

The Grounded Theory in geography: A possible way towards empiricism and theory construction after the Cultural Turn

Geiselhart, Klaus; Park, Martina; Schlatter, Fabian; Orłowski, Benedikt

Postprint / Postprint

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Geiselhart, K., Park, M., Schlatter, F., & Orłowski, B. (2012). The Grounded Theory in geography: A possible way towards empiricism and theory construction after the Cultural Turn. *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde*, 86(1), 83–95. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-67511-2>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/1.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/1.0>

The Grounded Theory in geography

A possible way towards empiricism and theory construction after the Cultural Turn

This is a translation of the original article:

Geiselhart, Klaus; Park, Martina; Schlatter, Fabian und Benedikt Orłowski (2012): Die Grounded Theory in der Geographie. *Ein möglicher Weg zu Empirie und Theoriebildung nach dem Cultural Turn*. In: *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 86 (1), 83–95.

Please note: German quotations have also been translated. This means that some quotations that originate in English but has been cited in their german translation may differ from the original sources.

[page 83]

Abstract

Apparently, epistemological realism has been largely overcome in the course of the cultural turn. Yet the essential problem of dualism between theory and practice remains. Grounded Theory research directly aims at this problem. Nevertheless, this research style has not yet been incorporated substantially into the academic field of Human Geography, although it is more popular in other social sciences. Especially for Geography which is a deeply empirical discipline there is a necessity for reflected and integrated methodologies. In this article we will outline the basic concepts of Grounded Theory Methodology. Based on these outlines we will point out some problems researchers might face, but also show benefits and implications. We argue that the Grounded Theory Methodology can be one important way of bridging the gap between theory and practice and that it can give an additional value to geographic research after the Cultural Turn.

1. Introduction

Geographical research was and is a profoundly empirical discipline. Researchers go out in the field and observe. But how can they observe without projecting their academic education into what they observe? The scientific theoretical discussion of the 1980s identified herein one of the biggest problems of geography. As HARD wrote: "The art of the geographer was to intuitively grid the world correctly, and to do so in such a way that his everyday geographical description scheme made the everyday actions of strangers easily understandable to his own people. In this way, the everyday world of the people described disappeared without a trace in the everyday world of the descriptive geographer" (HARD 1985, 17).

Although pure epistemological realism seems to have been largely abandoned in the course of the cultural turn, the problem of the dualism of theory and praxis still remains. The epistemological consequences of the ensuing and ongoing theoretical debates, for example on the "relationship **[page 84]** between everyday life, science and geography" (cf. LIPPUNER 2005, 11-28), have

increasingly allowed a truth-relativist paradigm to penetrate human geography. However, this increased the problem of access to empirical reality outside of what can clearly be regarded as second-order observations. This development henceforth blocked direct access to the world via self-observing and thus "constructive" empirics. Qualities previously invoked as strengths, such as "scientific background", "power of observation" or "experience" (cf. VON RICHTHOFEN 1983 [1886], 9) are suspected of being relics of a positivist scientific system, and the geographers who represent them are suspected of not being aware of the contingency of truths and thus the relativity of their own findings.

The awareness of the problem of access to the empirical world, and the desire for possible answers, is expressed in all sub-disciplines of human geography. For example, at the conference New Cultural Geography in Erlangen in January 2011, the problem of the connection between theory and empiricism was discussed and the question asked how regional research after the cultural turn (so the exact title of the conference) could be conducted. As a possible way to deal with this rupture, we see the Grounded Theory approach developed by GLASER, STRAUSS and CORBIN. As a pragmatic research style it is based on consistent truth relativism. With this article we aim to explain the basic features of Grounded Theory and to address its epistemological as well as its practical research problems, but also its implications, strengths and opportunities for geography.

