1-7-2013

The Constant Comparative Analysis Method Outside of Grounded Theory

Sheila M. Fram

Independent Researcher and Consultant, smfram@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Fram, S. M. (2013). The Constant Comparative Analysis Method Outside of Grounded Theory. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2013.1569>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

The Constant Comparative Analysis Method Outside of Grounded Theory

Abstract

This commentary addresses the gap in the literature regarding discussion of the legitimate use of Constant Comparative Analysis Method (CCA) outside of Grounded Theory. The purpose is to show the strength of using CCA to maintain the emic perspective and how theoretical frameworks can maintain the etic perspective throughout the analysis. My naturalistic inquiry model shows how conceptual frameworks and theoretical frameworks can be integrated when using the CCA method.

Keywords

Constant Comparison, Constant Comparative Analysis, Theoretical Framework, Conceptual Framework, Critical Discourse Analysis, Naturalistic Inquiry

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

The Constant Comparative Analysis Method Outside of Grounded Theory

Sheila M. Fram

Independent Researcher and Consultant, Iowa City, Iowa USA

This commentary addresses the gap in the literature regarding discussion of the legitimate use of Constant Comparative Analysis Method (CCA) outside of Grounded Theory. The purpose is to show the strength of using CCA to maintain the emic perspective and how theoretical frameworks can maintain the etic perspective throughout the analysis. My naturalistic inquiry model shows how conceptual frameworks and theoretical frameworks can be integrated when using the CCA method. Keywords: Constant Comparison, Constant Comparative Analysis, Theoretical Framework, Conceptual Framework, Critical Discourse Analysis, Naturalistic Inquiry

Grounded Theory (GT) use has spread to various fields of study since Glaser and Strauss' (1967) introduction of the methodology (Tan, 2010, p. 94). A review of the literature on the Constant Comparative Method shows the same movement. CCA, as a technique or method, appears to be considered as synonymous with GT. O'Connor, Netting, and Thomas' (2008) review of the GT literature shows a steady growth over the last several decades in the use of CCA within GT methodology. A review of dissertation abstracts from 2004 shows that GT is used in various ways. The authors highlight that 35% of the dissertations that state *grounded theory* in their dissertation abstracts, keywords, and/or titles focus on the use of the CCA method, but lack a definitive approach towards the development of a substantive theory. The problem appears to be a gap in the literature regarding discussion of the legitimate use of the CCA method outside of GT. The purpose of this commentary is to show the strength in using CCA to maintain the emic perspective (participant's view as insider) and how theoretical frameworks can maintain the etic perspective (outsider/ distant concepts) throughout the analysis. The commentary answers the question: What is the benefit of using CCA method outside of GT?

Tan's (2010) review of the literature presents the question about the use of the terms "methodology" (e.g. Allan, 2007; Glaser, 1992; Holton, 2007) and "method" (Fendt & Sachs, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) surrounding the use of Grounded Theory (GT). My understanding of the terms parallels Strauss and Corbin's (1998) definitions; methodology is "a way of thinking about and studying social reality," (p. 3), whereas, method is "a set of procedures and techniques for gathering and analyzing data" (p. 3). Tan's literature review clarifies that Glaser offers a methodological (paradigmatic) understanding; whereas, Strauss and Corbin offer a pragmatic understanding. My use of the terms in this commentary follows accordingly.

My argument for the use of the CCA method outside of GT begins with a review of the literature to highlight CCA's origins, the shortcomings of CCA method use in qualitative inquiry, and how the gap in the literature, along with a few recent adaptations of the CCA method, shows some movement towards innovation, which is synonymous with a strong tradition of methodological innovation in qualitative research (Wiles, Pain, & Crow, 2010, p. 3). Examples of how the method has improved and how my model adapts and advances the use of the method outside of GT support the argument for the commentary.

A review of most recent journal articles located in ACADEMIC SEARCH ELITE and JSTOR and dissertations in DIA from 2000 to 2011 highlights a small number of articles discussing the use of CCA outside of GT. O'Connor et al. (2008) stated:

It must be clear that constant comparison, the data analysis method, does not in and of itself constitute a grounded theory design. Nor does the process of constant comparison ensure the grounding of data whether "grounding" is used in a positivistic or interpretive sense. Simply put, constant comparison assures that all data are systematically compared to all other data in the data set. This assures that all data produced will be analyzed rather than potentially disregarded on thematic grounds. It is the time and the process of this constant comparison that determines whether the analysis is deductive and will produce a testable theory or whether the analysis is inductive and will build a theory for a particular context. (p. 41)

My argument substantiates O'Connor et al.'s claim that the method does not constitute a grounded theory design, but that how the method is adapted and used determines what methodology can support it. My model shows how the CCA method can be adapted and supported by using a naturalistic inquiry.

Constant Comparative Analysis: Emergence and Theoretical Sensitivity

Glaser and Strauss (1967) developed classical GT as an inductive approach to challenge the methodological restrictiveness of the hypothetico-deductive approach by allowing theory emerge from the organizing and reducing of data. Since classical GT, Glaser and Strauss have disagreed on the relationship between data and theory. Efforts following the disagreement consisted of reconciling the significance of the diverging concepts of "emergence" and "theoretical sensitivity" (Kelle, 2005). Kelle (2005) goes on to suggest that novice attempts during open coding when using a CCA technique to allow categories to emerge from the data resulted in confusion and an overabundance of categories. Such attempts sparked issues of emergence. Glaser's and Strauss' (1967) term, "theoretical sensitivity," originally meant a deep well of theories or theoretical knowledge that a sociologist gains over time. Glaser (1978) attempted to explain through the use of theoretical codes how to engage theoretical sensitivity. Strauss (1987), with Corbin (1998), developed a "coding paradigm," which was a structured theoretical coding process to follow when working with data during the axial coding step of their CCA method. Glaser asserted that the paradigm was an act of *forcing* the data. Strauss and Corbin's paradigm works similarly to a conceptual framework and has demonstrated that it can serve as a useful guide to help novice researchers to reduce and reorganize a large amount of data. The authors disagree regarding what significance should be placed on theoretical sensitizing.

Charmaz's Constructivist GT approach differs from Glaser's and Strauss' approaches in that the focus is on a mutual construction of knowledge by the researcher and participant and the ability to develop subjective understandings of participants' meaning (Charmaz, 2000, p. 510). Further, her approach focuses on how the researcher constructs method and methodological strategies and requires accountability of the study's contexts and the researchers' standpoint, priorities, and interactions (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p. 10). Constructivist GT works to adapt and advance the CCA method while still under the methodology of GT. Charmaz argues that classical GT localizes categories to data and ignores social reality relevant to the process of the logic of discovery. She argues that the classical GT stance is no longer tenable because of the establishment of Interpretivism, Symbolic

Interactionism, and other dominant theoretical perspectives in the social sciences. Her constructivist GT approach highlights the significance of distinguishing CCA as a method that can be used with other methods.

Shortcomings of Emergence

The Constant Comparative Analysis method is an iterative and inductive process of reducing the data through constant recoding (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Incidents or data are compared to other incidents or data during the process of coding. This process begins with open coding to develop categories from the first round of data reduction and further reducing and recoding allows possible core categories to emerge (Charmaz, 2001; Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987). Originally, Glaser and Strauss (1967) referred to their coding efforts as a part of the constant comparative technique for generating theory under the framework of the GT method (See also Glaser, 1965). Classical GT highlighted three types of constant comparison: incident to incident, concepts emerging from further incidents in new data, and concept to concept (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Later, Glaser (1978, 1992) more clearly defined the coding stages of CCA to include *Substantive coding* and *Theoretical coding*. Lincoln and Guba (1985) saw four distinct steps in Glaser's and Strauss' comparison coding process: comparing incidents applicable to each category, integrating categories and their properties, delimiting the theory, and writing the theory (p. 339). Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) offered a more fluid breakdown of CCA steps; which included open, axial, and selective coding. Their pragmatic approach showed novice researchers how to use the CCA method and GT methodology. Many manuscripts show the use of CCA exclusively to infer a theory while positioning themselves within a GT methodology (e.g., Bencze & Bowen, 2009; Mishna, Newman, Daley & Solomon, 2009; Pignato, 2010; Randolph, 2010; Stillman, 2011). Elliott and Jordan (2010) broke down the comparative process further stating:

...[CCA] begins by comparing incident to incident. But as it progresses, it is the increasingly abstract process of comparing concept to incident and concept to concept that further integrates coding... It is through the process of comparing concept to incident that the researcher can check to see if further incidents fit with the newly developed concepts and, in so doing, ensure that the concepts are capable of accounting for all related incidents in the data. (pp. 34-35)

Each approach emphasized specific steps when working data.

