"Time-Tripping" and Memory-Making: A Grounded Theory of Grounded Theory

Barry John Gibson[ORCID]

School of Clinical Dentistry, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Robert Porter

School of Applied Social and Policy Sciences, University of Ulster, Belfast, UK

Richard Ekins

Centre for Media Research, University of Ulster, Coleraine, UK

This paper explores the development of grounded theory methodology through the lens of memory studies, introducing the concept of "time-tripping" as a key generic social process. The paper identifies several sub-processes of time-tripping, including "reclaiming," "resisting," "retro-casting," and "landscaping," which shape the methodological "imaginary." Through a "grounded theory of grounded theory" approach, the authors analyze how these processes, influenced by individual and collective memory, authorship, and power dynamics, have contributed to the pluralism of the method. The paper concludes by suggesting that time-tripping offers a valuable framework for understanding the social processes of memory and forgetting in science.
Keywords: grounded theory, memory studies, collective memory, remembering, forgetting

INTRODUCTION

Memory studies have become increasingly prominent over the last 30 years as a way of understanding how individuals and groups come to know, understand, and interpret the past (Jacobsen, Punzalan, and Hedstrom 2013). Memory is seen as an active dialogue with the past, an ongoing accomplishment that takes place

through "material-discursive" practices (Foroughi et al. 2020; Warnock 1987). It can take different forms; for example, mimetic memory involves the transmission of practical skills and knowledge, communicative memory involves language, with cultural memory referring to the meaning of the past (Olick and Robbins 1998). Sociologists have been particularly interested in the making of collective memory, which typically refers to how *groups* feel about the past, their beliefs, emotions, and judgments (Conway 2010). It affects how the way groups remember their past directly affects their sense of self and their relationships with others (Olick and Robbins 1998). It is therefore a site of power; those who control narratives of the past can shape the present and the future; they also have an important influence on what eventually becomes "history" (Misztal 2003, 2010).

A sociological understanding of memory can reveal how dominant groups use memory to solidify their position. It can also enable the study of how marginalized groups resist such dominant narratives or how different social movements challenge state authority or strip each other of "moral authority" (Jansen 2007; Misztal 2003). Studies of memory reveal that remembering is a dynamic process, future-oriented and influenced by the problematics of the present. By studying memory, sociology can understand how the past is continually reinterpreted in the context of present needs and aspirations; it can also examine how the past is mobilized in multiple ways by different groups and how this relates to the transmission of culture (Adams and Edy 2021). Through investigating memory, sociologists can explore how traditions, values, and beliefs are sustained, including how societies maintain shared experiences of the past.

Although memory and history might be seen as different "routes to the past" (Lowenthal 1985), understanding the relationship between them is important. Positivist history sought to be objective, focusing on "how it really was," trying to establish a public account of the past, relying on written records, verifiable accounts, and, wherever possible, "critical distance" from the events studied (Halbwachs 1950). History's focus is more on events that happen over time; such events are irreversible, conditioned, and evoke chains of causes (Misztal 2003). In contrast to this, memory has been portrayed for its "atemporal sense of the past in the present" (Kartiel 1999:99–100), for a tendency to "mythologize the past, to look for similarities and to appeal to emotions" (Kartiel 1999:99–100). Memory has therefore also been "considered arbitrary, selective, lacking the legitimacy of history and ultimately subjective" (Misztal 2003:99). The understanding of the relationship between history and memory has changed over time, with memory studies successfully challenging history's claim over the past (Misztal 2003). Historians are now more aware that all history is, to some extent, an interpretation influenced by the present, leading to a realization that while memory and history are distinct, they are interdependent and can be complementary. Understanding these differences and interdependencies is crucial for sociologists and historians (Misztal 2003).

Memory is important since it can be used to produce greater tolerance or to foster conflict (Misztal 2003). It has an ongoing persistent impact on the present.

Sociological accounts of memory are also important because they can enable an analysis of when events pass and enter collective memory. Recent studies in the sociology of memory have explored this process by examining how the temporal dynamics of the past are understood. This work has explored the impact of "provisional endings," and the emergence of "reflective space" in memory-making (Adams and Edy 2021). Provisional endings refer to a series of events to which the ending is not yet fully determined or may be up for revision; the past is not yet past, and the boundaries of what will become past remain undecided. A reflective space represents the ability to examine the past with some sense of critical distance (Adams and Edy 2021). When participants are caught up in a sequence of events, it is only when the sequence has ended that it can subsequently be observed from the outside. This work, clearly influenced by Halbwachs (1950), recognizes that an important distinction between collective memory, biographical memory, and history is important because it enables an analysis of how the past becomes the past, or at least is allowed to be past.

In other important work, sociological studies of memory have focused on how "reputational trajectories" are formed and mobilized in memory work (Jansen 2007). Reputational trajectories can enable studies of the diverse ways historical figures are used by different movements. It highlights how past memory conflicts shape and restrict subsequent uses of such figures. This results in the production of unique reputational trajectories that are related to the effectiveness of various memory practices. Reputational trajectories are presented through a series of interconnected presents, where symbolic shifts in the values assigned to symbols by institutions can have a determinant effect on such trajectories. These values can then become established and in turn set new historical parameters for later actors. These studies are important because they seek to go beyond the "framing perspective" by developing a more nuanced analysis of how memory work as a process develops. In this paper, we argue that "memory work" is also crucial to the development of social-science research methods. We introduce and outline "time-tripping" as an important generic social process (Prus 2010; Simmel 1971) closely related to the making of collective memory. This article is based on a detailed case study of the methodological differences in the grounded theory method.

GROUNDED THEORY

Grounded theory, co-originated by Barney Glaser and Anslem Strauss in the 1960s, updated in 1978 by Glaser, then Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990), eventually resulted in a schism in 1992 (Kenny and Fourie 2014). This schism, we are told, led to the formation of various factions eventually coalescing around different approaches to the method (Bryant 2019). Barney Glaser, the co-founder of the method, always resisted the direction that grounded theory had taken. He continued to fight for the version he felt he had produced, a version that eventually became known as "classical grounded theory" (Annells 1996, 1997; Glaser and

Holton 2004). The 33 years since the "great schism" have resulted in the emergence of several different varieties of grounded theory (Bryant 2019). In addition to classical grounded theory (Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967), there is Strauss and Corbin's version (Strauss and Corbin 1990), constructivist (Charmaz 2000, 2006), Straussian (Strübing 2007, 2019), critical (Gibson 2007; Hadley 2019), indigenous (Harrison 2003; Stewart 2007), and more recently, an anarchist version has been proposed (Donaghey 2016).