2. The main principles of grounded theory

2.1 Empirical data as a basis for theory formation

The basic idea of investigations with the Grounded Theory is that, in contrast to hypothetico-deductive approaches, they do not investigate phenomena in the light of pre-formulated initial hypotheses (KELLE 2007, 33). Instead, the focus is on the empirical data as such, from which a *grounded theory*¹, which means a "theory founded in empirical data" (STRÜBING 2008, 13), is to be derived in a reflective process using systematic techniques and analytical techniques. "Data" can include all conceivable sources of information, such as transcripts of narrative interviews, notes of participating observations, but also visual and audio media such as sound files, drawings or photographs (CORBIN and STRAUSS 2008, 27). In addition, theoretical works, journalistic reports or artistic products can also be regarded as data material. Focusing on the [page 85] data enables us to describe and understand various aspects of an empirical field and their reciprocal relationships, while also methodically reflecting and overcoming one's own prejudices and biases. Ideally, empirical data should reveal "discoveries" that were previously unknown to the researcher or other outsiders (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 33). In order to develop theories from this perspective, Grounded Theory provides a comprehensive concept for data analysis, which is embedded in the framework of a circular research process. In its circularity, the entire research process is characterized by the basic principles of openness and the method of permanent comparison (see, for example, TRUSCHKAT et al. 2005). Grounded Theory is not to be seen purely as an understanding procedure in the sense of hermeneutics, because it does not pose the philosophical question of what could be a *priori truth* or pre-conception underlying an

1 JÖRG STRÜBING regrets the ambiguity of the word combination "grounded theory", which in his opinion leads to misunderstandings, above all because it "elevates the central quality of the theories to be developed making it the name for the procedure itself" (STRÜBING, 2008, 13). For the sake of precision one must therefore speak of "a research style for developing theories based on empirical data" (ibid., 14). Strübing himself, however, is of the opinion that this is "a little cumbersome" (ibid.). In this paper, we refer to the results of the procedure according to the Grounded Theory as grounded theories.

understanding mind. Grounded Theory deliberately abstains from such questions and sees the results of its work as syntheses of its influences, observations and its theoretical path dependency in all its contingency.

2.2 Heureka! - a systematic approach to a sudden flash of inspiration

At the beginning of a research process with Grounded Theory there is a very open and broad question, which certainly should not be so extensive that "it includes the whole universe of possibilities" (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 23), but nevertheless the probability of "discoveries and new insights" (ibid.) should be maximized. A particular phenomenon should only be identified in a later stage of research with the help of reflective data analysis, which will then turn into the core topic of research.

The initial selection of cases, i.e. of research subjects or situations, has "explorative character" (TRUSCHKAT et al. 2005). In contrast to strictly theory-based research, the researcher's existing knowledge should be kept in the background at the beginning of the study. Even (expert) literature initially serves more as an incentive for research and for further developing the ability to assign significance to the data collected through empirical work. Instead of rushing into existing patterns of explanation due to existing specialist knowledge, the researcher should free himself or herself from "judgement bias" (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 27) and pay attention to contradictions between empirical findings and existing theories. STRAUSS and CORBIN demand nothing less than to balance an intuitive approach with constant reflection: A "balance between creativity and science" (ibid., 27) is to be established, a creative and open way of research must not contradict valid and reliable theories, but it should consciously try to explore their limits. In principle, the aim is to validate existing theories and integrate them into new contexts; however, the results of an approach based on Grounded Theory can also lead to the rejection of existing theories.

For Grounded Theory, a high degree of openness and the demand for creativity is essential not just at the beginning of a study. TRUSCHKAT et al. (2005) explain **[page 86]** this by referring to the Grounded Theory founders' references to pragmatism and the associated abductive research logic. The term abduction used here goes back to CHARLES SANDERS PEIRCE and, according to REICHERTZ (1999), is "a mental process, a mental act, a mental leap that brings together what was never thought to belong together" (ibid.: 54). If an initially unexplainable thing is discovered within the investigation (the available knowledge of the researcher(s) does not offer a suitable concept), new conclusions can be drawn through creative inference. In a way, abduction, as described by PEIRCE, is the formalization of a flash of inspiration in science: "Abduction is the process of forming an explanatory hypothesis. It is the only logical operation which introduces any new idea. Deduction proves that something *must* be; Induction shows that something *actually* is operative; Abduction merely suggests that something *may* be" (PEIRCE 1960, 106 [CP 5.171, emphasis in original]).

Accordingly, abduction cannot be understood as an alternative procedure to deductive or inductive closure, because induction and deduction can ultimately only ever take place after an abductive closure. Where there is no new idea, there cannot be a hypothesis and consequently no scientific verification. Even if abduction cannot be described as a formally logical conclusion and therefore does not belong to the classical methods of scientific reasoning, scientific work is impossible without it. As a conclusion to a possible solution, abduction creates hypotheses and is therefore the creative spark in science.

