Grounded Theory: A methodological spiral between modernism and postmodernism

Abstract

Aim: Our aim in this paper is to explain a methodological/methods package devised to incorporate situational and social world mapping with frame analysis, based on a grounded theory study of Australian rural nurses' experiences of mentoring.

Background: Situational analysis, as conceived by Adele Clarke, is designed to move the research methodology of grounded theory away from its traditional postpositivist roots and around the postmodern turn. Clarke uses three types of maps during this process: situational, social world and positional, in combination with discourse analysis.

Method: During this grounded theory study, the process of concurrent interview data generation and analysis incorporated situational and social world mapping techniques. An outcome of this was our increased awareness of how outside actors influenced participants in their constructions of mentoring.

In our attempts to use Clarke's methodological package, however, it became apparent that our constructivist beliefs about human agency could not be reconciled with the postmodern project of discourse analysis. We then turned to the literature of symbolic interactionism and adopted frame analysis as a method to examine the literature regarding rural nursing and mentoring as secondary form of data.

Findings While we found situational and social world mapping very useful, we were less successful in using positional maps. In retrospect we would now argue that collective action framing provides an alternative to analyzing such positions in the literature. This is particularly so for researchers who locate themselves within a constructivist paradigm, and who are therefore unwilling to reject the notion of human agency and the ability for individuals to shape their world in some way.

Conclusion: Our example of using this package of situational and social worlds mapping with frame analysis is intended to assist other researchers to locate participants more transparently in the social worlds that they negotiate in their everyday practice.

Keywords

Summary Statement

What is already known on this topic

- Nurses commonly use grounded theory as a research methodology/methods package

- Traditional grounded theory is positivistic/post positivistic in intent

What is this paper adds

- A problematisation of grounded theory using situational analysis drawing on the experiences of

  an empirical research project

- A modified constructivist grounded theory methodological/methods package that combines

  situational analysis mapping techniques and frame analysis

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Grounded theory can be conceptualized as a series of variants reflecting a multiplicity of ontological and epistemological underpinnings. 'The form of grounded theory followed depends on a clarification of the nature of the relationship between researcher and participant, and on an explication of the field of what can be known' (Mills et al. 2006b).

This paper is based on our experience of undertaking a constructivist – omit? All GT is constructivist? No, there are some very strong arguments in the literature debating the possibility of grounded theory underpinned by constructivism, particularly from Glaser and his advocates grounded theory study about Australian Rural Nurses' experiences of mentoring (place for a ref. if we get a paper accepted soon enough), although it is not a data-based research report. Rather, it is a reflexive research adventure story (Clarke, personal correspondence) about reconciling our ontological and epistemological beliefs with the methodology/methods package used.

Initially the development of constructivist grounded theory is traced and Clarke's grounded theory methodology/methods package – situational analysis is outlined. We then problematise situational analysis in relation to a constructivist paradigm of inquiry where humans are recognised as having agency to construct and reconstruct their own realities while influenced by discourse and context. As an alternative to rejecting situational analysis in it entirety, however, we believe that the situational and social worlds mapping techniques described by Clarke are very useful in conceptualising the ways in which grounded theory codes can fit together. It was Clarke's use of discourse analysis as a strategy to examine these maps that provided us as constructivist researchers with an epistemological conundrum.

We believe that the situational and social worlds mapping techniques described by Clarke are very useful in conceptualizing the ways in which grounded theory codes can fit together. Nevertheless, it was Clarke's use of discourse analysis as a strategy to move away from a constructivist epistemology towards postmodernist thoughts provided us with a conundrum.

In an attempt to solve this challenge, we returned to one of the philosophical roots of grounded theory, symbolic interactionism, to find an alternative analytical heuristic – frame analysis. Situational and most importantly social world mapping are further explicated through a discussion about Strauss' theory of social worlds (1993), Goffman's theory of frame analysis (1974) and Benford and Snow's theory of collective frame analysis (2000). Finally, we illustrate the possibilities of a methodological/methods package, incorporating situational and social worlds mapping and collective frame analysis, by using our own experiences as an example.

BACKGROUND: OUR EMPIRICAL STUDY

Aim
The aim of the study was to examine how Australian rural nurses construct their experiences of mentoring. The specific objectives were:

1. To explore and co-construct, through interview, participants' experiences of mentoring in relation to their rural nursing practice.

2. To locate rural nurses' co-constructions of mentoring in the wider context of their social world

3. To construct a grounded theory of Australian rural nurses experiences of mentoring reflective of both context and process.

Participants

Nine rural nurses from five of the seven states of Australia and ranging in experience from 7-32 years participated in the study.