Perhaps the most recognizable variety of grounded theory today is Kathy Charmaz's constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2000, 2006), although both situational analysis (Clarke 2003, 2005; Clarke and Friese 2007) and the approach of Strauss and Corbin (Strauss and Corbin 1990; Strauss and Corbin 1998) are both recognized as distinctive grounded theory traditions (Bryant 2019). These differences matter. To the co-originator Barney Glaser, the development of varieties of grounded theory was experienced as a remodeling of the method. He rejected alternative interpretations and fought against changes to the program of grounded theory (Glaser 1992, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2019; Glaser and Holton 2004). Glaser invested considerable time, energy, and money traveling globally to teach classical grounded theory, establishing an international network of scholars and students interested in this approach. Many attendees and students went on to publish monographs in their own right, along with establishing the *Grounded Theory Review*, which became a central part of this program (Holton 2008; Holton and Walsh 2016; Nathaniel 2012; Nathaniel and Andrews 2010).

The proponents of this approach continue to defend this version against "slurring" and "remodeling" (Baker, Wuest, and Stern 1992; Glaser and Holton 2004; Holton 2019). Others, in particular Charmaz (Charmaz 2000, 2008, 2009) and Bryant (Bryant 2003, 2019; Bryant and Kathy 2007), objected to the reactions of Glaser, arguing that once something enters the public domain, it develops a life of its own. In short, while Glaser was free to object, he could not justifiably claim to own grounded theory, nor could he claim to control it as it developed.

Grounded theory provides a good case study in memory work and the politics of memory because the ending to the conflict around the method remained provisional; indeed, it could be argued that critical distance has been difficult to achieve.[1] This is because the debates about the method are still ongoing; both Glaser and the members of the classic grounded theory school of thought continued to resist the labeling of grounded theory as anything other. They also objected to any of the novel developments in the method proposed by thinkers like Kathy Charmaz (2000) and Adele Clarke (2003). While emerging authors would seek to innovate and take the method in new directions to resolve problems that they felt had emerged for the method, Glaser remained adamant that this was wholly unnecessary. In this paper, we aim to explore what has been going on in grounded-theory methodology in what can probably best be termed a "grounded theory of grounded theory."

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This is a grounded theory study shaped by the influence of symbolic interactionism. In keeping with studies of meaning making and memory, Mead's work on the philosophy of the present provides an important starting point for our analysis. Mead's idea that there is not simply one present, but rather multiple "presents sliding into each other" (Mead 1932:9) is well recognized in the literature on memory. In the context of this paper, this standpoint enables an expectation that the present in any methodological school of thought, such as grounded theory, should be excited by future possibilities, by the changes that will be required to resolve the problems of the present. Not only this, but as Mead stated:

> the reference is always and solely to the given past out of which a problem has arisen; and the outlines of the problem and the tests to which presented hypotheses are subjected, are found in the given past. As we have seen, this given past may itself at a later date be affected with doubt and brought under discussion. And yet the possible dubiety of the given past in no way affects the undertaking. (Mead 1932:7)

The past then is always referenced from the perspective of a problem that is relevant for the present, both past and present are (re)constructions. Mead's ideas generate a series of problems. First, if there are multiple accounts or perspectives constantly on the move sliding around and moving past each other, there must be some core or, in Mead's words, an account that is 'correct' or, as we would like to say, widely accepted. Second, just as there are multiple pasts and presents moving forward, the nature of these pasts and the accounts people give of them brush up against each other and develop into accounts that become socially accepted as perspectives from which others adopt their positions. This refers to the givenness of social reality as it is encountered by participants, who in turn, must interact with it (Mead 1929:240–241).

The "objectivity of perspectives" for Mead refers to when the "organism," in the case of this study, the methodologist, attempts to open a perspective that either matches the feedback from the environment or does not. When there is a failure of the environment to match the perspective of the methodologist, then a problem is generated, and they seek to reconcile this with further interaction. Mead later stated:

> In the second place, it is only in so far as the individual acts not only in his own perspective but also in the perspective of others, especially in the common perspective of a group, that a society arises and its affairs become the object of scientific inquiry. The limitation of social organization is found in the inability of individuals to place themselves in the perspectives of others, to take their points of view. I do not wish to belabor the point, which is commonplace enough, but to suggest that we find here an actual organization of perspectives, and that the principle of it is fairly evident. This principle is that the individual enters into the perspectives of others, in so far as he [sic] is able to take their attitudes, or occupy their points of view. (Mead 1932:165)

But there are other ideas that are of relevance from Mead's understanding of the past. As Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich (1983) have shown, within Mead's ideas there are at least four dimensions to his understanding of the past, present and future. The symbolically reconstructed past refers to the active redefinition of past events, imbuing them with contemporary significance and practical application. This dimension underscores the ongoing and transcendent nature of time, where the present enables and reconstructs the past to inform current perceptions. The social structural past on the other hand, pertains to the past's influence in shaping the present, encompassing sequences of activities that establish and constrain the probabilities for future occurrences. This dimension emphasizes the structuring impact of past events on present experiences. The implied objective past refers to the existence of antecedent events deemed necessary for present experience. This dimension is grounded in a situational ontology of consensus regarding past facts, where present realities provide the basis and structure for collective memory. Finally, the mythical past involves the creation of symbolic narratives to manipulate social dynamics. Such fictitious pasts, while lacking a factual basis, are designed to exert influence by materially affecting relationships. They are often constructed to establish and maintain advantage through myths that align with prevailing organizational patterns (Maines et al. 1983).

An approach informed by Mead's thinking and the resulting sociology of memory can enable a better understanding of the nature of the schism in grounded theory and how it has developed over time. At the heart of this process is a form of memory-making. The ending of the schism remains somewhat provisional and, following Adams and Edy (2021), we argue that the provisional nature of the ending means that there is a lack of critical distance within the debate itself. In many respects, time-tripping is about what happens *in between* individual and collective memory. How is this space marked by social psychological processes? How are these processes related to memory?