Charmaz's argument that Classical GT ignores social reality highlighted the first shortcoming of the use of Glaser's CCA as a technique of GT method regarding the emergence of a substantive theory. Strauss and Corbin and Charmaz modified GT as a methodology and in such efforts advanced CCA from a technique to a method. The literature shows others who followed similarly.

A number of manuscripts discuss a modified use of CCA during their analysis (e.g. Heydon & Hibbert, 2010; Sawey, 2011). Sawey's (2011) dissertation describes a variation of Glaser and Strauss' (1967) CCA "modified by Lincoln and Guba (1985)" (p. 20). Sawey uses "data management procedures, audit trails, and member checking.... a process...used to explore relationships between the themes,... [and the] peer-debriefing" (p. 301) technique to explore researcher's biases, meanings made and the interpretation process (Ibid.). Sawey follows Lincoln and Guba's (1985) relationship exploration process, "mutual shaping" (p. 340); which is used to produce a "reasonable construction of the data" (p. 347).

In Boeije's (2002) approach to using CCA as a method, the author structures the method by its exclusive use to analyze interviews. Boeije lists five steps in her application for interviews:

1. Comparison within a single interview.
2. Comparison between interviews within the same group.
3. Comparison of interviews from different groups.
4. Comparison in pairs at the level of the couple.
5. Comparing couples. (p. 395)

She explicitly makes the point in her review of CCA literature that "the literature does not make clear how one should "go about" constant comparison, nor does it address such issues as whether different types of comparison can be distinguished" (p. 393). Her approach is to use the epistemological structuring of the interview process to decide how to use the CCA method to analyze data. In these examples, researchers take a pragmatic step towards breaking down CCA, so as to use the method to answer their research questions. Boeije's (2002) approach and those of others get at the "emergence" issue that haunted the Glaser and Strauss' GT (1967) approach by testing better ways to pragmatically use the CCA method to support the emergence of a substantive theory from working the data.

The Shortcoming of Glaser's Theoretical Sensitivity

Classical GT established different places for substantive and formal theories in the research process. Formal Theories are a part of the foundation of knowledge, or "an armamentarium of categories and hypotheses on substantive and formal levels" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 46) that sociologists use to help them generate new theories. Grounded theorists differ in their approach regarding the relevance of the literature review and when it is necessary to refer to the literature. Glaser (1978, 1992) is explicit that one need not begin any GT project by reviewing the literature. He uses prior knowledge to develop a lens for analyzing data. Strauss and Corbin (1998) recognize how a review of the literature can "stimulate our thinking about properties or dimensions that we can then use to examine the data in front of us" (p. 45). Strauss and Corbin use a review of the literature to develop a lens. Charmaz (2010) further summarizes the importance of the literature:

...[T]he advice about postponing exploration of the literature usually emanates from experienced researchers, who themselves have developed an extensive knowledge of a vast mass of literature together with a general familiarity with key topics and an array of concepts at their fingertips. (p. 20)

Literature reviews are vital tools for developing frameworks and paradigms. The typical novice researcher is ill-equipped with enough knowledge to develop lenses or conceptual and theoretical frameworks that accurately pinpoint a social process or phenomenon. The review of the literature works to help develop frameworks and paradigms; which work as scaffolding for the researcher. Glaser's (1978) coding families in his *Theoretical Sensitivity* book is an example of developing theoretical sensitivity or a lens founded on implicit knowledge (from previous reviews of literature). Glaser maintained a methodological standpoint through his use of coding families. His cultural family of codes includes the terms social norms, social values, and social beliefs. An experienced researcher identifies a particular understanding of the term or concept, then during the theoretical coding stage, uses such an understanding to find evidence in the data that reflects this understanding. Strauss and Corbin's (1998) coding paradigm or conceptual framework, used during the axial coding stage, asks "questions about

the conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences of categories, thus making links between the ideas being conceptualized from the data” (Mills et al., 2006, p. 5). The novice researcher begins axial coding looking for causal conditions, contextual factors, actions, and interactions in response to a phenomenon, intervening conditions that help or hinder actions and interactions and consequences of actions and interactions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Their paradigm acknowledges that condition/consequences do not exist in a vacuum; most situations are a combination of micro and macro conditions; a full range of possible interrelationships between micro/macro conditions are not visible, but hidden; conditions and consequences exist in clusters; and action/interaction and emotional responses to events are not confined to individuals (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 92). The researcher comes in contact with topic-specific reviews of the literature that pertain to the inquiry at hand to develop theoretical sensitivity. Their coding framework highlights a shortcoming of Glaser’s approach to developing theoretical sensitivity, which emphasizes the theoretical knowledge of a more experienced researcher.

Similar to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) coding paradigm, Scott’s (2004) and Scott and Howell’s (2008) application of a conditional relationship guide and a reflective coding matrix are “two instruments [that] serve as bridges during the constant comparative process for the researcher moving between open coding and axial coding and later to selective coding” (p. 2). The conditional relationship guide helps novice researchers recognize the relationships among categories. A set of questions work to examine each category as it emerges. Scott’s (2004) guiding framework includes questions that ask:

- What is [the category]?
- When does [the category] occur?
- Where does [the category] occur?
- Why does [the category] occur?
- How does [the category] occur?
- With what consequences does [the category] occur or is [the category] understood? (p. 204)

The guide establishes a more obvious transition from open coding to axial coding without disrupting the comprehension of the participants’ views. Once this step is near completion the reflective coding matrix aids in identifying a core category and contextualizing this category by situating all other categories as “subcategories” that define the context. This tool “is ultimately designed to paint a picture of the central phenomenon, defining and describing it in a manner sufficient to account for the study data holistically as a narrative or story explaining the substantive theory of the central phenomenon” (Scott & Howell, 2008, p. 8). Similar to Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) paradigmatic framework, Scott’s tools maintain the emic perspective and work the data at the micro level.

In the 1980s, the terms *emic* and *etic* were used in anthropology, but later used in other disciplines, such as linguistics and psychology. Each discipline defined the terms differently. Marvin Harris, a cultural anthropologist, saw that the etics were an end in themselves. Such definitions as insider vs. outsider, native vs. scientist, and others have presented the words in terms of dichotomies (e.g. Pike, 1967). Kenneth Pike, a linguistic anthropologist, believes that etics are a means to emics. My use of the terms is in line with Geertz (1983) understanding of the terms. Geertz offered a description of the process of developing emic understanding.

Understanding the form and pressure of, to use the dangerous word one more time, natives’ inner lives is more like grasping a proverb, catching an allusion,

seeing a joke—or, as I have suggested, reading a poem—than it is like achieving communion. (p. 70)

This understanding of emic coincides with my efforts to develop a *thick description* as defined by Geertz, as well. Geertz (1983) definitions for emic, *experience-near concepts*, and etic, *experience-distant concepts* (p. 58), highlight how the process of understanding experiences is complex.

Strauss' and Corbin's (1990) coding framework underscores the need to focus on the participant's view and experiences and identify patterns as evidence of social processes in the experiences of the participants. The coding framework is a tool for maintaining the emic perspective. They recognize that to be able to identify the patterns, they would have to already have the knowledge from a review of the literature to *see* the patterns in the data during analysis. In contrast to Glaser, their efforts highlighted a shortcoming in Glaser's approach to theoretical sensitivity by showing the need for a coding framework to assist novice researchers in the use of the CCA method with GT methodology.