Data Collection

Eleven interviews were conducted in 2004/2005. Nine of these interviews were face-to-face, while two participants chose to be interviewed using the telephone. The literature about the problem of workforce for Australian rural nurses was also analysed as a secondary form of data (Mills et al. 2006c). Data sources included journal databases, newspapers, newsletters and websites. Both electronic and hand searching was used. We limited the years searched from 2000 to 2005. In 2000 the Australian government released a key report entitled *Rethinking Nursing* (National Nursing Workforce Forum 2000). Prior to the publication of this document, the federal government in Australia had abrogated responsibility for nursing to individual state governments. This is a key moment for Australian rural nurses and as such is a worthy point to begin our analysis.

Data Analysis

Consistent with accepted grounded theory methods, concurrent data generation and analysis, and the constant comparison of data-to-data, data-to-categories and category-to-category occurred. Theoretical sampling began after four interviews had been conducted. Due to the focused area of interest in this study, theoretical saturation was achieved after a total of nine interviews had been conducted and analysed, together with the collective frame analysis of the rural nursing and mentoring literature as a secondary source of data.

CONSTRUCTIVIST GROUNDED THEORY

Anselm Strauss and Barney Glaser (1967) conceptualized the original form of grounded theory, a form we call traditional grounded theory, which anchors our metaphor of a methodological spiral. Traditional grounded theory is positivistic/post positivistic in intent (Lincoln and Guba 2005 p.193-196), with researchers believing that theory will emerge from the data that they collect. They have an unswerving faith in the notion of a truth waiting to be uncovered. This form of grounded theory is also known as Glaserian grounded theory (Cutcliffe 2005) in recognition of the ontological and epistemological position of one of its forefathers, Barney Glaser.

Soon after the 1967 publication of the seminal text *Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Glaser and Strauss' paths diverged, with Strauss pursuing forms of grounded theory that corresponded with his central concern that action is at the heart of both process and structure (Corbin 1991). Key to Strauss moving grounded theory around another methodological turn was his assumption that there

is no one truth but that 'the external world is a symbolic representation, a "symbolic universe." Both this and the interior worlds are created and re-created through interaction. In effect there is no divide between external and interior world' (Strauss 1993 p.27). Strauss' history as a relativist, pragmatist and symbolic interactionist shaped his agenda for evolving grounded theory, as a methodology and as a method, in particular with the development of the conditional matrix as a way of situating action at the centre of his analyses.

Conditional matrixes trace, through the researcher's reconstructions, the conditional paths that shape the action apparent in the data being analyzed (Strauss and Corbin 1990). Using such an analytical tool clearly positions the researcher as an author we do not use footnotes. If the material is essential, include it in the main text I removed them who reconstructs meaning in the research process, because 'the very natures of the matrix and their paths are opaque until the researcher, with due concern for data, give them meaning and specificity' (Corbin and Strauss 1993 p. 65).

Constructivist grounded theory reflects the basic beliefs of constructivism as a paradigm of inquiry. Ontologically relativist, epistemologically transactional, methodologically dialectical, the researcher is a '"passionate participant" as facilitator of multi-voice reconstruction' (Lincoln and Guba 2005 p.196). We believe that constructivist grounded theory has its roots in the work of Anselm Strauss and has evolved through his work with Juliet Corbin, exemplified by their use of techniques to enhance theoretical sensitivity, the treatment of the literature as additional source of data, axial coding, the conditional/consequential matrix, complex diagramming and the use of a storyline to identify the core category. Each one of which works to construct and reconstruct the data generated with participants, as opposed to uncovering an emergent truth in traditional grounded theory (Mills et al. 2006b).

Charmaz was the first researcher to explicitly name her work constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006, Charmaz 2005, Charmaz 2000, Charmaz 1995b, Charmaz 1995a, Charmaz 1994), while resituating the researcher in relation to participants and rethinking the role of the researcher as author. Charmaz began by engaging with what she sees as a postmodern critique of traditional grounded theory by making a case for a form of constructivist grounded theory that is situated somewhere between positivism and postmodernism. She argues that taking a constructivist approach to the 'interactive nature of both data collection and analysis, resolves the criticisms of the method, and reconciles positivist assumptions and postmodernist critiques' (Charmaz 1995a p.62).