In this paper we propose a grounded theory of the grounded theory approach. The "grounds" of our approach are the original texts (Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967), along with histories of grounded theory as presented by Bryant (2019), Low and Hyslop-Margison (2021), and Morse et al. (2021). We select these texts because they provide a collective landscape of the overall developments in grounded theory, not only in terms of the publication history (events), but also from the perspective of the memories of those involved. As we shall see, the relationship between the memories of individual scientists and the body of work in grounded theory is fundamental to understanding how the method has developed.

Through the constant comparison of incidents of interactions between authors and the literature over the last 50+ years, we have developed the generic social process of time-tripping to explain how the nexus of memory and events intersect to generate new directions within the methodology. Time-tripping is a generic social process and, as such, it refers to "parallel sequences of activity" happening "across diverse

contexts," highlighting "the emergent, interpretive features of association" focusing "attention on the activities involved in the doing or accomplishing of human group life" (Prus 1996:140). As we shall see, this generic social process runs through the making of memory in the method. In what follows, we present this generic social process alongside examples taken from the literature on grounded theory to provide illustrations of how it works.

TIME-TRIPPING: ENRICHING THE GROUNDED THEORY IMAGINARY

Time-tripping involves authors' confronting challenges from the ground or environment of grounded theory as they see it and as they construct it, and seeking to propose some way to resolve them. The process of looking back in time from the perspective of the present involves taking certain grounds and, at the same time, certain problematics as given. The author then derives, through an abductive process, a solution to the problematic as it is seen from the present. The solution projects a new, reconstructed form of grounded theory that resolves the dilemma or problematic moving forward. The form of abductive reasoning generates an imaginary — by this we mean it generates a solution to the problem from the perspective of the author — that remains up for revision, to be accepted or rejected in the process of debate in the grounded-theory community. Time-tripping always carries a provisional element with it (Adams and Edy 2021). We use the term "imaginary" because we seek to capture the creative element of this abductive reasoning. What then matters is how such imaginaries developed different "path dependent" (Jansen 2007) trajectories within the wider methodology, gaining momentum and fanning out from the original schism.

The Dimensions and Properties of Time-Tripping

All time-tripping involves positioning in some form or another in the same way that all writing has to be positioned from the point of view of the present aimed at a desirable future. Time-tripping always, therefore, involves a construction of a relevant past taken from the perspective of the present moving to a future where the problems are resolved (Mead 1929, 1932). These fundamental dimensions of time-tripping are the philosophical bedrock of our approach. The following are the key properties of time-tripping in grounded theory.

Authorship

Time-tripping involves authorship, a property that plays out in many different directions: combining perspectives, building alliances, and reaching compromises. It is a central feature of the schism at the heart of grounded theory, remains central to the formation of generations, and is a constant theme of time-tripping. Authorship itself has several important properties:

a. It confers ownership, which is sustained over time; an indicator of ownership is recognition through citations.
b. It marks the relationship between the author and the collective enterprise; they can be a maverick, insider/outsider, or at the core/periphery.
c. Authorship also marks the interpersonal/collaborative nature of the relationship between the author and their followers or students. Students can form generations.
d. Visible/invisible — in the act of producing grounded theory, the author and their authorship can be visible or hidden. There are plenty of examples of hidden authorship and influence within grounded theory; for example, the influence of Jeanne Quint on grounded theory has only recently been examined (Bryant 2019).

The problem of authorship is deep rooted; it closely maps to the personal identity of the individual scientist and their work. It is also closely related to the "reputational trajectories" (Jansen 2007) of the method, its adherents, and individual scientists as they build relationships, schools of thinking, and generations. As we shall see, a central theme in Glaser's (1992) objections to new directions in grounded theory was the desire for his contribution to be recognized and remembered.

Problematics

Problematics as they manifest in the debates about grounded theory vary in terms of their external or internal reference points. The schism in grounded theory was an internal problematic, whereas the postmodern turn was clearly an external problematic. The shifting terrain of problematics, like the postmodern turn, resulted in changes in the external values and standards through which research methods in general were being judged. This had repercussions for the reputational trajectory of grounded theory's becoming, especially pertinent in the 1990s.

Problematics varied in the threat that they present the author; for example, they can be urgent or non-urgent. How problematics are read can become the source of controversy, which can lead to collective orientations and, by implication, blind spots. They are clearly based on memory, both individual and collective, in the same way that grounds are based on collective memory.

The Ground of Time-Tripping

All time-tripping involves a ground or a basic starting point around which the author assumes a set of givens about the reality around which the particular time trip is based. Grounds are derived from collective memory (Halbwachs 1950) combining with problematics in interesting ways. Charmaz (2000) and Clarke (2003, 2005) took for granted the criticisms leveled at grounded theory in the so-called post-modern turn. The post-modern turn informed the orientation of the new generation of qualitative researchers as they looked back. Clearly, this left grounded theory with formidable problems that needed to be resolved. Charmaz and Clarke both clearly

felt these criticisms were a credible threat to the continued relevance of the method. This was the ground upon which their various analyses were based, at least initially. Glaser rejected this ground and sought to constantly remember and so re-establish what he thought was the ground of grounded theory, this being his book with Anslem Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (hereafter called *Discovery*) and *Theoretical Sensitivity* (Glaser 1978, 2001, 2002; Glaser and Holton 2004; Glaser and Strauss 1967). Grounds in research methods, as collectively remembered, are deeply political in both their orientation and consequences. They are political because they shape the interpersonal relationships between authors, schools, and paradigms. They can also be political because they refer to historical moments in wider society, frequently resulting in a re-grounding, revision, or recasting of history and time.

Positionality

It should by now be obvious, following from our symbolic-interactionist heritage, that all forms of time-tripping involve some form of positionality. While the fundamental dimensions of positionality relate to the temporal dimensions of past, present, and future, it is the position that is adopted in relation to all three that gives the time-trip its meaning. The position here refers to how the past, present, and future are combined. One position might be to promote the purpose of grounded theory to produce generalized concepts such as those promoted by Simmel (1971), Blumer (1969), and Strauss (1993), or to carefully map knowledges fully embedded in time and place (Charmaz 2000, 2008; Clarke 2005). Positionality indicates the direction of travel from the selected past to the future; it also combines elements of authorship and reputational trajectory by indicating how the problematic past necessitates changes.

The Sub-Processes of Time-Tripping

The following sub-processes of time-tripping may be utilized at different times by different authors in different combinations: Reclaiming, Resisting, and Rejecting, Retro-casting, and Landscaping.

