NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

Grounded Methodology: Recent Trends and Approaches

Mahendra Sapkota, PhD
Central Department of Rural Development
Tribhuvan University, Nepal
sapkota.mahendra27@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7854-6554

Received: January 15, 2025 Revised & Accepted: March 15, 2025

Abstract

Grounded Theory (GT) has evolved significantly since its introduction in the 1960s by Glaser and Strauss, adapting to modern-day needs and implications in qualitative research. In this context, this paper follows a systematic review method and offers a critical approach. Grounded Theory was initially conceived to develop theories from empirical data, but these days, it includes heavily hybrid perspectives that add capabilities for interpretive praxis. In addition, processing large datasets with digital technologies has improved the complexity of analyzing data, which has a greater scope to capture and theorize within grounded methodology. The paper also discusses these evolutions and emphasizes that Grounded Theory has become diverse in both theory and practice, which calls for discovering and employing different tools and strategies. The paper concludes that a critical research gap exists in allowing truly universal, evidence-based theoretical models of grounded methods that can contribute to advanced social sciences research.

Keywords: Grounded Theory, research, big changes, mixed methods, digital tools, data analysis

Introduction

Research methodology is not a static notion but rather an evolving approach that adapts to various ontological and epistemological standpoints as well as empirical contexts. Among the numerous methodologies, Grounded Theory (GT) has emerged as a dominant paradigm in social science research, particularly in qualitative studies. Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss postulated this approach in the 1960s, setting a research paradigm benchmark. Since then, it has grown from a simple tool for analysis into a method of performing detailed, quality

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

research. Originally, GT was designed to bridge the gap between theoretical ideas and real-world proof. GT helps build theories through careful data collection and examination (Makri & Neely, 2021). It emphasizes a cycle of working with data, where data collection, analysis, and theory creation go hand in hand. That way, theories are genuinely based on concrete data. The current paper will present the numerous refinements that have made GT more widely applicable and appropriate in various disciplines.

One of the core strengths of GT is its flexibility in being applied in a varied range of research settings. This has made it acceptable to be used in the social sciences, a discipline committed to studying the behaviour of people and systems. However, in practice, GT is not linear; it is recursive and cyclical. It comprises a never-ending comparative strategy, consensual coding system and orthodox memoing. By doing this, the multifaceted realities could be investigated with a systematic yet flexible framework that studies through studying the local context (Charmaz & Thornberg, 2021). These approaches have been developed in different contexts, including the research question and the field setting. They also align with the technical change and the methods that are used in various fields of study. This greatly increases the depth of analysis and effectiveness of the procedure as grounded within the methodology. All these advancements have greatly enhanced the possibilities of GT to theorize the research findings and real-life human relationships and experiences in a realistic and enriching manner.

Technological advancement and new software applications have immensely impacted what is commonly referred to as the 'GT' methodological approach. These improvements have made this theory easier to handle, as mentioned earlier, and have significantly enhanced its practicality in social science research. The new tech has made it easier to work with data, streamlining the research process. This paper will elaborate on how new tools have improved GT, making it possible to develop more robust and efficient research theories in the future. However, challenges and dilemmas still prevail in practice. In this context, the paper analyzes theoretical issues and empirical dilemmas of the GT, providing a comprehensive understanding of its evolution and application.

Methodology

This paper, through a systematic review, delves into the latest methodological advancements in GT, a topic of significant relevance to scholars and researchers in social sciences and qualitative research methodologies. It meticulously analyzes literature publications in recognized scholarly journals that have reported their research over the last ten years. A systematic search strategy was created across a broad set of academic databases (JSTOR, PubMed, Google Scholar) to ensure the inclusion of the most extensive range of scholarly literature. This strategic approach, focusing on critical keywords (grounded theory, methodological innovation, qualitative analysis technology), aims to extract articles that reflect the progress in the methodological development of GT research. The result is a curated set of best papers that not only track the evolving ways of doing GT but also offer more significant contours for conceptual or theoretical meanings in published work.