The Shortcoming of Strauss' and Corbin's Theoretical Sensitivity

A group of literature focuses on CCA's use, influenced by Constructivist GT, with other kinds of analytic methods such as discourse analysis or thematic analysis (e.g., Hataway, 2010; Maloch, 2008; Reed, 2008; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Myers, 2007). Methods such as discourse analysis usually require some use of a conceptual or theoretical framework. This line of research adds confirming evidence that CCA maintains the emic perspective. Also, this line of literature underscores the use of conceptual and theoretical frameworks along with other methods, which can work to maintain the etic perspective.

The term, conceptual framework, takes its origins from Blumer's (1954) need to distinguish between definitive concepts and sensitizing concepts, he stated:

A definitive concept refers precisely to what is common to a class of objects, by the aid of a clear definition in terms of attributes or fixed bench marks....A sensitizing concept lacks such specification of attributes or bench marks and consequently it does not enable the user to move directly to the instance and its relevant content. Instead, it gives the user a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances. Whereas definitive concepts provide prescriptions of what to see, sensitizing concepts merely suggest directions along which to look. (p. 7)

GT's *theoretical sensitivity* is a process of using sensitizing concepts such as the concepts in Glaser's coding families. In qualitative research, the notion of a conceptual framework is focused at the concrete level of experiences. The core of this framework consists of a few concepts or a cluster of concepts with a logical relationship. Further explained:

Concepts enable us to distinguish one event or sensation from another. Concepts also allow us to relate events in the past to ones in the present or future. Often these concepts will cluster and form a higher-order unit of thought known as a construct...[for example] IQ is a construct that incorporates the concepts of age... and intelligence.... (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. xv)

A conceptual framework differs from a theoretical framework in its simplicity and sensitizing and suggestive nature. Anfara and Mertz (2006) explain that the development of theory at any stage is far more complex a framework than a conceptual framework. They state:

Propositions are expressions of relationships among several constructs....Because one proposition is usually insufficient to explain a new insight about an aspect of reality, researchers use a set of propositions that are logically related. It is this relationship of propositions that constitutes a theory. (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. xv)

Thus, the use of a conceptual framework at the concrete level is most in-line with a process underscoring elements of understanding concrete experiences and involving one gaining an understanding of the relationships between concepts from a particular perspective, or what Corbin and Strauss (2008) call a paradigm (p. 89). Such a focus points towards maintaining the emic perspective. Whereas, the theoretical framework is a process at the abstract level using relative theories and definitive concepts as comparisons to gain understandings in order to describe, explain, or predict social phenomena, which occurs when the etic perspective is maintained. This is not to say that conceptual frameworks do not also affect various aspects of a study. The more complex the concepts and the relationships between them, the more such constructs affect stages of the study. Corbin and Strauss (2008) stated that the use of a theoretical framework is appropriate when developing theoretical sensitivity. An existing theoretical framework aids in complementing, extending, or verifying findings; when alternative explanations are needed; when a researcher needs guidance for developing a new theoretical framework by reviewing an existing one; and when methodology must be determined (pp. 39-40).

Corbin and Strauss' (2008) post-positivist efforts, and Scott's (2004) and Charmaz's (2000) constructivist efforts to maintain a close proximity to the data are central to my argument regarding my need for a theoretical framework. The use of CCA exclusively maintains a focus on data at the concrete level. The use of post-positivist and constructivist kinds of frameworks maintain the emic perspective and concrete associations essential to data. My use of a theoretical framework moved me from the concrete to the abstract and my use of conceptual frameworks helped me to maintain the emic perspective while moving between these levels. My efforts centered on abstracting and identifying a complex social process occurring and structuring from ideological structures.

Another group of literature describes the use of CCA guided by Constructivist GT with the use of a conceptual framework (e.g., Palmer, 2010; Reed, 2007). Palmer's (2010) dissertation was guided by Constructivist epistemology (Piaget, 1975). Palmer uses anchored instruction theories, which involves problem-centered instructional activities, (The Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1990) to develop a conceptual framework. Palmer's use of CCA is based on a more pragmatic understanding of the technique of constant comparing. Also, Palmer follows Creswell's (2003) and Yin's (2009) step-by-step methods regarding case study collection and analysis stages. Palmer described the use of CCA, stating:

From a review of the data, the researcher formulated codes used as tags to identify concepts, themes, and meaningful patterns that emerged within each individual case. The researcher began with a code category encompassing the research purpose. This was then divided in to subcategories to represent the research questions. The researcher used different colors corresponding to the subcategories to mark text in the interview transcripts, survey questions, and artifact documentation to identify subcategories and emerging themes.

Alphabetical codes (A, B, C, D, etc.) were used to further identify meaningful patterns in data relating to the subcategories. All coded information was entered into an electronic data base for further analysis. (p. 63)

Palmer relies upon a review of the literature to develop a conceptual framework to apply during the analysis stage. Palmer's uses CCA as a technique and not as a method. Reed (2008) follows Strauss and Corbin's (1990) and Dick's (2005) instructions for analyzing data (p. 72). Reed starts with a thorough review of the literature and a theoretical sensitivity towards critical literacy concepts relative to the classroom activities, with which she is concerned (p. 75). Her use of the critical literacy concepts and a focus on social actions dictates the need to refer to social theories structured within a framework. Her use of such a framework includes the use critical discourse analysis (CDA), in line with theories by James Gee (1999), at the second stage of analysis. Her purpose for using CCA and CDA is to find a more "systematic and thorough way" (p. 84) to analyze the texts and language in the data.

Fairclough (1992) describes critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a mixture of various techniques for the study of textual practices and language use, which equate to distinctive social and cultural practices. Fairclough suggests that the concern is to analyze texts as elements in discursive practices significant in a larger social context. Early CDA examined patterns of word choices (Halliday, 1985), various patterns of themes connected to views of the world (Kress, 1989), and the sequenced structure of textual genres (Luke, 1995). Later CDA took into account the process of ideological formations and stepped away from traditional linguistic constructs by focusing on language use and speech as social practices in the context of social structures (Fairclough, 1995; Luke, 1995; van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). These later analyses show the link between texts (micro) and dominant power relationships (macro) within a social structure.

In Mills, Chapman, and Bonner's (2007) discussion of the advancement of GT with a postmodernist lens, the authors argue that the constructivist influence upon GT allows for the use of the discourse analysis method. Their argument supports the use of a "methodological/methods package" (p. 73) when using CCA with other methods for analysis. Such a package can include the use of Symbolic Interactionism methodology to develop a theoretical framework to use alongside the analysis methods (e.g., situational analysis, frame analysis). The authors show how Strauss' (1993) discussion of sociological theory of social worlds and arenas is the turning point for such an intersection (p. 75) and how Clarke's (2005) application of situational analysis pushes GT further in line with postmodernism. They stated:

Finding points of articulation between Strauss and Foucault---discourse/discipline and social worlds/arenas; the field of practice(s) and negotiated/processual ordering; and the gaze and perspective---Clarke (2005) argues for an approach to data analysis that reflects a concern with 'how discourses are produced and how we are constituted through them'. It is at this point that Clarke pushes [GT] around the postmodern turn and away from a constructivist paradigm of inquiry. (p. 75)

Thus, discourse analysis can be used with CCA method, and guided by a postmodern lens, through a discursive understanding of actors being constructed of and through discourse (Mills et al., 2007, p. 75).

Some qualitative studies incorporate the use of the CCA method, outside of GT, and the use of a theoretical framework during the data analysis process (e.g., Autry & Anderson, 2007; Chenoweth, 2009; Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008; Haney & McArthur, 2002;

Yamamoto, 2010). Chenoweth's (2009) dissertation is typical of how theoretical frameworks are used in conjunction with CCA as a method to maintain an etic perspective during analysis. Guided by an ethnographic methodology to aid in maintaining the emic perspective, Chenoweth developed a *situated learning theoretical framework* from Lave and Wenger's (1991) and Vygotsky's (1978) theories to "generate a richly descriptive, interpretive account of individual learning and development as situated within an informal community setting" (p. 29), and to understand the community setting from an etic perspective/outsider's view. Chenoweth needed to step away from the emic perspective to be able to see a learning process of a social group occurring. Chenoweth's modified use of CCA includes the use of a theoretical framework. Chenoweth states:

A modified constant comparison method of analysis was employed, and categories and themes were developed from open and axially coded data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990)... the themes were evaluated in comparison to a typology derived from the community of practice theoretical framework. The goal of this comparison was to answer the research question regarding the appropriateness of the community of practice framework for describing the informal learning and pedagogical development of volunteer docents.... (Glesne, 2006). (pp. 37-38)

Theoretical frameworks guide the researcher through a complex analysis, such as Chenoweth's framework did. Researchers' uses of theoretical frameworks highlight the shortcoming of relying on a Classical GT theoretical sensitivity or Strauss' and Corbin's approach to developing theoretical sensitivity under GT methodology. Theoretical frameworks are used to maintain an etic perspective, so as to *see* social processes working at the abstract level and as contexts.