Reclaiming Grounded Theory

Reclaiming involves rehabilitating grounded theory in a new form, fit for a new and changing environment. Charmaz (2000, 2008) positioned grounded theory as objectivist, reminding everyone that it had been criticized for being objectivist by authors from the postmodern turn. She wanted grounded theory to remain relevant by claiming that:

> The power of grounded theory lies in its tools for understanding empirical worlds. We can reclaim these tools from their positivist underpinnings to form revised, more open-ended practice of grounded theory that stresses its emergent, constructivist elements. (Charmaz 2000:510)

Constructivist grounded theory was better positioned to resolve the problems generated by the post-modern turn. In this time trip, Charmaz positioned grounded theory in relation to the post-modern turn through a partial memory selected from the relevant past. The simplified version she presented was based on the problematics defined by Denzin and Lincoln (1994). The new version of grounded theory that she generated aimed to resolve these problems and reclaim the method for the present. Charmaz was joined by Clarke who, citing Charmaz, added her own imaginary to the corpus of grounded theory:

> While scholars utilizing grounded theory have ranged from positivist to social constructivist, recent work is shifting toward more constructivist assumptions/epistemologies. Situational analysis is part of these shifts. I seek with Charmaz (2000:510) to "reclaim these tools from their positivist underpinnings to form a revised, more open-ended practice of grounded theory that stresses its emergent, constructivist elements" and to "use grounded theory methods as flexible, heuristic strategies." Charmaz emphasizes that a focus on meaning making furthers interpretive, constructivist, and I would add, relativist/perspectival understandings. My goal is to further enable, sustain, and enhance such shifts. (Clarke 2005:xxiii)

Clarke and Charmaz both sought to extend their constructivism by authoring a new imaginary for others. Note how she said she wished to "enable, sustain and enhance such shifts." In this respect, Charmaz's original imaginary was building followers, developing a life of its own, emerging as a new school in grounded theory. It was becoming part of collective memory, not just in debates about the method but in research practice as a program. Charmaz had also been joined by another important ally, Tony Bryant, who defended her proposed route for grounded theory after his own time trip where he had voiced concerns about the positivist strands in grounded theory, while identifying weaknesses in the looseness of the method (Bryant 2002). He stated:

> People who claim to be using GTM often use this as a way of disguising their methodological incompetence or fragility—particularly if they lack clear objectives or have poorly developed research ideas.

> Babchuk (1996) hints at this when contrasting Glaser's "laissez-faire" approach with Strauss' detailed procedural minutiae. In his survey of 15 years of publications in the Adult Education field, he notes euphemistically that GTM has been used as an "umbrella term" by a large number of researchers—by which he implies that they use the term to mean more or less anything they want. (Bryant 2002:32)

Bryant (2003) who later saw Glaser's (2002) challenge to Charmaz responded by defending her. The history of grounded theory can best be understood by analyzing the content, conditions and consequences of these time trips, how they connect to each other, split and divide over time. Charmaz's version of grounded theory shifted and changed, partly in response to criticisms (Low and Hyslop-Margison 2021). At

the outset her constructivist version of grounded theory contrasted with so called classical grounded theory by arguing that "the viewer creates the data and ensuing analysis through interaction with the viewed" (Charmaz 2000:523). That this happens in contexts bound by time, culture and structure. The researcher and the researched shape the meaning of what becomes the grounded theory. A constructivist grounded theory is said to be more focused on meaning and the constructs participants use to make sense of the problems they face. It places less emphasis on generating an integrated theory (Charmaz 2000, 2008).

Reclaiming grounded theory is particularly interesting because it took developments in current social theory and beyond as the grounds for an urgent re-reading of grounded theory. It then involved proposing that grounded theory needed to change to gain the benefits of these new developments. Clarke (2005) energetically selected multiple reference points, problematics, and existing theory with which to challenge grounded theory. In doing so, she argued that grounded theory needed to shift away from modernist ideals associated with knowledge production toward an emancipatory and critical focus on knowledge relations. This kind of approach to method building was particularly creative; it developed a whole array of strategies that pushed grounded-theory studies into new territory empirically and theoretically.

As stated previously, a key property of reclaiming grounded theory, and indeed all forms of time-tripping, is authorship; the author takes ownership and claims something for themselves. But authorship is important in another sense. In these interventions, the purpose was to make the author of grounded theory more visible. Not just in the process of doing grounded theory in the postmodern turn but also to make each author visible, owning a particular reclaiming project: Charmaz (2000) claimed constructivist grounded theory, Clarke (2005) situational analysis, and Schatzman (1991) dimensional analysis. A key property of this authorship is that it resulted in relationships that were able to develop over time; Charmaz (2000) would recruit a huge following, as did Clarke (2005). The obvious implication of this is that each of these authors has their own reputational trajectories, which are preserved and supported in projects of co-authorship. A consequence of reclaiming also, however, involved a change in the program of grounded theory, from additional steps to be performed in the method to reframing epistemological principles. Not only was the author to be more visible within the process of data collection and analysis, but so too was their influence on the data collected alongside their interactions with participants.

Changes to the program of the grounded theory method resulted in a closer mapping of grounded theory concepts to the perspectives of participants. The introduction of greater degrees of reflexivity in turn led to several changes; gone was the goal of generating a fully integrated theory around a core category (Charmaz 2000, 2006) and a relinquishing of the importance of formal theory, which was deemed too objectivist (Clarke 2005). Just as these projects have always been up for revision, they have also been vigorously resisted.

Resisting and Rejecting

Resisting, as a sub-process of time-tripping, involves rejecting changes in the status, program, or interpretation of grounded theory. The ground of resisting and rejecting is often located against some idea of grounded theory, either, as it was originally intended in *Discovery* (Glaser and Strauss 1967) and *Theoretical Sensitivity* (Glaser 1978) or in an attack on the more recent iterations of the method (Bryant 2003). Strategies for doing this can involve deflection, for example, when Clarke (2005:8) defended grounded theory against some of the criticisms coming from narrative analysis (Riessman 1993). This deflection involved pointing out that while narratives were focused on (re)presenting the stories of individuals, grounded theory was better focused on analyzing multiple perspectives on certain phenomena. Perhaps the most famous example of resisting is the work of Glaser (1992) in *Emergence v's Forcing: The Basics of Qualitative Analysis* (hereafter called *Emergence vs Forcing*).