In our opinion, one of the strengths of Grounded Theory is its insight that such processes of idea development basically precede any research work and can therefore not be ignored. In order to take into account the importance of abduction in the research process, Grounded Theory not only asks how hypotheses can be reliably tested beyond the execution of classical inferences, but also how they come about in the first place. The focus is thus directed to the researcher, his or her motivation and attitude, as well as to the process of research itself. In this respect, Grounded Theory is also interested in the contribution of creativity to the development of relevant research questions: How does a new thought, the idea for a hypothesis, enter science? Where does the flash of inspiration come from that shows researchers where they should next turn their research efforts to?

The aim of explorative social science research is to discover opinions, experiences and ways of dealing with things that are not yet known in other contexts of life and therefore cannot be anticipated. For this purpose, it is necessary to be aware of the necessity of creative sparks in the form of abductions, and ideally even to generate them purposefully.²

2.3 Theoretical sensitivity - self-reflection as a research strategy

Grounded Theory's interest in the process of idea development and its motivation to make "discoveries" in empirical data is closely [page 87] related to the concept of "theoretical sensitivity". STRAUSS and CORBIN understand this as an "awareness of the subtleties in the meaning of data. [...] Theoretical sensitivity refers to the ability to have insights, to give meaning to data, to understand and to separate the important from the unimportant" (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 25). Although this understanding provided by STRAUSS and CORBIN could create the impression that theoretical sensitivity is a kind of "seventh sense", the term rather refers to individual pre-knowledge of the field of research as well as to the personal experience of the researcher(s) (ibid., 25 f). The "sense" for the selection and interpretation of the data, which is present from the beginning, should be consciously developed further in the course of the research and with the help of specific techniques. The aim is to gradually move away from description, to increase one's own analytical ability and thus to be able to select interesting cases for investigation and to meaningfully specify the initially open question (ibid., 56 f).

At this point a dilemma of Grounded Theory becomes apparent. On the one hand, findings should "emerge" from the data alone; on the other hand, it is ultimately always the researcher who knows how to name and link new concepts in the first place.³ KELLE (2007, 32 ff) calls this contradiction an "inductivist self-misunderstanding" of Grounded Theory (see also STRÜBING 2008, 50 ff). Dealing with this dilemma requires nothing less than the development of the researcher's personality, and Grounded Theory offers a number of techniques for this purpose (cf. STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 56 ff) which can be very helpful in developing one's capacity for self-reflection.

² See REICHERTZ (1999, 55 ff) for strategies to bring about targeted abduction.

³ KELLE (2007) criticizes STRAUSS and CORBIN's inaccurate depiction and tries to concretize the term: Theoretical sensitivity means "the availability of usable heuristic concepts that enable the identification of theoretically relevant phenomena in the data material" (ibid.: 38). Every perception of the researcher is ultimately dependent on theoretical concepts that are already available, even if these are "everyday concepts" with which phenomena become conceptually paraphrased (ibid., 34, 39).

2.4 Theoretical sampling - theory formation on probation

In Grounded Theory, data selection, data analysis and theory building are closely linked. Not least to meet the demand for validity, data analysis and data selection (sampling) are put into a reciprocal relationship. An adaptive and circular principle of sampling is pursued, i.e. the selection criteria for data collection are repeatedly redefined in the course of the research. This is done on the basis of the findings already gained during this process (cf. CORBIN and STRAUSS 2008, 143 ff; STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 148 ff).

Theoretical sampling ties in with the logic of data analysis and the three basic types of coding (see 2.4) (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 152). Accordingly, cases are selected on the basis of those concepts that either appear repeatedly in data analysis or are obviously absent and thus have "confirmed theoretical relevance for the developing theory" (ibid., 148). Although there are no strictly formal guidelines for theory-guided sampling, the aim is to iteratively move from an initially **[page 88]** very open data selection to a selective data choice. Openness does not stand for arbitrariness: Initially samples can be formed according to statistical standards, data is collected both systematically and randomly, and foreign data sets, for example from statistical surveys, can be integrated into the research design. In the further course of research attention should then be directed more strongly to relationships and variations of the categories developed. This means that the researcher should for example aim at deepen findings from initial interviews or observations in order to determine further "occurrences" to be investigated (ibid, 156f). While in the beginning openness to "all possibilities" (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 153) is to be maintained, in the later course of the research it is a matter of checking the relationships between the concepts developed by means of suitable cases - either by choosing similar cases or by examining polar opposites (ibid., 155). Finally, the data selection is to be narrowed down with the help of selective sampling so that certain aspects of the theory can be checked and refined (ibid., 158f).