My model, involving the use of the CCA method outside of Classical and Straussian GT along with conceptual and theoretical frameworks, continues to make efforts towards innovation in qualitative research by solving the problem with the gap in the literature regarding discussion of the legitimate use of CCA method outside of GT. The purpose of my commentary is to show the strength in using CCA to maintain the emic perspective and how theoretical frameworks can maintain the etic perspective. Excerpts from my study show how the CCA method can legitimately be used in such a way.

Role of the Researcher

As a doctoral student, I sought financial support by teaching courses. I was told I had been hired because of my teaching experience, yet I was restricted to using a curriculum packet and particular instructional strategies. I implemented the instruction as directed, but recognized that I was required to teach a specific way. I was in a position of authority as an instructor, but had little power from the standpoint of the course coordinator. I made a connection between my experiences as a TA while reading about the theory of the hidden curriculum and socialization (See Jackson, 1968) and was influenced to investigate similar TA positions and experiences for my dissertation topic.

As a researcher, I was privileged to know the inside details of teaching the courses included in my study. Yet, I was seen as a possible threat to the participants' standing as instructors because of the information I was trying to gain from them. I was a graduate student and TA with little power in one context and a researcher with more power in another context.

My Study as an Example of Using CCA as a Method apart from Grounded Theory

My dissertation (Fram 2008) research followed Human Subjects protocols and was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board. The experiences captured in the study are centered on the practices of the graduate students themselves. I stated the use of a qualitative design and interpretive approach (Fram, 2008, p. 32). I did not intend to do a GT study, but to benefit from the use of the CCA method. My qualitative assumptions about researching the socialization phenomenon paralleled Erickson's (1986) interpretive understanding of examining human meaning in social life and what Schwandt (2000) stated were interpretive understandings about how knowledge is socially constructed; relationships are complex and ever-shifting and reality is constructed based on our observations. My choice of qualitative methods centered on answering research questions about a socialization process for TAs and providing a *thick description* for the real-world phenomenon of the socialization of graduate students. Geertz's (1973) *thick description* is a thorough explanation of the behavior or phenomenon and the context, so that the person trying to understand can gain meaning from the description (p. 6).

My recruitment process consisted of me giving a presentation on my dissertation topic at two separate instructor meetings (for two different courses) and answering questions by all eight graduate students. When five participants approached me, I emphasized the voluntary nature of being a participant, I asked them to read a detailed informed consent form; I asked them to sign the form; and I asked them to participate during the spring semester in 2007. The names of the participants and references to non-participants included in my study and in this commentary are pseudonyms used to maintain confidentiality.

Data Collection

I used the fieldwork methods: participant observations, conversational interviews, and document collecting. I videotaped classroom practices and interviews in addition to observing and collecting documents. I did not have to gain consent from all in the classroom, because I captured long shots of instruction to blur individual faces. I presented my research topic to the students and assured confidentiality emphasizing that no one would be viewing the tapes and that the tapes would be destroyed after the final report was written. Most of the time, I was an observer only, but several experiences I encountered influenced me to take the observer as participant position, especially when the instructor or a student prompted me to be involved in classroom discussions while I was observing. Similar to Weisz (1989), I collected pre-existing (syllabi) and generated (lesson plans) documents to identify various types of curricula enacted (overt, social, hidden, etc.). I included documents as data alongside the field notes from my observations and the transcriptions of the videotapes of classroom interactions. I mainly relied upon guided conversations/unstructured interviews with the participants during times of discussion. The flow of a conversation between the researcher and participant is guided by some questions or points to cover. The researcher plans to guide the conversation in a certain direction, and to let the conversation evolve and progress overall (Merriam, 1998).

Data Analysis

Each level of analysis required a reworking of the data to recognize emerging and embedded themes that pointed towards the following assertions: (a) the socialization process consisted of pre-packaged instruction; (b) senses of obligation disguised accommodating acts supporting the curriculum, program orientation and the dominant/dominated relationship; (c) a *deficit-model*, *community-of-learners*, and *program ideology* contradicted the social

ideologies of the graduate students; and (d) conflicting ideologies highlighted various kinds of *resistance contradictions* existing in the field. These assertions are understood under a postmodern/critical social theories framework. My understanding of *critical* centered on critiquing social domination and of politicizing social problems (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 52). My main theoretical framework for identifying a type of socialization process contained critical social theories (e.g., Bourdieu's *class habitus* and *symbolic violence*; Marxian theory on human society—*base* and *superstructure*) and Symbolic Interactionist concepts and theories (e.g., Blumer's concept of *accommodation*; Mead's theory of *the nature of the self*). The qualitative research design included the use of constant comparative analysis, critical discourse analysis, and conceptual and theoretical frameworks. My model is explained highlighting the use of an adapted CCA method with conceptual and theoretical frameworks.

A Model: Using CCA with Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks Outside of GT

My Study Is a Naturalistic Inquiry and Not a GT Study

Respectfully, my use of CCA outside of GT centered on avoiding what Glaser explicitly declares to those who have modified the method and GT. Glaser states:

The mixing of QDA [qualitative data analysis] and GT methodologies has the effect of downgrading and eroding the GT goal of conceptual theory. The result is a default remodeling of classic GT into just another QDA method with all is descriptive baggage. (Glaser & Holton, 2007, p. 48)

My intent was to modify the CCA method outside of GT, so as to support a naturalistic inquiry and qualitative analysis. I did not want to follow Strauss and Corbin and Charmaz; who explicitly adapted the CCA method under the frameworks of GT methodology and Constructivism. My use of CCA did not involve the use of classical GT methodology. Having conducted a review of the literature before collecting data, I started to make some connections between my experiences and socialization processes. My use of CCA was to identify and confirm that a socialization process existed and not to identify an emerging substantive theory. Glaser (2007) stated:

Determining a problem on an a priori focus provides for a NI [Naturalist Inquiry] inquiry (1) the boundaries of the study or the proper terrain of the inquiry and (2) determines the inclusion-exclusion criteria for new data. Of course, GT boundary and inclusions are emergent solely on theoretical saturation of categories and their properties, and delimiting tactics for data collection—theoretical sampling and data analysis, theoretical completeness, memo bank saturations, open to selective coding, etc.” (p. 123)

My use of a theoretical framework—it's connected concepts and theories—was developed after a review of the literature. The elements of the framework were used to identify the essential elements of a socialization process that were ever-changing and evolving. My use of CCA was explicitly pragmatic in nature.

A CCA Method Model for a Naturalistic Inquiry

I wrote memos during the data collection process about any and all thoughts and reactions that I experienced with regard to the data daily. My typical interview process

included asking questions about the TAs' experiences and referring to video-taped images of them teaching. After the interview and viewing of the tape, I would return to my journal and write down what I was thinking while I listened to the participant. Also, I compared my experiences with the experiences of the participants to identify what experiences were salient for all of us. Having taught the courses as a TA, my insider position was fraught with strongly held opinions and beliefs. Because of my position and proximity to the participants, I was in a fragile situation of experiencing and seeing social inequalities and using that information for my own benefit, which was to produce a dissertation and expose what I witnessed. In such a position of power and resistance, I needed to be constantly cognizant of my position, privileges, standpoint, and trajectory.