The central problematic Glaser (1992) was confronting was that, for him, the work of Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990) represented a break with the tradition of grounded theory. The ground for Glaser's taken-for-granted world was the original texts (Glaser 1978; Glaser and Strauss 1967). *Emergence vs. Forcing* was written as a counterargument. Just some specific points of resistance were that:

- Strauss' coding approach focusing on labeling incidents and then categorizing them was deemed unnecessary. Indeed, many of Strauss' additional techniques and approaches were deemed unnecessary at best and damaging at worst (Glaser 1992:42).
- The questions asked by Strauss were said to lead to full conceptual description. (Glaser 1992:44–45). This was the case specifically with axial coding and indeed with his use of Schatzman's form of dimensionalizing.
- The use of the dimensional theoretical code was forcing one code onto the grounded theory process (Glaser 1992:46–47).
- These conceptual codes derail the constant comparative method, which was the core of grounded theory (Glaser 1992:70).

Throughout *Emergence vs Forcing*, Glaser insisted on emergence, which referred to the openness of the process of doing grounded theory that, in turn, allowed it to develop. He made many points of refutation to some of the key innovations associated with Strauss' (1987) and Strauss and Corbin's (1990) version of grounded theory. His arguments were a point of resistance to key moments in the constructivism of Charmaz (2000) and were eloquently picked up by Simmons (2022) at a much later date. Simmons reiterated Glaser's point as follows:

> A staunch constructivist position holds that all human knowledge, no matter how derived, is a human, interpretive construct. I would agree with this on a fundamental ontological, epistemological level. On a practical level, holding steadfastly to this position leads to a shaky foundation that undermines the credibility

of all social/behavioral science. Although it may be impossible to research and understand anything without incorporating something of oneself into it, this is not a legitimate justification for choosing to purposefully incorporate one's pre-conceived questions, theoretical categories or paradigm, political or professional ideology, theoretical speculations, and/or personal predilections into the research design and process. As Glaser (2002, p. 6) stated, "Constructionism is used to legitimate forcing. It is like saying that if the researcher is going to be part of con-structing the data, then he/she may as well construct it his way." … the stricture in CGT that the research is not about what is relevant to the researcher, but what is relevant to the participants. (Simmons 2022:61)

Simmons' (2022) time-tripping involved seeing the writings of Charmaz (2000, 2006) as a central problematic upon which to base his criticism; his grounds are the original texts of Glaser and Strauss (1967), Glaser's (1992) response to Charmaz and his memory of working with both Glaser and Strauss. Glaser (1992), deeply offended at the modifications that Strauss proposed to the method, engaged in time-tripping to emphasize that he had a stake in the future of grounded theory as co-originator mostly because, in his perspective, the reputational trajectory of himself as author and his method as a whole was being threatened. He argued that Strauss was playing down his input and then remarked on the qualities of intellectual property which:

… has several properties that distinguishes it from material, personal or real prop-erty. It has originators, but no ownership rights of a sticking, binding nature. Who indeed owns what, once it is published? Therefore how does one control, husband and manage his intellectual property without the rights of ownership? What can be done about theft, misuse. abuse, use ignoring the originator? Not much, except maybe a little social control, and usually nothing, especially when it is not easy to understand the material in depth. (Glaser 1992:120)

This demonstrates Glaser's fear of being forgotten. His desire to see his contribu-tion to grounded theory to be remembered *and retained*. A central focus of this resistance was *against* the post-modern turn in favor of a more direct *program of methods* centered around the essential criteria of grounded theory as it was originally intended. This then shows that for classical grounded theorists, the ground for analy-sis always begins with the original texts and their collective memory of the schism is that the ending is very much provisional and up for revision in the way that Adams and Edy (2021) discuss.

Retro-Casting

Retro-casting as a sub-process of time-tripping involves going back to a core text, but then indicating that a way to resolve perceived problematics is to go even further back to *remember* that which is forgotten. Retro-casting involves refitting grounded theory with remembering *and* a better *understanding* of the relevance of older problematics and their solutions to current dilemmas; several examples exist

in the literature (Bryant 2019; Ekins and Porter 2023; Gibson and Hartman 2013; Strübing 2007; Strübing 2019). A good example is the work of Strübing:

> One of the originators of grounded theory obviously draws heavily on the prag-matist and interactionist traditions. But what traits did this legacy go on to leave in Anselm Strauss's methodological work? I will claim that there is a strong bond between the thoughts of early North American pragmatism and both the method-ological and the socio-theoretical concepts at the core of grounded theory — at least as long as it is the Straussian variant of grounded theory that we are talking about.
>
> This chapter outlines some of the key concepts of early pragmatism, such as George Herbert Mead's notion of objective reality as that of interacting per-spectives, John Dewey's iterative-circular understanding of problem-solving processes, and Charles S. Peirce's concept of abduction as the long sought-after explanation for the creation of new ideas in problem-solving. (Strübing 2007:580)

Time-tripping here involves *remembering*. Strübing's analysis begins with the split between Glaser and Strauss arguing that *Discovery* was part of the problematic background. This is because, in his view, this text is a mixed bag of methods and approaches. His retro-cast sought to reinvigorate grounded theory by remembering the relevance of Pierce, Dewey and Mead. He revisits, in a very productive way, ideas about the nature of data and theory. He indicated that:

> While it is true that conceptualizing objects and thereby reality as being actively "carved out" (Mead 1938: 660) includes the possibility of different perspectives of different actors, more often than not perspectives overlap or are in many aspects identical. Mead explains this "objective reality of perspectives" (1932/1959: 161) by drawing on the dialectical concept of the mutual shaping of actor and object as well as by postulating his idea of interaction based on the processual integra-tion of the "generalized other" into one's own actions. In this way, every intelli-gent act of "carving out" an object is "social to the very core" (Mead 1934:141). (Strübing 2007:584)

Strübing also examined the nature of theory, promoting an in-depth examination of everyday concepts and their position in the theory building process.

Retro-casting differs from reclaiming; it involves puzzling out problematics rather than asserting them as the basis for a new grounded theory project. In this case, Strübing puzzled out the problematic nature of the data and theory in grounded theory, then re-cast these by revisiting previous ideas embedded in texts that, it was claimed, influenced grounded theory. In this sense, puzzling out varies in the degree to which it is tight or loose with respect to previous texts or ideas. Gibson and Hartman (2013) produced a recasting of grounded theory based on a close reading of the original texts and the sociological literature within which these were embedded. The reading of these previous texts subsequently became new proposed grounds for grounded theory, which is then enriched by such acts of remembering.