Unwilling to abandon realism totally and so move towards the 'vertigo of relativity' (Berger and Luckmann 1967 p.5), Charmaz, at this time, stood on the brink of the postmodern turn – in many ways living out a postmodern position with its 'shifted emphases to localities, partialities, positionalities, complications, tenuousness, instabilities, irregularities, contradictions, heterogeneities, situatedness, and fragmentation – complexities' (Clarke 2003 p.555), and yet reluctant to name it as such. Focusing on the nature of the relationship between interviewer and participant, how the researcher composes their reconstructions of data into a multi-vocal story that is resonant of participants' voices and aiming 'to get at meaning, not at truth' (Charmaz 2000 p.526). This positions Charmaz's form of constructivist grounded theory much closer ontologically and epistemologically to postmodernism than postpositivism.

A possible explanation for her not taking a clearer position initially could be that as a pragmatist she attached less importance to arguing the why, instead focusing on the how of undertaking grounded

theory research – while at the same time feeling compelled to engage in contemporary debate. Ten years after hovering between postmodernism and post positivism, Charmaz now situates herself as a critical interpretivist who 'build[s] on the pragmatist underpinnings in grounded theory and advanc[es] interpretive analyses that acknowledge these constructions' (Charmaz 2006 p.10).

Constructivist grounded theory studies are reflexive in design, repositioning the researcher from being a distant expert (Charmaz 2000) to being a co-constructor of meaning with participants in the generation of data. Researchers reconstruct data into a theory that they themselves must own, while simultaneously grounding it through the use of active codes (Charmaz 2006) reflective of participants' words.   Implicit in meeting this challenge is the development of reciprocity between participants and the researcher and the explication of power imbalances in these relationships (Mills et al. 2006a).

GROUNDED THEORY USING SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

Adele Clarke's work *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn* uses constructivist grounded theory as a launching pad for a Foucauldian discourse analysis of power. Crafting a grounded theory methodology that is explicitly underpinned by a postmodern epistemology and ontology, Clarke built on the work of Strauss that spoke to the sociological theory of social worlds and arenas (Strauss 1993).

Central to her methodological/methods package is discourse which can be explained as a 'set of common assumptions which, although they may be so taken for granted as to be invisible, provide the basis for conscious knowledge' (Cheek 2000 p.23). Situational analysis provides us with the tools to be able to 'draw together studies of discourse and agency, action and structure, image, text and context, history and the present moment – to analyze complex situations of inquiry broadly conceived' (Clarke 2005 p.xxii).

This form of grounded theory continues to rely on the accepted tenets of theoretical sensitivity, theoretical sampling, constant comparative methods, coding, memoing and diagramming (Clarke 2005). Diagrams are radically transformed, however, into maps that are the basis for higher-level analysis. These are situational maps, social worlds/arenas maps and positional maps:

1. Situational maps lay out the major human, nonhuman discursive and other elements in the research situation of inquiry and provoke analysis of relationship among them;

2. Social worlds/arenas maps lay out the collective actors, key nonhuman elements, and the arena(s) of commitment and discourse within which they are engaged in ongoing negotiations – meso-level interpretations of the situations; and

3. Positional maps lay out the major positions taken, and not taken, in the data vis-à-vis particular axes of difference, concern, and controversy around issues in the situation of inquiry (Clarke, 2005, p. xxii).

In her reworking of the analytical processes of an evolving grounded theory, Clarke moves beyond drawing solely upon the work of Strauss as underpinned by symbolic interactionism. This turn to the

postmodern relies upon discourse analysis as a research methodology that examines how texts work to influence socio cultural practice (Crowe 2005).

Drawing upon the work of Jaworski and Coupland (1999), Clarke discusses three approaches in the design of a situational analysis study, while primarily using the third option in her own work. The first of these is negotiating discourse in social relationships/interaction and refers to finding out about how discourse actually enters into social action/interaction. Second is producing identities and subjectivities through discourse, which explores how discourses shape and change subjectivities. The third option is concerned with producing power/knowledge, ideologies and control through discourse, and as such lends itself to a Foucauldian approach to the analysis of such discourses.

Finding points of articulation between Strauss and Foucault – discourses/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 grounded theory around the postmodern turn and away from a constructivist paradigm of inquiry.

Foucauldian scholars understand individuals to be constructed of and through discourse. '[F]ormal knowledges emerge from *savoir,* which is not logical or rational, and… this process of emergence does not have a guiding or agentic subject at its center' (Scheurich and McKenzie 2005 p.848). Constructivist scholars differ on this notion of agency 'tak[ing] their primary field of interest to be precisely that subjective and intersubjective social knowledge and the active construction and cocreation of such knowledge by human agents that is produced by human consciousness' (Lincoln and Guba 2005 p.203).