Conceptual frameworks were used as tools to help me maintain the emic perspective (Carspecken 1996; Finley, 1998). My first conceptual framework during data collection consisted of me constantly asking conditional questions about my actions of *position-taking* and *power* and how my actions had *embodied meaning*. My postmodern lens required me to take a *critical* approach and not a *constructivist* approach. "Power will show up when a body posture indicates suppressed or repressed action or indicates an imposed subjective state of some kind" (Carspecken, 1996, p. 126). I was a member of *interactive power relations*; "[these] occur when actors are differentiated in terms of who has most say in determining the course of an interaction and whose definition of the interactive setting holds sway" (Carspecken, 1996, p. 129). Having been a TA, it was too easy to make incorrect assumptions about the experiences of my participants. My conceptual framework forced me to question any assumptions that could have blinded me and prevented me from gaining a full understanding of my participants' experiences as TA's. My use of the conceptual framework consisted of me asking questions before I began collecting data on a daily and weekly basis depending on my data collection schedule for each month. In initial sessions of interviewing, many of the participants were guarded and kept asking whether the coordinator for the course would be reviewing the transcripts. I reiterated my confidentiality protocols. Because of their concern, I asked the participants to be a part of a member-checking process. I understood that I was seen as a student privy to information that could jeopardize the participants' standing as instructors. My member-checking efforts consisted of me taking the time to discuss my field notes from observing and memos about my experiences teaching as a TA with my participants during the interviews and in one-on-one meetings. Participants' comments were used to help me make any necessary changes in my approach to developing and maintaining rapport and to test assumptions I made while collecting data.

My Use of CCA

At the first level of analysis, CCA helped me to focus on identifying whether or not a socialization process even existed. The existence of a socialization process underscored a process of learning to teach a specific way. The socialization process was not just about learning to teach, but involved inculcating specific cultural arbitraries deemed legitimate by a pedagogical authority that being a college of education represented by the people who worked within that institution. Achievement for the TA's centered on acquiring and effectively employing specific instruction practices; many, of which, were prescribed in the curriculum package they received for the courses they taught.

The experiences of Denny, one of the participants, learning how to teach in a specific way offered evidence of social control and a process of inculcation. I reduced the data through constant recoding (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Open coding involved developing categories (Creswell, 2007, p. 64). The emerging themes included: *establishing acceptable practices*, *reproducing acceptable practices*, *acting authoritative*, *acting as a facilitator*, and *using a*

logical framework to teach content. During an instructor meeting, Dr. Alton, the coordinator, directed Denny on making changes to a PowerPoint presentation and directed the TAs on how to use the various slides to discuss conflict theories. Denny's comments about how TAs can offer his or her "two cents" quickly came to mean that suggestions were only taken if Dr. Alton agreed to listen to them. Dr. Alton and Denny were using a logical framework for teaching the content involving lecture, slides, visuals, and a discussion in a specific order. Eventually, after recoding and reducing, some possible core categories stood out (Strauss, 1987). Socialization was one of the categories. Additional categories taken from Spradley's (1979) conceptual framework (pp. 199-201) for identifying forms of social control helped me to test the initial codes, so as to see how else the data could be interpreted. Spradley's codes, *less noticeable practices of social control* and *ways people manage social relationships*, helped me to identify incidents as acts of compliance and accommodation. Denny highlighted that Dr. Alton made suggestions towards him when they were discussing a lecture; such suggestions were symbolic gestures. Denny's agreement with the suggestions highlighted his compliance, which pointed to a process of inculcation. When Denny and Dr. Alton used the PowerPoint presentations, Denny followed the exact logical framework presented in the instructor meetings. Denny's presumed compliance rested on his *reproducing acceptable practices* as directed by Dr. Alton.

At this point, I refer back to a few theories that I came upon in my review of the literature to gain a better understanding of the patterns I was seeing in the data. According to Bourdieu (1991), a person acquires a set of dispositions which literally mold the body and become second nature through mundane processes of training and learning, similar to learning and inculcating table manners (p. 12). Denny's inculcation underscores the difference among teaching, socializing, and inculcating.

The experiences of Katrina, another participant, offered examples of accommodation and socialization in contrast to Denny's process of inculcation. At the beginning, her actions supported the codes *establishing acceptable practices* and *using a logical framework to teach content*. Initially, Katrina decided not to use the prescribed Feinburg textbook (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004) and prepackaged instruction as directed by Dr. Alton. She stated that Dr. Alton agreed to such changes. She felt the textbook did not offer adequate definitions of Marxian and other theories and it was not engaging the students. She felt the activities should complement the text she was offering. These actions supported Spradley's *the ways people solve problems* code. She was taking a position due to her struggle with teaching the course in a specific way. She attended the instructor meetings and as time passed her instruction changed. She was called into a meeting with Dr. Alton, which concerned her original efforts to go outside of the box while teaching and comments made by students. A number of students in her classroom were contacting Dr. Alton and asking why their assignments and readings were different than the assignments and readings in the other course sections. After her meeting with Dr. Alton, it became more obvious that she was incorporating the texts and activities that Dr. Alton discussed in the instructor meetings, but she rarely used such materials in the same order as Dr. Alton. With each passing week, she began to incorporate elements from Dr. Alton's presentations and began to follow his directives. Later data showed evidence that her actions supported the code *reproducing acceptable practices*. In February, she started the first week lecturing, but incorporated Dr. Alton's *artifact activity* and other activities. In April she began to include further activities, PowerPoint slides, and a video as directed by Dr. Alton. Also, she followed much of the logical framework to teach just as Dr. Alton did. I further compared the data supporting the four codes, *using a logical framework to teach content*, *establishing acceptable practices*, *reproducing acceptable practices* and *less noticeable practices of social control* with the definition of accommodation to confirm that

Katrina's experiences offered examples of accommodation. The evidence supporting these codes highlighted acts of accommodation as a form of social control.

My use of CCA to identify that a socialization process existed emphasizes the concrete experiences of the participants. From the emic perspective, Denny's and Katrina's experiences over time offer examples of inculcation and accommodation as essential elements of a socialization process. My maintenance of the emic perspective consists of allowing codes to emerge, using codes of social control in comparison with the emerging codes, and the use of conceptual frameworks to keep myself focused at the concrete level.

One overarching theme at the second level was *carrying out practices with proficiency*. This theme seemed to confirm the program orientation and the pre-packaged instruction, which was used as a tool to foster acts of proficiency and efficiency in instructing in a specific way. Overall, this code pointed towards acts of accommodation. The videotape transcriptions were taken apart and sections were organized by a change in situation. Each change in situation was coded, included with the rest of the data, and organized under overarching codes. The change from one incident to the next was not seen until the tapes were re-viewed after transcribing. The introduction of an incident included the instructor changing instructional strategies, the students and instructor beginning an impromptu discussion, the instructor and students beginning an activity and other changes in practices. The experiences of Katrina and Neal, another participant, are highlighted.

Katrina's logical framework for teaching content was a repeated line of actions. As observed in videotapes, Katrina summarized previously discussed concepts and lectured on new concepts. Then, she discussed the readings for that day and followed up with an activity or video. Soon, she began to incorporate activities and videos that Dr. Alton discussed in the weekly instructor meetings. Katrina became more efficient at instructing with each passing week. These texts supported the theme, *carrying out practices with proficiency*. I compared the incidents to distinguish which ones were examples of accommodation. At this point, I recognized Katrina's actions of carrying out Dr. Alton's instructions, suggestions, and including his discussed activities and videos as accommodating Dr. Alton.

Neal emphasized the Black perspective as part of efforts using the curriculum to foster an understanding of others. Also, his emphasis on the Black perspective supported his civic responsibility to teach the PT's to understand others and instill a sense of obligation to break down discrimination. His efforts to maintain a racial ideology amounted to a form of "strategic compliance" (Lacey, 1977, p. 14). I referred back to this theory, which I came upon in my review of the literature, to understand why strategic compliance was required. It was required because of the restrictions of the curriculum and program orientation and his dominated position. Neal stated that he followed the directives of Dr. Alton. Neal's acts of accommodation involved strategic compliance, which contrasted with Katrina's acts of accommodation. But both misrecognized that they accommodated to maintain a good standing as an instructor.