The selection of the interview persons or the material to be examined is thus guided by one's data, while at the same time the theoretical concepts discovered must "prove themselves" again and again (HILDENBRAND 2008, 33). If cases discovered through theoretical sampling point in a new direction, concepts must be reformulated. The theory must be adjusted, restricted or, in extreme cases, even rejected. It is also advisable to return to "old material" (STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 152) in order to analyze it again under new aspects. In this circularity, constant validation of the emerging theory becomes immanent in the process. The open sampling broadens and opens the perspectives on a phenomenon, the comparative and the selective sampling in turn close and focus the view. The question of when this process can be regarded as completed will be explained further below in the context of the concept of theoretical saturation.

2.5 The process of analysis

BÖHM (2007, 476) aptly describes the research style of Grounded Theory as "arts" that cannot be learned by recipe. This becomes particularly clear in the process of data analysis. Embedded in the framework of the research process, the actual grounded theories mature within the process of data analysis. Central to their development is the coding and step-by-step cross-linking of data to related categories.

The first step of analysis is open coding (cf. STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 43 f) and the conceptualization or "breaking-up " of the data. In the actual case of textual analysis, this means picking out a sentence or a paragraph and (spontaneously) naming the phenomenon it contains,

i.e. "giving names to each individual incident, idea or event contained therein" (ibid., 45). In constant comparison with already assigned denominations, similar phenomena can gradually **[page 89]** be grouped together as "concepts" under a single name. At a higher level of abstraction similar concepts are then bundled and grouped into categories. This "categorization" facilitates it to gradually develop an analytical insight into the data. Parallel to open coding, the method of "axial coding" is to be applied: Axial coding reassembles the resulting categories "in a new way by identifying connections or relationships between a category and its subcategories" (ibid., 76). Open coding breaks-up the data, while axial coding re-connects or merges the categories.⁴ Hypothetically, categories are connected, checked against existing or newly collected data, reconnected, re-verified, and so on. At the end stands selective coding, in which the categories are placed in relation to a central category on a more abstract level and are integrated into a theory (ibid., 94 ff).

Key to both the coding process and the research process as a whole is the demand for constant writing of memos. Memos help to organize and memorize thoughts and ideas, and to keep the coding (and the entire research process) comprehensible for oneself and others (see ibid., 169 ff).

The "art" of data analysis ultimately also lies in maintaining a certain openness with sufficient creativity and at the same time allowing appropriate theoretical concepts to flow into the evolving theory. If existing theories are prematurely applied, important aspects which can only be understood with the help of the data may be left out.

Computer-based tools

To make the complex coding process more manageable, practical tools are required. Computer-assisted systems for qualitative data analysis, such as ATLAS.ti, help to handle large amounts of data. However, caution is advised, since certain analysis processes result from the program structure and in practice the hope of a "grounded theory at the push of a button" is quickly dashed. Advantageous is the possibility of organizing the codes graphically in the form of diagrams (axial coding) and the firm linking of codes and text passages. The latter allows for quick reference and comparison of the corresponding text passages, which proves to be extremely practical when placing the codes in relation to each other. Not only for human geographers of special interest is the possibility of such programs to include visual data into analysis (e.g. maps or photographs). Recently, ATLAS.ti offers an interface to Google Earth™ which allows users to encode the available geoinformation for their own research interests.

3. Pragmatist truth relativism in Grounded Theory

So far, the procedure has been described, which inevitably leads to the question, which epistemological value and truth character the developed theories can have. The epistemological position of Grounded Theory is one **[page 90]** of truth relativism, which takes seriously the contingent and idiosyncratic character of every knowledge and theory. Notwithstanding this conviction, it does not elevate this relativism to dogma, but recognizes that it is the task of

⁴ A tool supporting this complex process mentally is the paradigmatic model, making it possible to systematically inquire into relationships between categories (see STRAUSS and CORBIN 1996, 78 ff; CORBIN and STRAUSS 2008, 89 ff).

scientists to present their work as relevant, important and "correct". RECKWITZ (2003) sees this as an irresolvable contradiction:

"The 'reflexive awareness of contingency' motivates the social sciences to intervene in social discourses and to make the invisibilisation of contingency carried out there 'visible' again (or for the first time) - and this is only possible by engaging in the game of 'realistic' descriptions and strategically presenting their chronically fragile, perspective interpretations as 'realistic'" (RECKWITZ 2003, 98).