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

Following this, each scientific reading was subjected to an extensive revision. To choose entries, we focused criteria on the importance and significance of an article in developing GT methodologies. Three primary components were analyzed closely, including adopting emerging analytical technologies, their application in data analysis, and new theoretical paradigms. A synthesis that was able to extract these data from the articles was expected to inform about what GT researchers were doing and begin to answer presumably relevant emergent questions for a two-decade period. This systematic methodological approach was designed to ensure the review would provide a rich understanding of how recent developments shape GT methodology and findings within social science research qualities.

The systematic review significantly contributes to the advancement of GT as a constantly evolving research methodology in response to new challenges of contemporary research practice. GT has constantly evolved by integrating emergent technologies, theoretical knowledge, and resourceful guidance to study complex social phenomena. It also entails that the transformation holds baseline flexibility as to its method – as its power to generate rigorous and empirically humane knowledge speaks for this generation's continued relevancy. The analysis seeks to further the ongoing, more considerable academic discussion by identifying ways grounded theorizing can develop and improve its methodological practices, ranging from recommendations for critical applications to continued efforts at increasing relevance within contemporary social scientific research.

Critical Review

The increasing use of mixed methods within GT signifies a significant shift in qualitative research methodologies. Recent conceptual debates suggest that integrating quantitative data into the qualitative GT framework can enrich our understanding of complex research phenomena (Charmaz, 2015; Cullen & Brennan, 2021; Morse, 2020). This methodological pluralism enhances the developed theories regarding evidential density and conceptual depth and enlightens researchers about recognizing multiple dimensions of social behaviours and their crossover nature. By employing these mixed methods, researchers are better equipped to develop rich, contextually grounded, empirically tested theories, enhancing the credibility and generalizability of their findings.

Promising developments in theoretical sensitivity have also turned GT the right way around. Previous literature highlights the need to enhance researchers' skills in recognizing and describing theoretical concepts originating from empirical information as an alternative to theoretical constructs through generality (Charmaz, 2014; White & Cooper, 2022). In this instance, greater sensitivity facilitates a more reflexive process of coding and theory development, thus preventing theoretical insights from running too far ahead of the evidence being collected and analyzed. These improvements and refinements not only make it possible for theorists to conduct an endless cycle of testing but also ensure that the quality and relevance of analyses are continually enhanced, fostering a sense of optimism and hope for the future of qualitative research.

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

Such tools are not widely utilized in the natural sciences, which underlines the fact that most of us learn to do GT research without leveraging current technological advancements. These tools improve the management of massive and sophisticated data sets, resulting in higher accuracy rates and better analytical procedures (Cunningham et al., 2017; Dawson, 2019). The provision of technological support positively impacts the efficiency of data management in performing well-grounded iterative methodological steps. Consequently, it ensures transparency between data collection and output, an essential step for this technique based upon iteratively analyzing transcripts. However, despite these successes, GT is not all praises. A significant concern is the inherently subjective nature of data interpretation and how this can confound with research biases. It may threaten the objectivity and originality of what GT intends to do or create (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Critics claim that the world views, paradigmatic stances, prior knowledge, and empirical insights of researchers can inappropriately determine how data is interpreted, ultimately distorting theoretical saturation (the point at which no new information or themes are being found in the data) and scientific conclusions.

This continuing controversy points to the requirement that GT approaches continuously reflect and revise their methodological approach to dealing with this problem. Therefore, GT has undeniably made substantial methodological advancements—scraping the disciplinary walls of mixed-methods integration, polishing theoretical sensitivity, and shining current technological tools—but is still riddled with issues requiring sustained inquiry and clarification (Charmaz, 2021). These developments and conversations reinforce the idea that GT is a moving feast in social science inquiry, requiring a scholarly research logic sufficient to cope with the vast diversity of this method.

Results and Discussion

This reinterpretation of the literature demonstrates that GT has maintained its relevance and adaptability in qualitative research, showcasing its flexibility and applicability. The methodological approach continuously evolves, driven by new methodologies and sophisticated technological artifacts (Themelis et al., 2023). These developments have broadened the basis and utility of GT. They have improved grounded methodology's richness, depth, and precision without compromising its essential elements, such as iterative analysis mechanisms and data saturation approach to inquiry formation. These developments also add to the conceptual development of GT as a rich foundation equipped for rising and adaptive qualitative research in general and social science study more broadly. The following section critically highlights the major changes and improvements in the GT approach.