Bourdieu's (1991) statement on the arbitrariness of the social structure emphasizes how obligation is a sign of the exercise of power through misrecognition, he states:

The terms recognition and misrecognition play an important role here: they underscore the fact that the exercise of power through symbolic exchange always rests on a foundation of shared belief... They recognize or tacitly acknowledge the legitimacy of power, or of the hierarchical relations of power in which they are embedded; and hence they fail to see that the hierarchy is, after all, an arbitrary social construction which serves the interests of some groups more than others... it presupposes a kind of *active complicity* on the part of those subjected to it. (Italics in original, p. 23)

Hence, the TAs' accommodating acts highlight their dominated position and work to legitimate a pedagogical authority and give legitimacy to Dr. Alton's efforts toward teaching the course in a specific way. Their sense of obligation was what disguises this actuality, thereby misrecognizing the accommodating acts. The use of Bourdieu's critical social theory in my theoretical framework guided me through a process of social control.

Neal explicitly recognized that he was accommodating expected instruction practices while maintaining a racial ideology by emphasizing the Black perspective. By accommodating he was able to maintain his good standing as an instructor. Neal recognized how he had to "cross that border" every time he entered the classroom. He stated:

The students aren't that diverse racially, most of the students are white, middle-class women, so I tried it different ways and I always get the confused look, that look, what is he talking about (laughs), and I've kind of become more structured in the way I teach it so.

Because of the "confused look," Neal's reaction to "become more structured" meant he was accommodating ideological restrictions and supported the *less noticeable practices of social control* code. In comparison with other incidents, data also supported the *ways people solve problems* code. He adapted by instructing differently and my observations offered evidence of his acts of accommodation and strategic compliance. The result was that he used Dr. Alton's logical framework for teaching, the materials passed out at instructor meetings, and the activities as directed by Dr. Alton. Neal's actions supported the *reproducing acceptable practices* code.

My use of CCA and the conceptual frameworks helps me focus at the concrete level and maintain an emic perspective. I piece together incidents using the codes to see how acts of accommodation vary for each of the participants. I am able to identify what the socialization process looks like and how it progresses based on the experiences of each participant. At this point, I see lines of social action. I complete my use of CCA at the second level of analysis involving verbatim transcripts. I am at the point where I need to continue my focus on the theories as comparisons during the third level of analysis. The third level of analysis requires me to maintain the etic perspective to understand the social significance of all of these lines of actions. At the level of abstraction, I recognize an ideological structure at play.

My Use of a Theoretical Framework

From a review of the literature, I integrated the sensitizing constructs of *struggle* (*symbolic violence*), *resistance*, *accommodation*, and *mediation* (*social action*) into a theoretical framework on social reproduction. I took from Bourdieu (1993) notions that struggle is conflict and *position-taking* involving the use of strategies; where what is *at stake* is the power to impose certain beliefs and practices. Bourdieu (2000) claims that resistance can be understood as a group mobilizing through "discordant" behavior "to favor or to prevent" (p. 235) structural transformations. Such discordant behaviors are human actions that occur within margins of freedom (p. 234). Bourdieu's idea of discordant behaviors extends from Weber's (1978) theory of social action. Weber underscores that all human behavior, as social actions, are given subjective meanings by the acting individuals in the context of a situation. An individual accounts for the behavior of others and orients his/her actions accordingly (p. 4). Such behavior entails acts of mediation and accommodation. Blumer's (1969) Symbolic Interactionist theories of accommodation explain that during social

interactions, actors are constructing actions based on their interpretations of the situation. Accommodation is maintaining a balance within a situation. The act of compromising is a concession; whereas accommodating as social action emphasizes the process of continued adaptation and adjustment as situations change and progress.

My use of a theoretical framework to further identify the essential elements of the socialization process requires me to maintain an etic perspective and a focus at a level of abstraction. In the first and second levels, some of the essential elements identified include the pre-packaged instruction, a dominant/dominated relationship between the coordinators and TAs, the program orientation, the curriculum as an ideological tool, and misrecognized acts of accommodation. I end my use of CCA and moved to the use of the critical discourse analysis (CDA) method. My purpose for using CDA is to gain a discursive understanding of the social actions of the participants. As Mills, Chapman and Bonner's (2007) discuss, CCA can be used with a Symbolic Interactionist methodology to guide an analysis of social actions. I am not exclusively focusing on social actions, but discourses that manifest through social actions. CDA allows me to abstract from the data and to identify the macro level processes. I transition from the emic to the etic to understand the social practices of the TAs as a social group.

I used Fairclough's (2000) conceptual framework and his use of CDA for identifying social control through the classification of social practices. His framework and use of CDA helped me to better identify a process of social production in a "transdisciplinary way" (p. 166). "The great strength of the concept of practice is that it allows analysis of social structures to be brought into connection with analysis of social (inter)action" (p. 167). To complete Fairclough's first CDA step, I used CCA to approach each incident as a text from a genre-specific understanding of the function of the parts of an incident. Understanding each piece of an incident as text can highlight how to frame such pieces as a whole text or line of actions. At the second step, I began framing the elements of the incidents and, then chaining the incidents as a whole text, so as to see what "process of production," or control of action and interaction, was occurring. I compared codes as they developed with the constructs in my conceptual framework to identify examples of social control. At the third step, I looked for evidence of emphasized perspectives or "selling," information and practices that pointed to "asymmetrical relations," and "omitted information" and practices (Fairclough, 2000, pp. 178-179).

My final level of analysis shows how a *deficit-model*, *community-of-learners*, and *program ideology* contradicted the social ideologies of the graduate students. The *community-of-learners ideology* excerpt shows an example of how Lena, one of the TA's, recognizes specific beliefs that conflict with her own beliefs and how she accommodates and mediates. At this level, it is crucial to maintain an etic perspective and an outsider understanding, because Lena's experiences are about her being an outsider and seeing what others cannot see because of their insider position.

As an immigrant and English Language Learner (ELL), many of Lena's comments in the interviews highlighted her struggle with the community-of-learners ideology existing in a bilingual education course. Much of her early childhood, schooling experiences started out with incidents of being "baby sat" by teachers. Later experiences involved "discipline," "training" and "no choice" but to study specific subjects like history and to prepare to "become a teacher" as a female. I inferred that she had developed an aversion towards being a member of a community. Her instructional practices highlighted her accommodating acts, but a closer look, showed signs of her limitations during instruction. Her obligation to help the PT's learn to teach ELLs was conflicted by the fact that she noticed how a sense of community was imposed upon them, but her obligation disguised her efforts to stay in good standing as an instructor. Lena resisted reconciling her ideologies during the socialization

process. Her conflict was with the community-of-learners ideology and its requirement highlighted in the syllabus, the directives in the course, and in her own doctoral program: *to develop and become a member of a specific community of learners*.

Lena accommodated by following the directives from the coordinator of the bilingual education course as presented in instructor meetings. Her actions were similar to Neal's actions of accommodation in that lines of her actions were consistent and supported the codes, *reproducing acceptable practices* and *using a logical framework to teach*. She used the same materials, activities and instructional strategies as the coordinator had directed and in the order that the coordinator discussed. What stood out in the video tapes was her attitude while following through with the lesson plans. She seemed to be *going through the motions*. When I asked her about my focus on a possible socialization process and her instruction in the course, she became upset:

There is one problem in a community of learners, you are learning to become somebody, you are learning something so, this whole socialization issue, the point is to make you to become somebody, well, what if I don't want to become that somebody? What if I don't want to take on that thinking and doing and something that is required of that community? The problem with a community is that you cannot be allowed to be there and not be a part, and then you are excluded. If this approach is being used in the classroom or a teacher preparation program, basically, you have no choice.

Comments like: "learning to become somebody," "make you to become somebody," "what if I don't want to," "not allowed to be there and be a part," and "no choice;" were listed under the early code, *less noticeable practices of social control*. I looked for a perspective being emphasized that required an individual to take a dominated position as a TA. A sense of community was consistently emphasized. The construct mediation pointed to the dissemination of this perspective—the syllabus and the activities used in the classroom. I reviewed Lena's early discussion of experiences she had attending school to gain her understanding of the concept of "community." Her inability to reconcile the community-of-learners' ideology with her own ideology highlighted the limitations of her sense of obligation to help the PT's understand how to better teach ELLs.

