the information provided sufficient / useful?”
• “Which are the most important features for you?”

Interviewing:
Respondent is asked to elaborate on their holiday choice and perceptions of online holiday reviews in that context. Sample questions:
• “Did the reviews affect your decision? If yes, how and to what extent? If not, why?”
• “Do you generally consult holiday review portals to plan your holidays? If yes, which ones and why? If not, why?”

Filtering & grouping
Codes extracted and grouped according to content type: Photos, textual descriptions, hotel reviews)

Note-taking & video recording

Follow-up Interview

Question list enrichment

Open coding
**Cruise Educators (5 Semi-Structured Interviews)**

(a) Cruise Employers (10 Semi-Structured Interviews)

Research Questions:
- Disconnect between degree programme and internship?
- Stakeholder worldviews?
- Tentative factors determining internships perceptions

(b) Cruise Students (34 Internship Report Content Analysis (Qualitative))

(c) Cruise Educators (5 Semi-Structured Interviews)

Cruise Employer (CE) – related Findings

Cruise Student (CS) – related Findings

Cruise Educator (CEd) – related Findings

Step 1: Descriptive exploration of students’ perspectives

Step 2: Coding results and tentative model development

Step 3: Perspective comparison CCA

---

GROUNDDED THEORY
(How to Present Findings)

Structure the documentation and aim for transparency in the data collection and interpretation... Not visa versa
Proposed GT Paper Structure

Usually too much text... What to include and where?

Introduction
- Context and research relevance
- Justification and summary of research approach

Research Methodology
- Respondent / Source Description Table
- Interview guidelines / Roadmaps (include an overview of research activities and dates)
- Code metrics (Codes extracted, merged, rejected)

Results & Discussion
- Each Axial Code as subsection
- Include ‘indicative open codes’ in each subsection
- Elaborate each axial code with the help of literature (look back at memos)
- Present tentative model (incl. Tentative hypotheses)

Implications & Limitations
- Address issue of subjectivity in interpretation and ‘forcing’ – What counter measures were adopted?
- Define the applicability and usefulness limits of the results / findings

Appendices
- Interview transcripts
- Coding book / Memos
GROUNDED THEORY & INNOVATION MANAGEMENT
(Philosophy & Systematic Creativity)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation Development:</th>
<th>Innovation Acceptance:</th>
<th>Innovation Diffusion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Fusion between Grounded Theory and Action Research = Grounded Action / Grounded Practice | • Technology Adoption Model (TAM) as a new theoretical code? | • Bass Model theoretical code (External & Internal Influences)  
• Delphi-type data collection approach + additional coding level |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papathanassis, A. &amp; Knolle, F.</td>
<td>Exploring the adoption and processing of online holiday reviews: A grounded theory approach. Tourism Management, 32: 215–224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You for your Attention

Research Functions:
- Founder & Chairman of the Cruise Research Society (http://www.cruiseresearchsociety.com)
- Co-Director of the Institute for Maritime Tourism (IMT) (http://www.imt.hs-bremerhaven.de/)
- Editorial Board Member of the Journal of the European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation (EJTHR) – (http://www.ejthr.com/)
- Reviewer of the Tourism Management Journal (http://journals.elsevier.com/02615177/tourism-management/)

Administrative Functions:
- Dean of Studies – Faculty of Business & Economics
- Chairman of the CIM Examinations Committee
- Member of the CIM Study Affairs Committee
Glaser’s Coding Families
(1967 & 1992)
Glaser’s (1978: 73-82)
*Theoretical Coding Families (1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Coding Family</th>
<th>Theoretical Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Six C's</td>
<td>Causes (sources, reasons, explanations, accountings or anticipated consequences), Context or Ambiance, Contingencies, Consequences (outcomes, efforts, functions, predictions, anticipated/ unanticipated), Covariances, Conditions or Qualifiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Limit, Range, Intensity, Extent, Amount, Polarity, Extreme, Boundary, Rank, Grades, Continuum, Probability, Possibility, Level, Cutting Points, Critical Juncture, Statistical Average (mean, medium, mode), Deviation, Exemplar, Modicum, Full, Partial, Almost, Half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Dimensions, Elements, Divisions, Piece of, Properties of, Facet, Slice, Sector, Portion, Segment, Part, Aspect, Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Type, Form, Kinds, Styles, Classes, Genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Mutual Effects, Reciprocity, Mutual Trajectory, Mutual Dependency, Interdependence, Interaction of effects, Covariance [GLASER78], Face to Face Interactions, Self-indications, Delayed-interaction [GLASER98, Symbolic Interaction].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cutting Point</td>
<td>Boundary, Critical juncture, Cutting point, Turning point, Benchmark, Division, Cleavage, Scales, In-out, Intra-extra, Tolerance levels, Dichotomy, Trichotomy, Polychotomy, Deviance, Point of no return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Coding Family</td>
<td>Theoretical Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Means-goal</td>
<td>End, Purpose, Goal, Anticipated consequences, Products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Social norms, Social values, Social belief, Social Sentiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Concensus</td>
<td>Clusters, Agreements, Contracts, Definitions of Situation, Uniformities, Opinions, Conflict, Discensus, Differential perception, Cooperation, Homogeneity-heterogeneity, Conformity, Non conformity, Mutual expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>Social control, Recruitment, Socialization, Stratification, Status passage, Social organization, Social order, Social interaction, Social mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Parsimony, Scope, Integration, Density, Conceptual level, Relationship to data, Relationship to other theory, Clarity, Fit, Relevance, Modifiability, Utility, Condensibility, Inductive-Deductive balance and interfeeding, degree of, Multivariate structure, Use of theoretical codes, Interpretive, Explanatory, Predictive Power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ordering or Elaboration</td>
<td>Structural Ordering (unit size of: organization, division...), Temporal Ordering (A→B→C), Conceptual Ordering (Achievement Orientation, Institutional Goal, Organizational value, Personal Motivation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Concepts, Problems, Hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Linear model, Property Space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glaser’s (1992: 170-175)