According to the pragmatist concept of truth, however, theories cannot claim absolute truth, but rather gain their relevance by being included in the social discussion: "True ideas are those which we acquire, which we can assert, put into effect and verify" (JAMES 1975, 163). In a pragmatist sense, grounded theories are "true" in two respects: on the one hand, the theory must constantly reaffirm itself to researchers as it is being developed. Also, a theory should be presented to the readers not only theoretically, but also including its various justifications contained in the events investigated. A theory thus acquires its persuasive value, its pragmatist truth value, not only through one interview, through one statement, but rather through manifold confirmation in the empirical material. On the other hand, a newly developed grounded theory acquires validity by enabling others to discuss social problems and formulate proposals for their solution. In this sense, we always generate concepts and theories against the background of what we socially or politically desire and want we aim to achieve. According to pragmatism, there is no research free of premises without a normative background. Normative statements must be reflected and openly presented. In addition, pragmatism also expects research that is oriented towards social negotiation and understanding (see the introduction in this volume).

4. Theoretical saturation and readiness for publication

In order for grounded theories to contribute to solving social problems as described above, the results of respective studies must be published in an appropriate form and at the "right" time. The decision on when a research project can be completed depends on the degree of theoretical saturation. A grounded theory is considered theoretically saturated when no new findings emerge from the processed data material. The theory developed from the data so far is conclusive and free of contradictions. Its core categories are fully developed in their depth and their mutual references (CORBIN and STRAUSS 2008, 143).

[page 91] Nevertheless, theoretical saturation cannot be an "objective" criterion for the publication maturity of a research paper. In this context, Glaser & Strauss stress the responsibility of researchers to decide when a grounded theory should be published:

"As soon as the researcher is convinced that his analytical frame of reference is a systematic, object-related theory, that it contains a sufficiently precise identification of the facts under investigation and that it has been put into a form that would allow other researchers to use it if they had to work in the same field - then he can publish his results with confidence. He is convinced of his own wealth of knowledge and cannot find any reason to change this conviction. This is not an arbitrary act, but results from the efforts the researcher has made to verify his views" (GLASER and STRAUSS 1979, 96).

This quotation contains a number of terms that make those who adhere to a positivistic understanding of science tend to deny the Grounded Theory procedure any scientific character: It refers to "convictions" and not to "verification" or "falsification", to "sufficient accuracy" and not to "precision" and "reliability". However, the decision that a scientific work is ready for publication

is not an act of arbitrariness, but must be made responsibly in terms of the social impact of the results.

Regardless of the degree of theoretical saturation, researchers who proceed according to Grounded Theory must be aware that their results can never be considered "finished" or "completed". Rather, from the perspective of Grounded Theory, theories are understood as "temporary and transitory reification" (RECKWITZ 2003, 10) of continuous theorizing, which "at the moment of their formulation are again the starting point of new theorizing" (ibid.). GLASER and STRAUSS sum up this insight by writing: "The published word is not the final one, but only a pause in the never-ending process of generating theory" (GLASER and STRAUSS 1967, 40).

5. Of the (un)practical doubt: doing research with Grounded Theory

Although Grounded Theory has become "one of the most frequently used buzzwords in connection with qualitative social research" (STRÜBING 2008, 7) since its "first description" by GLASER and STRAUSS (1967), it has so far only rarely been represented in the university curricula of social science-oriented disciplines - including human geography. The sparse communication of this research style in seminars, lectures or other courses may be due to the fact that a decisive characteristic of Grounded Theory is the great freedom within its approach. Thus, a clearly formalisable sequence of action steps is lacking, which requires the researcher to take on a considerable responsibility [page 92] for the continuous reflection and correction of the research process.

Especially for newcomers to qualitative research, the procedure according to Grounded Theory can be both a salvation and a disaster: it "rescues" through its promise or the "mantra" of Grounded Theory (BRYANT 2007, 32) that theories can be elicited from any kind of data, if one only gets sufficiently involved and works hard enough with them. In this way, it relieves researchers of some of the worry that they may not come up with substantial new findings after several years of work. At the same time, while the absence of a rigid methodological corset means scientific flexibility, it is sometimes perceived as an excess of freedom, which can result in disorientation and inefficiency.