As I moved to the second level of analysis, several comments from Lena pointed to what others thought of Lena's situation as an instructor and graduate student. One comment from Lena stood out. She discussed a conversation she had with another graduate student/instructor teaching the course. Lena stated:

...it was kind of fashionable to talk about conservative attitudes of students, who are all white, middle-class and English-Only and against Spanish and all of that. I thought I was trying to say that sometimes they can have a point in some things they say and it's not necessarily how you see it. Finally, one of my colleagues said "yeah you know what, you don't have a stake there, but me, so and so is my advisor and I'm doing my dissertation on such and such and the people on my committee—I really feel that I have a stake in it.

Lena's comment highlighted a conflicting perspective and position-taking occurring. The construct of resistance highlighted that the community-of-learners ideology was imposing a specific belief upon the PT's and this belief was disseminated through the syllabus directives, the assignments and classroom activities.

Her comment sparked further interest, I referred back to several memos I had written during the data collection process. In several memos written after interviewing Lena, I wrote about my experiences teaching the same course. As a TA, I was explicitly teaching the PT's to question inequalities as directed by the coordinator in instructor meetings. When the PT's tested and resisted my instruction, I mediated and resisted their attempts. My experience in the struggle entailed having a stake. As an instructor, I was even told that I must maintain the "community" in the classroom and was given instructions on how to do so. These instructions involved implementing teamwork activities. At times, I witnessed how the community-of-learners ideology worked to stop resistance by reinforcing specific ways of thinking and acting as a group of PT's. At the time, my stake in the struggle was about the power to impose particular beliefs. The use of "community" in the classroom helped my position-taking work more smoothly.

The comment, "you don't have a stake there" by the graduate TA to Lena, highlighted the struggle and referred to the TA's sense of obligation to maintain the community-of-learners ideology. The TA's comments alluded to possible disguised acts of accommodating and a process of indoctrination, as well. The TA was telling Lena that Lena did not have the same obligation, nor should she. The comments, "my advisor," "people on my committee," and "I really feel that I have a stake in it," highlighted "asymmetrical relations" and the dominant/dominated relationship between graduates and professors. This TA tacitly acknowledged the ideology and appropriated it.

Discussions on moral education and indoctrination include comments about how "community influence" and community ideologies maintain some kinds of indoctrination or acculturation" (Mesa, 2003, p. 81). My use of a conceptual framework helps me to better understand my experiences, so as to be able to recognize similarities in my instruction and Lena's instruction. Having a similar struggle as Lena with the community-of-learners ideology shows a pattern at the concrete level. I maintain an etic perspective through the use of a theoretical framework to identify that the patterns of social actions are discursive in nature and point to an ideology.

Lena pointed out the conflict between the PT's and the instructors. She stated:

The problem was you were indoctrinated into that community and you have this whole idea that it's us and them with your students. You are an instructor, technically when someone stresses an opinion that isn't your opinion they become "them." As an instructor you are basically putting those students who do not agree with your opinion into a very bad position with all the power you have, to decide who says what, whose opinion is listened to, you're cutting those people out.

Lena's identity as an immigrant and ELL put her in a marginalized position that allowed her to see how others were indoctrinated. This imposition played out in "us and them" situations. As C. Wright Mills (1959) stated, she was a spectator. He wrote:

What ordinary men [sic.] are directly aware of and what they try to do are bounded by the private orbits in which they live; their visions and their powers are limited to the close-up scenes of jobs, family, neighborhood; in other milieu, they move vicariously and remain spectators. (p. 9)

The TA's act of telling Lena that Lena "didn't have a stake" in the issue was the TA's attempt to point out Lena's spectator position without realizing it. As an immigrant, Lena's position allowed her to see what the TA did not recognize or misrecognized. Lena was able to see that

the “stake” for the TA was the ability to impose a belief and involved supporting the community-of-learner ideology. Lena ended by saying:

I’ve lived in a country with similar attitudes and I know what the consequences can be and this is a free country and I’m entitled to think what I want and I want that for my students. I don’t want to be put in this situation.

Her comment, her teaching practices equaling a lack of enforcing the ideology and compliance, her aversion to the ideology, and expressing herself in a marginalized position amounted to a resistance of a dominant ideology that was disseminated in syllabus statements and verbal directives of acceptable practices in instructor meetings and her doctoral program.

I use CCA to allow codes to emerge, I use established codes (e.g. social control) in comparison with emerging codes to test an alternative way of viewing data, and I use conceptual frameworks to stay focused at the concrete level. Using CCA helps me to piece together incidents, which require me to maintain an emic perspective and a focus at the concrete level. My need to end my use of CCA and use CDA centers on gaining a discursive understanding of social actions. This requires me to abstract from the data to see the evidence of social processes. The use of a theoretical framework requires me to maintain an etic perspective, a distance and an outsider position. From an etic perspective, I am able to see what I can of the socialization process that the participants and I experienced because I become a spectator during the process (just as Lena was). The strengths of CCA helps me to maintain an emic perspective when needed; whereas, a theoretical framework helps me to maintain an etic perspective when needed, as well.

The Abductive Process

My moments of deduction through the use of conceptual frameworks are an abductive process of analyzing the data. O’Connor et al.’s (2008) statements underscore that a researcher’s decision to use the CCA method in a specific way limits what methodology can guide the use of the method. Kelle (2005) states:

Deductive reasoning is the application of general *rules* to specific *cases* to infer a result...by induction one generalizes from a number of cases where a certain result is observed, and infers to general rule, claiming that these results can be observed in all cases of a class which the observed cases belong to. Often such an “abductive” inference (cf. Reichertz 2003) starts by a surprising, anomalous event which cannot be explained on the basis of previous knowledge.... (para. 28-30)

My abductive process, indicative of processes that many qualitative researchers use, allows the researcher to use disconfirming evidence to constantly test categories and assertions made and to enforce reflexivity. As Charmaz (2006) points out, “Abductive inference entails considering all possible theoretical explanations for the data, forming hypotheses for each possible explanation, checking them empirically by examining data, and pursuing the most plausible explanation” (p. 188). The abduction process underscores the connection between the logic of discovery and the logic of validation. My use of an abductive process allows me to use the CCA method to maintain the emic perspective and, then, move to the use of a theoretical framework to maintain the etic perspective. The abductive process limits disruption of the logic of discovery (e.g., the process of identifying a socialization process at the concrete level) and strengthens the logic of validation (e.g. using theories and constructs

to test emergent codes at the abstract level) (See Wilson & Chaddha, 2010). My use of the CCA method within a process of abduction is easily guided by a methodology of naturalistic inquiry as Blumer (1969) intends it—through exploration and inspection (pp. 39-47). My process of exploration consists of a review of the literature and the use of naturalistic methods of interviewing and observation. My process of inspection consists of concept construction, via a constant comparison of emergent codes, and the development of a logic of relationship among the concepts (See Athens, 2010), which help to strengthen the logic of validation process.

Conclusion

My interest in the use of the CCA method outside of GT is grounded in the discovery of few articles on such a matter. Originally, I inquired about the benefits of using the CCA method outside of GT. This inquiry has led me to develop a CCA method model for naturalistic inquiry. The purpose was to show the strength of using CCA to maintain the emic perspective and how theoretical frameworks maintain the etic perspective throughout the analysis. Through a process of abduction within a naturalistic inquiry of exploration and inspection, my adaptation and use of the CCA method allows me to focus at the concrete level and maintain an emic perspective, so as to be able to use CDA method to gain a discursive understanding of social actions at a level of abstraction. My use of a theoretical framework to abstract and maintain an etic perspective allows me to see a socialization process developing in its natural setting. My CCA method model for a naturalistic inquiry consists of an adapted CCA method involving open coding, axial coding, member checking, selective coding and the use of conceptual frameworks throughout the abduction process. By approaching the data in this way, I am able to use CDA and theoretical frameworks to maintain an etic perspective and identify the essential elements of a socialization process. All of this is done outside of the GT methodology.