Diverse worldviews and approaches of grounded methodology

GT methodology is a research framework with an interpretive philosophy. It allows for diverse approaches grounded in different epistemological perspectives. The GT was emerged as particular researcher methodology in the 1960s along with exciting research opportunities which then opened new possibilities for empiricist inquiry and theoretical development. This

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

evolution, crediting to pioneering work such as Glaser and Strauss (1967) bridging theory with empirical investigation, has led to a diverse and rich landscape of GT method across multiple disciplines. Every discipline is saturated with profound philosophical ideas that inform how researchers collect and interpret data. While following Glaser's traditional methodology, these new ideas are formed in an inductive process that relates to data directly — independent of previous thoughts of the world. As one variation of the GT example, the Straussian GT refers to a more structured analysis method that highlights the theoretical background needed to form a research strategy (Charmaz, 2006).

Constructivist approach proposed by Charmaz is a more recent development in the theory and practice of GT. This approach emphasizes the researcher's subjective relationship with data, fostering a collaborative knowledge production involving participants. The constructivist epistemology of GT informs this approach and gives us the certainty that this data will emerge through interpretative interaction and not be discovered as objective facts. This collaborative nature of the approach better enables understanding of social phenomena by acknowledging sociocultural conditions' impact on the research process and the subjects being researched (Charmaz, 2014, 2021). Secondly, Clarke's analysis of context is consistent with the GTM tradition. However, it extends it into a postmodern concern with complex social locations and how numerous influences constitute them, including non-human and discursive ones (Clarke, 2005, 2021). They could then study all behaviours at the individual and group levels about broader societal institutions, structures, and networks.

The classifications in GT as a methodological approach raise several philosophical questions, including ontological (the nature and boundaries of reality) and epistemological (how knowledge is produced). They include constructivist views that reality can be created and maintained by the interactions of human experiences or objectivism, where an entity exists independently of being perceived. Such diversity in approaches aligns with the preferences of each group and likely impacts their respective worldviews. The nature of the research questions they seek to theorize is invariably shaped by their philosophical leanings, paradigmatic choices, and disciplinary differences. Table 1 below lists the key discrepancies in all ground theory points of view:

Table 1: Approaches in Grounded Theory Methodology

Approach	Theorists	Philosophy	Focus of Research
Classical	Barney Glaser	Positivist/Objectivist	Data-driven theory generation, minimal preconceptions
Straussian	Anselm Strauss	Pragmatic	Detailed procedural guidance, iterative refinement
Constructivist	Kathy Charmaz	Constructivist	Interaction between researcher and subject, context-awareness
Situational Analysis	Adele Clarke	Postmodern	Complex social interactions, including non-human factors

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

However, the fit of the study context and type of study have advantages and limitations to each GT method. Researchers may be well positioned to utilize particular tools and approaches of GT optimally by orienting their methodological choices around study aims, epistemological position, and field conditions. As a result, they are willing to create hypotheses that are not only profound and discerning but also well-situated and closely capture the truth downstream (Cullen & Brennan, 2021; Themelis et al., 2023; White & Cooper, 2022). Such strategic implication allows scholars to leverage methodological benefits of GT benefits, thereby supporting a process with strength and grounding in making theoretical contributions through significant empirical work.

Expanding Scope through Methodological Innovations

The empowerment that GT brings to researchers is evident in the many methodological developments it has allowed to be applied. This empowerment has become a valuable advancement in a diverse study context. Mixed-methods techniques have been critical, with quantitative data supporting or extending the findings, verifying their conclusions, and offering more generalizable information (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This flexible approach is beneficial for detailed case-type phenomena with their webs of factors in interplay and allows a deeper understanding of basic patterns and crucial processes (Clarke, 2021; Maxwell, 2012). The importance of GT in understanding digital behaviors cannot be overstated. Its adaptability to online and virtual contexts has significantly added to its appeal as a relevant approach in the digital age. This adaptability has unlocked the new world of online observational data and virtual focus groups, making it convenient for researchers to understand digital behaviours and interactions in a manner that was previously unexplored (Hargittai, 2015). The developments in methodology suggest that GT continues to be a necessary and timely methodological tool, particularly as the world moves online into big data and undergoes its digital divide in the pursuit of information communication and technology (ICT).