The proof of the value of such retro-casting is the degree to which these ideas subsequently become part of the ongoing reality of perspectives on grounded theory. Since these activities are, by their nature, aimed at the supporting structures of grounded theory, their positionality is always in relation to some pre-existing aspect of grounded theory. Retro-casting then is typically additional to one or more aspects of the method; Strübing contributes to remembering the symbolic-interactionist roots of grounded theory. In contrast, Gibson and Hartman's (2013) book seeks to remember the sociological context of grounded theory.

Landscaping

The final sub-process of time-tripping that we want to cover is that of landscaping. Landscaping involves grouping texts in the history of grounded theory in different ways and placing them into the landscape of qualitative methods. There are several important examples of landscaping, the most famous being Denzin and Lincoln's (1994) introduction to their book *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. In this text, they famously argued in favor of a nuanced landscape for qualitative methods that included post-modern sensibilities. Their landscaping exercise included a critique of grounded theory that betrayed a certain desire to see it pass from methodological memory. As we have seen, both Charmaz (2000) and Clarke (2005) drew on this text to justify new rehabilitated versions of grounded theory that they in turn had authored.

Other examples of landscaping in grounded theory have followed (Bryant 2019; Bryant and Kathy 2007; Morse et al. 2021), each seeking to establish important historical moments in the development of different versions of grounded theory. There are two very important consequences of landscaping. One is the temporal ordering of developments in research methods, with one development building on previous developments and knowledge of methods accumulating. There is an aspect of landscaping that can and does involve making what is in the past, pass. Such memory entrepreneurship seeks to revise the past as past, enforce provisional endings, and create periods in history (Adams and Edy 2021).

Landscaping also results in the formulation of hierarchies of authority. A clear objective of Morse et al. (2021) was to place the originators and their students as primary sources for knowledge about the method. They sought to establish generations of authorial prestige. Those who have proximity to the originators of grounded theory, who were supervised by them, and had interpersonal relationships with the originators, by implication, have more insight into what the originators really meant. There is a risk here of essentializing training relationships alongside the establishment of an in-group and an out-group in grounded theory. The justification for an in-group/out-group distinction is based on authority and is a clear example of the exercise of power in memory. It betrays how this in-group mobilizes collective interpersonal resources, institutional positions, and relationships to remain the key memory entrepreneurs of grounded theory. In doing so, the recommendation is that

certain authors should be forgotten and others are more worthy of remembering in the collective imagination. Methodological capitalism at its finest!

DISCUSSION

In many respects time-tripping is about what happens in between individual and collective memory. How is this space marked by social psychological processes? How are these processes related to memory? The conflict at the heart of grounded theory is a conflict over who and what should be remembered in the method; it is also about what the program associated with the method should look like in the present. Time-tripping as a generic social process involves selecting what should be forgotten, projecting what is worthy of memory and should remain relevant in the future. If memory is an act of "thinking of things in their absence" (Warnock 1987:12) then time-tripping is the negotiation of things *into* the future. It generates imaginaries both individual and collective that ought to be carried forward. Time-tripping is about recovering a lost past and rehabilitating it for the future (reclaiming); it is about challenging forgetting and change (resisting), remembering what has been forgotten (retro-casting), and the making of collective memory in the present (landscaping).

The schism in grounded theory was both past and unfinished. Glaser continued to fight the memory entrepreneurs (Adams and Edy 2021), asserting his own version of grounded theory as the original and authentic version. In the process of authenticating (Ekins and Porter 2023), he engaged in different forms of memory work. Through time-tripping, he continually resisted the forgetting of his contribution to the development of the method. This resistance ensured that the schism at the heart of grounded theory was never really settled. Adams and Edy (2021:1417) discuss how frequently the past is not allowed to pass and how endings remain "provisional." Doing so was a strategic choice with Glaser successfully building an associated school of thought called "classical grounded theory." But he was not alone. Others were doing similar things in their memory work. The history of grounded theory is about how pluralism emerged through the complex interplay of time-tripping, how it was conditioned and the consequences that flowed from it.

A recurring theme throughout this paper has been authorship, not simply as the act of attributing ownership to the production of methodological chapters and papers, but also the building of alliances, generations, and groups of association. That authorship should become so central is perhaps not so surprising given the fact that the co-originators ended up disagreeing so publicly. It is ironic that a method that was meant to overcome the theoretical capitalism that went before it should end up replacing theoretical capitalism with methodological capitalism. This was a key factor, not only of the schism but remains so in the development of generations of grounded theory (Morse et al. 2021).

Taking time to support students, to write books and publish on grounded theory produces intellectual property. But as Glaser (1992) pointed out, such intellectual property has "no ownership rights of a sticking, binding nature" (Glaser 1992:120).

Glaser's (1992) book was an act of memory-making, seeking to build resistance to what he clearly thought was the process of forgetting in the grounded theory method. At stake for Glaser was not only his reputation but, perhaps more importantly for him at least, the reputation of grounded theory as a method in social science. In many respects, this recognition indicates the influence of the social structural past on his current situation (Maines et al. 1983). Intellectual property rights do not give control over how research methods develop. The nature of such rights does not allow for the author to retain total control over their intellectual legacy in the same way that one might have control over a car or a house. Others have pointed this out; Bryant (2003) said as much in his response to Glaser when commenting on his attack on Charmaz's version of grounded theory. This social structural past then conditions how much control he could retain over the intellectual legacy of grounded theory *as a collective product*. In this respect, he could not do this any more than he could control the minds of other authors involved in the collective enterprise.

We would suggest then that perhaps time-tripping, seen as a generic social process, may be a conceptual framework that might enable the operationalizing of Mead's perspective on memory. In doing so, it may also enable the further integration of important developments in memory studies. Glaser's authorship not only implies a reputational trajectory affected by changes in the social structural past; his author-ship as co-originator of grounded theory is also part of the implied objective past and so, as the method changed, he felt he absolutely had to comment. It was a per-sonal commitment because of the implied objective past. This implied objective past clearly fed forward throughout debates about grounded theory. Glaser and Strauss were co-originators. They had students like Charmaz, Corbin, and Stern who, in turn, also had implied objective pasts *as their students*. This put them into a posi-tion where they felt they had to say something as the method was seen to be erod-ing (Baker et al. 1992). The implied objective past is a central dimension of the authority of the second generation (Morse et al. 2021). We argue, following this, that time-tripping and these fundamental dimensions of the past and present are continu-ally at play in the field of research methodology. Time-tripping has ongoing structural consequences resulting in the formation of new alliances, relationships, and schools of thought. In grounded theory, it enabled the production of new programs, resis-tance movements, and counter critiques. It also enabled the ongoing revision of the method, sharpening its intellectual legacy (retro-casting) and promoting a continu-ally shifting landscape.