As a novice researcher at the time, the need to use a theoretical framework, in moments of deduction, was essential for answering my research questions. My use of conceptual frameworks were influenced by Corbin and Strauss' (1990, 1998) ideas structuring their coding paradigm. I recognized that conditions and consequences work in clusters and exist in contexts; that micro and macro conditions exist simultaneously and can be hidden; and that actions/interactions exist for individuals and groups. The new knowledge I gained from using an adapted form of the CCA method consists of understanding how to integrate conceptual frameworks and theoretical frameworks into the process of using the CCA method. My experience tested Corbin and Strauss' (2008) examples of when to use a theoretical framework. My use of CCA tested the adaptability of the method for future use in maintaining an emic perspective as a researcher. As a more experienced researcher now, I continue to espouse the use of CCA at the early stages of a research project to identify patterns in the data and to organize large amounts of data so as to abstract categories. CCA is not an easy method. It can help novice researchers to develop an ability to systematically organize and reduce data. I suggest using theoretical frameworks exclusively as tools for comparing, confirming and identifying.

Further inquiry into the adaptability of the CCA method needs to occur to foster innovation in qualitative research. I present a call to action to qualitative researchers to further investigate the use of the CCA method outside of GT as a part of the tradition of innovation in qualitative research. Such continued efforts towards innovation in research can only offer us newer and better ways to use the CCA method under the guidance of other methodologies besides GT, Constructivism and Symbolic Interactionism.

References

- Allan, G. (2007, December). The use of the grounded theory methodology in investigating practitioners' integration of COTS components in information systems, *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Information Systems*. Montre´al, Que´bec, Canada.
- Anfara, V. A., Jr., & Mertz, N. T. (Eds.) (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Athens, L. (2010). Naturalistic inquiry in theory and practice. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 39(1), 87-125.
- Autry, C. E., & Anderson, S. C. (2007). Recreation and the Glenview neighborhood: Implications for youth and community development. *Leisure Sciences*, 29(3), 267-285.
- Bencze, J. L., & Bowen, G. M. (2009). A National Science Fair: Exhibiting support for the knowledge economy. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31(18), 2459-2483.
- Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory. *American Sociological Review*, 18, 3-10.
- Blumer, G. H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality & Quantity*, 36, 391-409.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (Eds.) (2007). *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory*. London: Sage.
- Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 509-536). Sage: London.
- Charmaz, K. (2001). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 675-694). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.
- Chenoweth, E. (2009). Becoming ambassadors of informal learning: Docents' development within a museum community of practice. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70/11. UMI: 3378811
- Clarke, A. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1990). Anchored instruction and its relationship to situated cognition. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-10.
- Corbin, J. (1998). Alternative interpretations: Valid or not? *Theory & Psychology*, 8(1), 121-128.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21.

- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport Education and Society*, 13(1), 97-117.
- Dick, B. (2005). Grounded theory: A thumbnail sketch. Retrieved from <http://www.aral.com.au/resources/grounded.html>
- Elliott, N., & Jordan, J. (2010). Practical strategies to avoid the pitfalls in grounded theory research. *Nurse Researcher*, 17(4), 29-40.
- Erickson, F. (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 163-195.
- Feinberg, W., & Soltis, J. F. (2004). *School and society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fendt, J., & Sachs, W. (2008). Grounded theory method in management research: Users' Perspectives. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3), 430-455.
- Finley, S. (1998). Teacher education faculty as researchers: Composing lives in context, a blend of form and content. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(07), 2439. (UMI No. 9840534)
- Fram, S. (2008). "Look, it takes practices": The socialization of graduate students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(04). (UMI: 3311749)
- Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method*. Routledge: London.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1983). "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological knowledge. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology* (pp. 55-70). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12(4), 436-445.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (2007). Naturalist inquiry and grounded theory. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*. Supplement, No. 19, pp. 114-132.
- Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2007). Remodeling grounded theory. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*. Supplement, No. 19, pp. 47-68.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Haney, J. J., & McArthur, J. (2002). Four case studies of prospective science teachers' beliefs concerning constructivist teaching practices. *Science Education*, 86(6), 783-802.

- Hataway, C. J., Jr. (2010). International organizations and multicultural workforces: An examination of group muting and organizational culture. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 71(07). (UMI No. 3409023)
- Heydon, R., & Hibbert, K. (2010). "Relocating the personal" to engender critically reflective practice in pre-service literacy teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 796-804.
- Holton, J. A. (2007). The coding process and its challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 265-289). London: Sage.
- Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kelle, U. (2005). "Emergence" vs. "forcing" of empirical data? A crucial problem of "grounded theory" reconsidered. *Forum, Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), #27.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge UP.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maloch, B. (2008). Beyond exposure: The uses of informational texts in a second grade classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 42(3), 315-362.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mesa, J. A. (2003). Reassessing moral education from the perspective of the predicament between the individual and the community. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(12): 4257. (UMI No. 3074310)
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination* (P. Clinquart, Trans.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a constructivist approach to grounded theory: Implications for research design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 12(1), 8-13.
- Mills, J., Chapman, Y., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2007). Grounded theory: A methodological spiral from positivism to postmodernism. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 58(1), 72-79.
- Mishna, F., Newman, P. A., Daley, A., & Solomon, S. (2009). Bullying of lesbian and gay youth: A qualitative investigation. *British Journal of Social Work*, 39(8), 1598-1614.
- O'Connor, M. K., Netting, F. E., & Thomas, M. L. (2008). Grounded theory: Managing the challenge for those facing institutional review board oversight. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(1), 28-45.
- Palmer, D. (2010). Teaching with technology: A multiple-case study of teachers' perspectives on the use of technology-based instruction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 71(03). (UMI No. 3396559)
- Piaget, J. (1975). *L'équilibration des structures cognitives*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Pignato, J. M. (2010). An analysis of practical challenges posed by teaching improvisation: Case studies in New York State schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 71(12). (UMI No. 3430429)
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton.
- Randolph, B. L. (2010). Reculturing: changing the culture of practice. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 71(03). (UMI No: 3399310)

- Reed, A. (2008). "I won't think about it the same way again": Critical literacy as an anti-bullying tool in the middle school setting. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(09), p. 3770. (UMI No: 3278253)
- Reichertz, J. (2003). *Die Abduktion in der qualitativen Sozialforschung*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Sawey, A. (2011). The lived experience of in-service science teachers building a community of practice during a long-term professional development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 71(06). (UMI No. 3449517)
- Schwandt, T. D. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructivism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 189-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, K. W. (2004). Relating categories in grounded theory analysis: Using a conditional relationship guide and reflective coding matrix. *The Qualitative Report*, 9(1), 113-126. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR9-1/wilsonscott.pdf>
- Scott, K. W., & Howell, D. (2008). Clarifying analysis and interpretation in grounded theory: Using a conditional relationship guide and reflective coding matrix. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(2), 1-15.
- Scribner, J. P., Sawyer, R. K., Watson, S. T., & Myers, V. L. (2007). Teacher teams and distributed leadership: A study of group discourse and collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 67-100.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stillman, J. (2011). Teacher learning in an era of high-stakes accountability: Productive tension and critical professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 113(1), 133-180.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss A. L. (1993). *Continual permutations of action*. New York, NY: Aldine DeGruyter.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tan, J. (2010). Grounded theory in practice: issues and discussion for new qualitative researchers. *Journal of Documentation*, 66(1), 93-112.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In *Mind and society* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*, 2 vols (G. Roth and C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weisz, E. (1989). A view of curriculum as opportunities to learn: An examination of curriculum enactment. *Education*, 110(2), 155-162.
- Wiles, R., Pain, H., & Crow, G. (2010). *Innovation in qualitative research methods: A narrative review*. National Centre for Research Methods, University of Southampton: UK.
- Wilson, W. J., & A. Chaddha. (2010). The role of theory in ethnographic research. *Ethnography*, 10(4): 549-564.
- Yamamoto, J. K. (2010). The role of emotion in secondary school leadership: A qualitative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 71(10). (UMI No. 3424647)
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Author Note

Sheila Fram graduated from Arizona State University in 2008 with a PhD in Education. She, currently, is working as an Independent researcher and consultant. Her research expertise includes the examination of collection and analysis methods in qualitative and mixed methods research. She also critically examines educational built environments and how they impact teaching and learning processes. She can be reached at smfram@gmail.com.

Copyright 2013: Sheila M. Fram and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Fram, S. M. (2013). The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(Art. 1), 1-25. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/fram1.pdf>