Enhancing Rigor and Depth with Technological Tools

The application of GT has evolved in recent years, mainly due to the advent and popularisation of qualitative data analysis software (QDAS). Tools like NVivo and ATLAS, with their high data coding, organization, and analysis features, allow us to work with big datasets with reasonable efficiency and effectiveness (Woods et al., 2016). These technologies not only help in analyzing data comprehensively and systematically but also enable visible coding approaches, ensuring the transparency and credibility of the research process and findings.

Using software tools is not just a convenience, but a necessity to maintain the purity of the iterative process, a crucial aspect for GT. New data almost always means new ideas for what to measure. To supplement with Robust Programming and data (Cunningham et al., 2017), gathering all the information possible and analyzing it is made more efficient by software tools currently in use. The designer can rapidly switch and reorder data columns to ensure the emerging theory is grounded in a constantly evolving dataset. This reassures the reliability of the research process and the credibility of the emerging theories.

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

Maintaining Foundational Principles amidst Evolution

Despite the ever-changing landscape of technology and methodology, the fundamental principles of GT have stood the test of time. The iterative process of data collection and theory-building, a hallmark of GT, remains steadfast. This unwavering commitment to the core tenets of GT ensures that the resulting theories are firmly grounded in empirical data, employing a methodology that seeks to develop rich and contextually situated theories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Makri & Neely, 2021). The use of GT fosters a deep connection with the data as it circulates, spiralling and revolving. In essence, it's about investing focused time in digesting raw data until we either achieve a satisfactory synthesis or exhaust our ideas, whichever comes first.

This blend of tradition and innovation is a recurring theme in contemporary academic literature, underscoring the importance of being theoretically sensitive and reflexive. GT research, while making significant methodological progress over time (Charmaz, 2014), continues to challenge researchers to be open to data insights and committed to a responsive, adaptable, and rigorous theory formation process. This adaptability, coupled with a firm grounding in empirical facts, enhances the method's legitimacy and relevance in the field of qualitative research.

Navigating Challenges and Debates

The development of a GT faces various challenges. There is also a fear that the data explosion and numerous sophisticated analytical tools currently available in every lab may escalate complexity, leading to duplication and overloading investigators. Trying to explain this multi-layered phenomenon has meant that researchers have had to deal with massive amounts of data and use complicated technologies that may sometimes distract from the focus (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). In addition, this over-reliance on technology tools may come with its own set of problems as such instruments risk getting in the way of many GT method's essential relationship to data, which is the direct and unmediated interaction with the research subject matter, thereby creating a divide between researchers and their burgeoning datasets.

Hence, the personal perception of data and the chance for researcher bias are still vital obstacles to traverse based on how to follow up from this point in time. The interpretative approach of GT, which is beneficial for obtaining profound insights simultaneously, makes it vulnerable to the questionability of its objectivity and verifiability (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Consequently, confronting these challenges entails a sustained dedication to the methodological rigour and transparency of GT research for it to both retain credibility—i.e. that which can be believed—and dependability—that upon whose results one might safely rely. Emerging trends and methodological advancements emphasize the need for GT practitioners to contend with epistemic choices in a scientific evaluation of methodologies, perspectives, ethics, and their influence on research results.

Ontological and Epistemological Critique

From the start, GT has been scrutinized by ontological and epistemological critics who have shed light on many difficulties and oddities that arise when applied in differing academic disciplines or research paradigms. Ontologically, GT has been criticized for its realist

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

underpinnings that knowable reality is revealed by participants' perceptions and experiences within empirical data through a qualitative engagement. Critics maintain that this view fails to recognize the existence of what is possibly a multifaceted, agentive, and constructed reality (Charmaz, 2006; Clarke, 2021; Corbin, 2017; Ramalho et al., 2015; Suddaby, 2006; Themelis et al., 2023). Moreover, epistemologically GT is on the positivist side of things in that it relates to science as finding knowledge through rigorous, systematic data analysis. This is a methodologically deterministic idea contested by constructivist scholars. In addition, constructivists maintain that data are not discovered but constructed by researchers who collaboratively derive meaning from dialogue with their subjects (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Morse, 2020; White & Cooper, 2022).