Time-tripping also involves power and positionality; a good example of power being mobilized in this respect is the charge of objectivism against grounded the-ory. Grounded theory has been charged with objectivism ever since Denzin and Lincoln's (1994) landscaping exercise at the beginning of their seminal text, *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. The landscaping exercise solidified some of Den-zin's (1988) earlier views on the grounded-theory approach. This charge has become an important symbolic point of criticism, incredibly productive and, at the same time, providing the grounds for many of the subsequent innovations in grounded

theory. Many of those engaging in memory entrepreneurship in grounded theory were funded and located in the academy, with all of the institutional advantages this brought. Strauss and Corbin (1990) continued to develop their approach to grounded theory inside the academy. Likewise, Charmaz had a long career as an important academic in her own right. Glaser, on the other hand, committed to building a school of thought, classical grounded theory, largely located and personally funded outside of the academy. Each of these schools of thought had very different organizational processes, resources, and methods of evaluation. In some ways, the schism was an ending; it was the ending of the method as a singular thing, enabling the splitting of grounded theory into different varieties (Bryant 2019), many of which were supported by the publishing house at Sage Ltd.

CONCLUSION

As a grounded theory of grounded theory, time-tripping is the generic social process through which authors' interactions with individual and collective memory can lead to remembering and forgetting in scientific methods. A consequence of this social process is how scientific alliances are built, how generations are formed, and how association develops within scientific communities. We would argue, though, that this generic social process might indeed be seen across multiple social contexts in scientific communities, disciplines, and generations. More work is needed to develop the emerging theory of the study of memory and forgetting in science. Further work could look at how this process operates across disciplinary boundaries and in different scientific contexts and communities. Nonetheless, it does seem to provide some promise for studying the social processes behind scientific memory-making and forgetting.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

NOTE

1. The ending remains provisional since the participants in these debates were fully active and in the room until only relatively recently. Barney Glaser died on the 20th of November 2022 and Kathy Charmaz died on the 27th of July 2020. Many participants in these debates have warm personal memories of working with both of these important thinkers.

REFERENCES

Adams, Tracey T. and Jill A. Edy. 2021. "How the Past Becomes the Past: The Temporal Positioning of Collective Memory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 72(5):1415–1429.

Annells, Merilyn. 1996. "Grounded Theory Method: Philosophical Perspectives, Paradigm of Inquiry, and Postmodernism." *Qualitative Health Research* 6(3):379–393.

Annells, Merilyn. 1997. "Grounded Theory Method, Part I: Within the Five Moments of Qualitative Research." *Nursing Inquiry* 4(2):120–129.

Baker, Cynthia, Judith Wuest, and Phyllis Noerager Stern. 1992. "Method Slurring: The Grounded Theory/Phenomenology Example." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 17:1355–1360.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bryant, Antony. 2002. "Re-Grounding Grounded Theory." *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application* 4(1):25–42.

Bryant, Antony. 2003. "A Constructive/Ist Response to Glaser." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 4(1):15. Retrieved March 24, 2025 (https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/757).

Bryant, Antony. 2019. *The Varieties of Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Bryant, Antony and Charmaz Kathy. 2007. "Grounded Theory in Historical Perspective: An Epistemological Account." Pp. 31–57 in *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2000. "Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods." Pp. 509–535 in *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed., edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2008. "Constructionism and the Grounded Theory Method." Pp. 397–412 in *Handbook of Constructionist Research*, edited by J. Holdstein and J. F. Gubrium. New York: The Guilford Press.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2009. "Shifting the Grounds: Constructivist Grounded Theory Methods." Pp. 129–193 in *Developing Grounded Theory: The Second Generation*, edited by J. M. Morse, J. Corbin, B. J. Bowers, K. Charmaz, A. E. Clarke, and P. N. Stern. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Clarke, Adele. 2003. "Situational Analyses: Grounded Theory Mapping after the Postmodern Turn." *Symbolic Interaction* 26(4):553–576.

Clarke, Adele. 2005. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clarke, Adele and Carrie Friese. 2007. "Grounded Theorizing Using Situational Analysis." Pp. 363–397 in *The Handbook of Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Conway, Brian. 2010. "New Directions in the Sociology of Collective Memory and Commemoration." *Sociology Compass* 4(7):442–453.

Denzin, Norman K. 1988. "Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists." *Contemporary Sociology* 17(3):430–432.

Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. "Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research." Pp. 1–17 in *The Lanscape of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. London: Sage.

Donaghey Jim 2016 "Punk and Anarchism: UK, Poland, Indonesia." PhD thesis, Loughborough University.

Ekins, Richard and Robert Porter. 2023. *The Politics of Authenticating: Revisiting New Orleans Jazz*. London: Lexington Books.

Foroughi, Hamid, Diego M. Coraiola, Jukka Rintamäki, Sebastien Mena, and William M. Foster. 2020. "Organizational Memory Studies." *Organization Studies* 41(12):1725–1748.

Gibson, Barry J. 2007. "Accommodating Critical Theory." Pp. 436–453 in *The Handbook of Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Gibson, Barry J. and Jan Hartman. 2013. *Rediscovering Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Glaser, Barney G. 1978. *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 1992. *Emergence v's Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 2001. The Grounded Theory Perspective: Conceptualization Contrasted with Description. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 2002. "Constructivist Grounded Theory?" *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 3(3). Retrieved February 14, 2025 (https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/825).

Glaser, Barney G. 2005. *The Grounded Theory Perspective III: Theoretical Coding*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 2009. *Jargonizing: Using the Grounded Theory Vocabulary*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 2019. "Grounded Description: No No." Pp. 441–445 in *The Sage Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Glaser, Barney G. and Judith Holton. 2004. "Remodeling Grounded Theory." *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 5(2). Retrieved February 12, 2025 (https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/607).

Glaser, Barney G. and Anslem Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Hadley, Gregory. 2019. "Critical Grounded Theory." Pp. 564–592 in *The Sage Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage Publication.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1950. *Collective Memory*. London: Harper Colophon Books.