**Theoretical Coding Families PLUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Coding Family</th>
<th>Theoretical Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Basics</td>
<td>Basic Social Structural Process, Basic Social Structural Condition (shifts, semesters, quarters, fiscal), Basic Social Psychological Process (teaching, child rearing, learning curves, becoming, education, grieving, maturing), Basic Psychological Process (identity development, character formation, loving, unconscious agendas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paired Opposite</td>
<td>Ingroup-Outgroup (in-out), Manifest-Latent, Explicit-Tant, Figure-Ground, Normative-Comparative, Reduction-Substruction, Induction-Deduction, Generative-Verificational, Unit-Concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Likert Scales, Guttman Scales, Cummulative Scales, Random Walk Scale, Funneling Down, Scaling Down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Structural Functional</td>
<td>Authority Structure, Reference Groups, Role Sets, Status Sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Confidence Limit, Tolerance Zone, Front Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unit Identity</td>
<td>Professions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Mean, Median, Mode, Confidence Limit, Tolerance Zones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Two Competing Paradigms

**Positivist vs. Post-Positivist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivist</th>
<th>Post-Positivist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>▶ Describe phenomena</td>
<td>▶ Understand phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Rejection of Metaphysics</td>
<td>▶ Rejection of Positivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Control &amp; Prediction</td>
<td>Understanding &amp; Evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Tool</strong></td>
<td>Empiricism (Study what can be directly observed and measured)</td>
<td>Critical Realism (Study what can be directly observed and measured, but must be aware that observation is fallible and theory revisable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Creation Approach</strong></td>
<td>“Building knowledge” (Linear Approach) (Nature’s laws are out there, waiting to be discovered)</td>
<td>“Growing knowledge” (Iterative Approach) (Peer evaluation &amp; Scrutiny, survival of the ‘fittest’ theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mind-frame</strong></td>
<td>Objective reality exists (rejection of subjectivism / relativism)</td>
<td>Objective reality exists (as positivism, but an individual cannot be 100% certain of it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worldview</strong></td>
<td>Deterministic universe</td>
<td>Probabilistic universe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beginning with general wonderment (an empty mind)
Emerging theory, with neutral questions
Development of a conceptual theory
Theoretical sensitivity (the ability to perceive variables and relationships) comes from immersion in the data
The credibility of the theory, or verification, is derived from its grounding in the data
The theory is grounded in the data
A basic social process should be identified
The researcher is passive, exhibiting disciplined restraint
Data reveals the theory
Coding is less rigorous, a constant comparison of incident to incident, with neutral questions and categories and properties evolving. Take care not to ‘over-conceptualise’, identify key points
Two coding phases or types, simple (fracture the data then conceptually group it) and substantive (open or selective, to produce categories and properties)
Regarded by some as the only ‘true’ GTM

Having a general idea of where to begin
Forcing the theory, with structured questions
Conceptual description (description of situations)
Theoretical sensitivity comes from methods and Tools
The credibility of the theory comes from the rigour of the method
The theory is interpreted by an observer
Basic social processes need not be identified
The researcher is active
Data is structured to reveal the theory
Coding is more rigorous and defined by technique. The nature of making comparisons varies with the coding technique. Labels are carefully crafted at the time. Codes are derived from ‘micro-analysis which consists of analysis data word-by-word’
Three types of coding, open (identifying, naming, categorising and describing phenomena), axial (the process of relating codes to each other) and selective (choosing a core category and relating other categories to that)
Regarded by some as a form of qualitative data analysis (QDA)

* Jones & Alony (2011)