The varied form and multifaceted implications of GT are also evidenced in its methodological variants, specifically the differences between Glaser's objectivist GT (brought into primary positions through a classical approach) contrasting with Charmaz's constructivism grounding principle for innovation methodology. Glaser conceptualizes theory testing and deductive-path paradigm building as the essence of his method. At the same time, Charmaz emphasizes how she sees participants meaningfully engaged in research processes that help to construct their experiences with researchers collectively. This new way of thinking suggests a less controlled view of seeing knowledge and approves of a more interactive incursion in the role of researchers (Burns et al., 2022; Charmaz, 2014; Ramalho et al., 2015). Such differences highlight its ability to be adapted epistemologically, meaning it can fit with different research aims and contexts -- thus suggesting GT is more generalizable across fields and paradigms.

The strong recovery of the methodological adaptations from the ontological and epistemological threats leaves much confidence in the studies employing GT method with the option of refining the method despite the shortcomings. As a result of the conflict of theories, the stance has become markedly more self-reflective: researchers remain fully mindful of their theoretical frame of reference and how this chimes with their practice. Such awareness has promoted a series of more robust data collection methods, including member checks, cross-checking or triangulation, and reflexive journaling. Such changes address criticisms and strengthen the methodological approach of GT research, with evidence of its capacity for evolving within current debates in academics and the ability to provide a rich understanding of the various realities of the socio-political world.

Theoretical and Empirical Critiques

From the start, GT has been scrutinized by ontological and epistemological critics who have shed light on many difficulties and oddities that arise when applied in differing academic disciplines or research paradigms. Ontologically, GT has been criticized for its realist underpinnings that knowable reality is revealed by participants' perceptions and experiences within empirical data through a qualitative engagement. Detractors counter that this view fails to recognize the existence of what is possibly a multifaceted, agentive and constructed reality (Charmaz 2006; Clarke 2005; Seale, 1999; Themelis et al., 2023). Moreover, epistemologically GT is on the positivist side of things in that it relates to science as finding knowledge through

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

rigorous, systematic data analysis. This is a methodologically deterministic idea contested by constructivist scholars. In addition, the constructivists maintain that data are not discovered but constructed by researchers who collaboratively derive meaning from dialogue with their subjects (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Cullen & Brennan, 2021; White & Cooper 2022).

The varied form and multifaceted implications of GT are also evidenced in its methodological variants, specifically the differences between Glaser's objectivist GT (brought into primary positions through a classical approach) contrasting with Charmaz's constructivism grounding principle for innovation methodology. Glaser conceptualizes theory testing and deductive-path paradigm building as the essence of his method. At the same time, Charmaz emphasizes how she sees participants meaningfully engaged in research processes that help to construct their experiences with researchers collectively. This new way of thinking suggests a less controlled view of seeing knowledge and approves of a more interactive incursion in the role of researchers (Burns et al., 2022; Charmaz, 2014; Suddaby, 2006). Such differences highlight its ability to be adapted epistemologically, meaning it can fit with different research aims and contexts -- thus suggesting GT is more generalizable across fields and paradigms.

Moreover, the ontological and epistemological concerns have created multiple forms of perceiving and performing GT method. This discord has resulted in the emergence of more self-reflective researchers to ensure they are alert to the theory they make and its correlation to the actual research being carried out. Consequently, researchers have implemented more rigorous methods to ensure qualitative research is valid and trustworthy (e.g., member checks or triangulation) and reflexive journaling (Corbin, 2017; Corbin & Strauss, 2015). The following changes address criticism and improve the methodological rigidity of GT research, demonstrate GT's ability to adapt in light of current academic debates, and offer profound analysis of intricate social realities.