Nevertheless, young scientists and academics choose this research style comparatively frequently, especially when writing qualification papers. The conditions under which such research is carried out are often characterised by scarce resources, especially in terms of the time available. At the same time, young researchers in particular are still in the probationary phase. In a figurative sense, they ask to be admitted to a scientific community whose system of rules and formalities are usually either largely oriented on quantitative criteria, which works in a reconstructively descriptive manner, or they expect research to be theory-driven in a strict sense. Especially for externally funded projects or contract research, which are becoming increasingly important in the academic context, preliminary results are only satisfactory to a limited extent and are difficult to justify in the often prescribed application logic. Anyone who is involved in a research project who can only vaguely answer the frequently asked question among colleagues about the research question and working title of the qualification work over a longer period of time will quickly become suspicious of unfocused and inefficient work. However, this is precisely the point where the research style of Grounded Theory demands a rethinking of the predictability of research processes from all those involved: Within the framework of Grounded Theory, Franz Breuer emphasises that "shifting focus or re-focusing [...] does not appear as a failure of preliminary considerations or assumptions, but rather as a calculated and thoroughly desired ingredient and result [...]" (BREUER 2009, 55).

A lack of orientation and the fear of having chosen an inefficient procedure is particularly noticeable in researchers who use Grounded Theory for the first time, especially at the beginning of the coding procedure. Newcomers hope to make the abundance of data in the evaluation process more manageable by reducing the data material - as for example in the Qualitative Content Analysis according to MAYRING (2007). However, coding according to Grounded Theory is rather an expanding process. Especially in the phase of open coding, the data material is not reduced, but the amount of text continues to increase: codes are assigned and commented on, and first memos are written. Additional commentary and interpretation text is added to each text fragment in the primary document (BÖHM 2007, 478). UDO KELLE and SUSANN KLUGE describe the experience of an uncontrollably large amount of data [page 93] that is beyond any simplification as a "drowning in the data" (KELLE u. KLUGE 2010, 57). If you realize that you can spend as much time as you like on a short section of text while hundreds of pages are still waiting to be analyzed in a similarly detailed way, you will soon understand that it will usually not be possible to consider the entire data material equally. In this moment of deeply felt researcher's hardship, it is necessary to engage in analytical and selective thoughts as well as to distance oneself from the work. Not infrequently, such moments of contemplation clear the view and (not only) lead to a creative spark in the work with Grounded Theory.

6. Conclusion

We regard the research style of Grounded Theory as a fundamentally suitable way to guide research processes in geography. However, such a procedure is by no means free of pitfalls and difficulties. The procedure is labour- and time-intensive, the required effort is difficult to estimate at the beginning. Those who work according to Grounded Theory must be able to withstand the uncertainty of the openness of results, even if their data leads them into a dead end.

On the one hand, this research style opens up a great amount of leeway in the conception and implementation of research projects, but on the other hand it also harbours dangers. If the principles of self-reflexivity, quality assurance and the claim to abstraction are not taken seriously enough and are not communicated, the result is work that reaps justified accusations of arbitrariness and unscientificity. In the worst case, Grounded Theory is merely instrumentalized and research is conducted with a realistic perception of truth and a correspondence-theoretical claim to truth is pursued. In this case, Grounded Theory is only on paper and only serves as a justification for carelessly organized empiricism. Such work can seriously endanger the reputation of the research style. In this sense, it can only be hoped that future authors will apply it in a responsible and problem-oriented manner. If the guidelines of Grounded Theory are taken seriously, it can initiate a lively and creative research process in which both, researchers and theories can grow.

Grounded Theory proposes mediation between theories and empirical findings. Neither analyses guided by individual theories nor research practice that aims purely at validating or falsifying a hypothesis fulfill this requirement. According to the pragmatic understanding of truth, theories and knowledge always develop in relation to a practical context and are thus rationally and empirically grounded. They are contingent and path-dependent and therefore by no means arbitrary. Theories should grow, be integrated or appear in a new light through other research contexts. In doing so, theories should not lose their grounding, or their reference to social problems. The resulting "new" theories should be seen in their socio-political context and ideally [page 94] help those involved to understand, if not to solve, the problems. This is the proposal that pragmatism offers science as a socio-political stance. In this sense, we believe that Grounded Theory provides a possible

tool for empirical research after the Cultural Turn. Concepts and theories that are relevant in a socio-political context can be developed. However, they must not be presented with a naive style of truth, but must be conveyed in a discussion- and communication-oriented manner.