Harrison, Neil. 2003. "Grounded Theory or Grounded Data? The Production of Power and Knowledge in Ethnographic Research." *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* 32:101–106.

Holton, Judith A. 2008. "Grounded Theory as a General Research Methodology." *The Grounded Theory Review* 7(2):67–93.

Holton, Judith A. 2019. "Teaching and Learning Grounded Theory Methodology: The Seminar Approach." Pp. 415–440 in *The Sage Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage Publications.

Holton, Judith A. and Isabelle Walsh. 2016. *Classic Grounded Theory: Applications with Qualitative and Quantitative Data*. London: Sage Publications.

Jacobsen, Trond, Ricardo L. Punzalan, and Margaret L. Hedstrom. 2013. "Invoking 'Collective Memory': Mapping the Emergence of a Concept in Archival Science." *Archival Science* 13:217–251.

Jansen, Robert S. 2007. "Resurrection and Appropriation: Reputational Trajectories, Memory Work, and the Political Use of Historical Figures." *American Journal of Sociology* 112(4):953–1007.

Kartiel, Tamar. 1999. "The Past in Israeli Pioneering Museums." Pp. 99–135 in *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*, edited by D. Ben-Amos and L. Weissberg. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Kenny, Meabh and Robert Fourie. 2014. "Tracing the History of Grounded Theory Methodology: From Formation to Fragmentation." *Qualitative Report* 19(52):1–9.

Low, Jacqueline and Caitlin Hyslop-Margison. 2021. "Kathy Charmaz: Theory, Method, and Scholarly Identity." *Symbolic Interaction* 44(3):632–664.

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past Is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maines, David R., Noreen M. Sugrue, and Michael A. Katovich. 1983. "The Sociological Import of GH Mead's Theory of the Past." *American Sociological Review* 48(2):161–173.

Mead, George H. 1929. "The Nature of the Past." in *Essays in Honor of John Dewey on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Mead, George H. 1932. *The Philosophy of the Present*. Indiana, USA.: Open Court Publishing Company.

Misztal, Barbara A. 2003. *Theories of Social Remembering*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Misztal, Barbara A. 2010. "Narrative's Reliance on Memory: The Case for an Interdisciplinary Exchange between Memory and Narrative Studies." *Life Writing* 7(1):85–97.

Morse, Janice M., Juliet Corbin, Barbara L. Bowers, Kathy Charmaz, Adele L. Clarke, and Phyllis Noerager Stern. 2021. *Developing Grounded Theory: The Second Generation Revisited*. New York: Routledge.

Nathaniel, Alvia and Tom Andrews. 2010. "The Modifiability of Grounded Theory." *Grounded Theory Review* 9(1):65–78.

Nathaniel, Alvita. 2012. "An Integrated Philosophical Framework that Fits Grounded Theory." Pp. 187–200 in *Grounded Theory: The Philosophy, Method, and Work of Barney Glaser*, edited by V. Martin and A. Gynnild. Boca Raton, FL: Brown Walker Press.

Olick, Jeffrey K. and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1):105–140.

Prus, Robert. 1996. *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research: Intersubjectivity and the Study of Human Lived Experience*. New York: State University of New York.

Prus, Robert. 2010. "Ethnographic Comparisons, Complexities and Conceptualities: Generic Social Processes and the Pragmatic Accomplishment of Group Life." *Comparative Sociology* 9(4):496–527.

Riessman, Catherine K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schatzman, Leonard. 1991. "Dimensional Analysis: Notes on an Alternative Approach to the Grounding of Theory in Qualitative Research." Pp. 303–314 in *Social Organization and Social Process: Essays in Honor of Anselm Strauss*, edited by D. Maines. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Simmel, Georg. 1971. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simmons, Odis E. 2022. *Experiencing Grounded Theory: A Comprehensive Guide to Learning, Doing, Mentoring, Teaching, and Applying Grounded Theory*. Irvine: Brown Walker Press.

Stewart, Jan. 2007. "Grounded Theory and Focus Groups: Reconciling Methodologies in Indigenous Australian Education Research." *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* 36:32–37.

Strauss, Anslem. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, Anslem. 1993. *Continual Permutations of Action*. New York: Aldine De Cruyter.

Strauss, Anslem and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. California: Sage Publications.

Strauss, Anslem and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Strübing, Joerg. 2007. "Research as Pragmatic Problem-Solving: The Pragmatist Roots of Empirically-Grounded Theorizing." Pp. 580–602 in *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Strübing, Joerg. 2019. "The Pragmatism of Anselm L. Strauss: Linking Theory and Method." Pp. 51–67 in *The Sage Handbook of Current Developments in Grounded Theory*, edited by A. Bryant and K. Charmaz. London: Sage.

Warnock, Mary. 1987. *Memory*. London: Faber & Faber.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTOR(S)

Barry John Gibson is a Medical Sociologist working at the School of Clinical Dentistry at the University of Sheffield. He studied sociology at the University of Ulster in the early 1990s, where he received a 1st Class Honors Degree in Sociology. He then went on to study at the Queen's University of Belfast School of Clinical Dentistry, where he received a Master's in Medical Science Degree in Pediatric and Preventive Dentistry in 1992 and a PhD in 1997. Since then, he has worked at King's College London and Sheffield. His expertise covers grounded theory, systems theory, and the sociology of health and illness.

Robert Porter teaches at Ulster University and is the author of a number of books. These include: *The University in Crumbs* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2023) co-authored with K.A. Porter and I. Mackenzie; *Meanderings Through the Politics of Everyday Life* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2018); *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism* (EUP, 2013) co-edited with B. Dillet and I. Mackenzie; *Dramatizing the Political* (Palgrave, 2011) co-authored with I. Mackenzie; *Deleuze and Guattari: Aesthetics and Politics* (University of Wales Press, 2009); and *Ideology: Contemporary Social, Political and Cultural Theory* (University of Wales Press, 2009).

Richard Ekins, after studying at the University of Texas at Austin and the University of Chicago, completed his doctorate on G.H. Mead and the sociology of knowledge at the University of London in 1978. A sociologist, psychoanalyst, and musicologist, Ekins has been Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Cultural Studies at Ulster University, UK, since 2009. He recently published with Robert Porter, *The Politics of Authenticating: Revisiting New Orleans Jazz*, Lexington, 2023, and is currently working on its companion volume, *Psychoanalysis and the Politics of Authenticating*, also with Robert Porter.