Conclusion

As an emergent method, GT plays a crucial role in addressing the complexities of modern qualitative inquiry. The evolution of forums of development and technological addition has extended the application of GT and enhanced its analysis. Its continued growth reinforces a core prerogative, namely the formulation of testable hypotheses on an empirical basis at scales of great relevance to its target subject areas. However, to maintain its utility and applicability, the methodology must continue to evolve, particularly in response to the increasing complexities of modern research. This adaptability is a vital strength of the GT, ensuring its relevance for future research endeavours.

GT, a vital part of qualitative research methodologies, is well-suited to today's scientific investigations due to its need for the collection of various records. The direction forward will be best advised by building on technological developments and improving approaches to reduce bias. This is a necessary step to ensure the sustained applicability of GT as a methodological framework for ideal-type theory building from research data. The evolution of

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

the approach reflects that it remains both adaptive and reflexive when confronted with constant changes in opportunities to develop interdisciplinary research and challenges.

References

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

Burns, M., Bally, J., Burles, M., Holtslander, L., & Peacock, S. (2022). Constructivist grounded theory or interpretive phenomenology? Methodological choices within specific study contexts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *21*, 16094069221077758. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221077758

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed). Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2015). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (3rd ed., pp. 53-84). Sage Publications. http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Charmaz_1996.pdf

Charmaz, K. (2021). The genesis, grounds, and growth of constructivist grounded theory. In J. M. Morse, B. J. Bowers, K. Charmaz, A. E. Clarke, J. Corbin, C. J. Porr, & P. Noerager Stern (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory* (2nd ed., pp. 153-187). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315169170

Charmaz, K., & Thornberg, R. (2021). The pursuit of quality in grounded theory. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *18*(3), 305-327. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1780357

Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Sage Publications.

Clarke, A. E. (2021). From grounded theory to situational analysis: What's new? Why? How? In J. M. Morse, B. J. Bowers, K. Charmaz, A. E. Clarke, J. Corbin, C. J. Porr, & P. Noerager Stern (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory* (2nd ed., pp. 223-266). Routledge.

Corbin, J. (2017). Grounded theory. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 301–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262614

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Cullen, M. M., & Brennan, N. M. (2021). Grounded theory: Description, divergences and application. *Accounting, Finance & Governance Review*, *27*. https://doi.org/10.52399/001c.22173

NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2025 Pages: 129-139
ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/nprcjmr.v2i3.76965

Cunningham, J. A., Menter, M., & Young, C. (2017). A review of qualitative case methods trends and themes used in technology transfer research. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *42*, 923-956. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-016-9491-6

Dawson, C. (2019). *AZ of digital research methods*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351044677

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

Hargittai, E. (2015). Is Bigger Always Better? Potential Biases of Big Data Derived from Social Network Sites. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 63-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716215570866

Makri, C., & Neely, A. (2021). Grounded theory: A guide for exploratory studies in management research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *20*, 16094069211013654. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211013654

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Morse, J. (2020). The Changing Face of Qualitative Inquiry. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 19. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920909938

Ramalho, R., Adams, P., Huggard, P., & Hoare, K. (2015). Literature Review and Constructivist Grounded Theory Methodology. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *16*(3). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-16.3.2313

Seale, C. (1999). *The Quality of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications.

Suddaby, R. (2006). From the Editors: What Grounded Theory is Not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 633-642. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083020

Themelis, C., Sime, J. A., & Thornberg, R. (2023). Informed grounded theory: A symbiosis of philosophy, methodology, and art. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *67*(7), 1086-1099. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2022.2115135

White, R. E., & Cooper, K. (2022). Grounded theory. In *Qualitative research in the post-modern era: Critical approaches and selected methodologies* (pp. 339-385). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85124-8_9

Woods, M., Paulus, T., Atkins, D. P., & Macklin, R. (2016). Advancing Qualitative Research Using Qualitative Data Analysis Software (QDAS)? Reviewing Potential vs. Practice in Published Studies using ATLAS.ti and NVivo, 1994-2013. *Social Science Computer Review*, 34(5), 597-617. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439315596311