Literatur

- Böhm, A. 2007: Theoretisches Codieren: Textanalyse in der Grounded Theory. In: Flick, U., v. Kardorff, E. u. I. Steinke (Hrsg.): Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch. 5. Aufl. Reinbek bei Hamburg, S. 475-485.
- Breuer, F. 2009: Reflexive Grounded Theory. Eine Einführung für die Forschungspraxis. Wiesbaden.
- Bryant, A. u. K. Charmaz 2007: Grounded Theory in Historical Perspective: An Epistemological Account. In: Bryant, A. u. K. Charmaz (Hrsg.): The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory. London, S. 31-57.
- Corbin, J. u. A. Strauss 2008: Basics of Qualitative Research. Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. 3. Aufl. Thousand Oaks.
- Glaser, B. 1998: Doing Grounded Theory - Issues and Discussions. Mill Valley.
- Glaser, B. u. A. Strauss 1979: Die Entdeckung gegenstandsbezogener Theorie: Eine Grundstrategie qualitativer Sozialforschung. In: Hopf, C. u. E. Weingarten: Qualitative Sozialforschung. Stuttgart, S. 91-114.
- Hard, G. 1985: Die Alltagsperspektive in der Geographie. In: Osnabrücker Studien zur Geographie, 7, S. 15- 77.
- Hildenbrand, B. 2008: Anselm Strauss. In Flick E.; v. Kardorff, E. u. I. Steinke (Hrsg.): Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch. 5. Aufl. Reinbek bei Hamburg, S. 32-42.
- James, W. 1975: Der Wahrheitsbegriff des Pragmatismus. In: Martens, E. (Hrsg.): Philosophie des Pragmatismus. Ausgewählte Texte von Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, Ferdinand Canning Scott Schiller, John Dewey. Stuttgart.
- Kelle, U u. S. Kluge 2010: Vom Einzelfall zum Typus. Opladen (= Qualitative Sozialforschung, 4).
- Kelle, U. 2007: Theoretisches Vorwissen und Kategorienbildung in der „Grounded Theory“. In: Kuckartz, U., Grunenberg, H. u. T. Dresing (Hrsg.): Qualitative Datenanalyse: computergestützt. Methodische Hintergründe und Beispiele aus der Forschungspraxis. 2. Aufl. Wiesbaden, S. 33-49.
- Lippuner, R. 2005: Raum, Systeme, Praktiken. Zum Verhältnis von Alltag, Wissenschaft und Geographie. Stuttgart (=Sozialgeographische Bibliothek, 2).
- Mayring, P. 2008: Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlage und Techniken. 10. Auflage. Weinheim, Basel.
- Peirce, C. 1960: Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce.
- Peirce, C. S. 1960: Pragmatism and Pragmaticism. In: Hartshorne, C u. P. Weiss (Hrsg.): Collected Papers. 2. Auflage. London, (= Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, 5).
- Reckwitz, A. 2003: Die Krise der Repräsentation und das reflexive Kontingenzbewusstsein. Zu den Konsequenzen der post-empirischen Wissenschaftstheorien für die Identität der Sozialwissenschaften. In: Bonakcer, T., Brodocz, A. u. T. Noetzel (Hrsg.): Die Ironie der Politik. Über die Konstruktion politischer Wirklichkeiten. Frankfurt/Main, S. 85-103.

[page 95] Reichertz, J. 1999: Gültige Entdeckung des Neuen? Zur Bedeutung der Abduktion in der qualitativen Sozialforschung. In: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 2, S. 47-64.

von Richthofen, F. 1983 [1886]: Führer für Forschungsreisende. 2. Aufl. Berlin.

Strauss, A. u. J. Corbin 1996: Grounded Theory: Grundlagen Qualitativer Sozialforschung. Weinheim.

Strübing, J. 2002: Just do it? Zum Konzept der Herstellung und Sicherung von Qualität in grounded theory-basierten Forschungsarbeiten. In: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 54-2, 318-342.

Strübing, J. 2008: Grounded Theory. Zur sozialtheoretischen und epistemologischen Fundierung des Verfahrens der empirische begründeten Theorienbildung. 2. Überarbeitete und erweiterte Aufl. Wiesbaden (= Qualitative Sozialforschung, 15).

Truschkat, I., Kaiser, M. u. V. Reinartz 2005: Forschen nach Rezept? Anregungen zum praktischen Umgang mit der Grounded Theory in Qualifikationsarbeiten. In: Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Social Research, 6/2, Art. 22 (abrufbar unter: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/470/1007>, zuletzt geprüft am 27.09.2011).