Demonstrating a commitment to an agentic actor or participant in this constructivist grounded theory study meant that we were unable to use discourse analysis, as it is argued for by Clarke, to move along the methodological spiral from modernism to postmodernism. Rather we were left searching for an analytic method or heuristic that recognized an individual's ability to shape their world. Sharing Clarke's interest in a Straussian form of grounded theory we decided to further explore his work to try and find an alternative path.

SOCIAL WORLD MAPPING

Symbolic interactionists have developed theories of social worlds since the early Chicago tradition, heavily influenced by the thinking of George Mead (Strauss 1993). Strauss uses social worlds and arenas to organize a conceptualization of society that moves away from social structures as entities such as the state, organizations, social classes and families. Rather, social worlds are the 'principle affiliative mechanisms through which people organize social life. Insofar as it meaningfully exists, society as a whole, then, can be conceptualized as consisting of layered mosaics of social worlds and arenas' (Clarke, 2005, p. 46; emphasis added). Arenas are defined as the 'interaction by social worlds around issues – where actions concerning those are being debated, fought out, negotiated, manipulated, and even coerced within and among the social worlds' (Strauss, 1993, p. 226).

In a revised introduction to *Mirrors and Masks*, Strauss argues that 'social structure and interaction are intimately linked, and also reciprocally affect each other (again) over time. This is a temporal

view not merely of interaction but of structure itself, the latter shaped by actors through interaction' (Strauss 1958/1997 p.7). In saying this, Strauss postulates social worlds as the interactions between individual actors and collective groups of actors (often represented by individuals) and how these can be understood in relation to their ability to negotiate, contest and align positions on issues of importance. This perspective of negotiated order stresses that 'one of the principle ways that things get accomplished … is through people negotiating with one another, and it takes the theoretical position that both individual action and organisational constraint can be comprehended by understanding the nature and context of those negotiations' (Maines & Charleton, cited in Strauss, 1993, p. 249).

FRAME ANALYSIS

Frame analysis gained currency as an analytic imperative in symbolic interactionism through Goffman's key work, *Frame Analysis* (1974), in which he wrote about how individuals (such as the participants in this study) organized their experiences through the identification of schemas or frames of interpretation. He emphasized that in doing this it was not his intent to address 'the structure of social life but the structure of experience individuals have at any moment of their social lives' (Goffman, 1974, p. 13).

Frames provide a way in which individuals' (who are members of particular social worlds) perceptions of issues are aligned in order to promote action and change. Influential in such realignments are the discourses that are present in their lives. Creed, Scully and Austin appropriate Gamson's eloquent description:

> Like a picture frame, a frame directs our attention to what is relevant; like a window frame, it
>
> determines our perspectives while limiting our view of the world; like the frame of a house, it is an
>
> invisible infrastructure that holds together different rooms and gives shape to the edifices of meaning.
>
> Thus, as the unifying structures employed in constructing meaning, frames are properties of texts,
>
> where texts are broadly conceived. (Gamson, cited in Creed, Scully & Austin, 2002, p. 481)

In healthcare research, frame analysis is often used to dissect the production of frames by the media about particular public health issues such as smoking and breast cancer (Kolker, 2004; Wakefield, McLeod & Clegg Smith, 2003). Nurses, however, have not commonly reported using frame analysis as a research method. One Australian study by Lloyd and Hawe (2003) uses Entman's analytical heuristic to identify how a variety of health professionals, including nurses, frame the problem of post-natal depression.

Collective action framing 'makes sense of events in ways that highlight a collective set of values, beliefs, and goals for some sort of change' (Martin, 2003, p. 733), and has been widely applied in the social sciences, particularly by symbolic interactionists. The majority of researchers draw upon three core conceptual articles produced by David Snow and Robert Benford in the 1980s and early 1990s (Creed, Scully & Austin, 2002). Benford and Snow have since performed a retrospective assessment of the dissemination of work that has been produced under the label of collective action framing. At the same time they have been able to clarify and reiterate the original core framing tasks and how these are developed, generated, elaborated and finally diffused (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Three core tasks make up the process of collective action framing, namely identifying how and when actors diagnose the problem, articulate a prognosis or a proposed solution to the problem, and motivate action or move 'people from the balcony to the barricades' (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 615). When undertaking each of these core tasks, frame analysis allows for a deeper examination of the influential discourses and negotiations within social worlds through the dual processes of articulation and amplification. Articulation refers to the way discourses align certain voices, events and experiences to create a 'new angle of vision, vantage point, and/or interpretation' (read construction) of different issues. Amplification of the collective frame involves 'accenting and highlighting some aspects, events or beliefs as being more salient than others' (Benford and Snow 2000 p.623).

Strategic processes must also be considered as potential influences when undertaking the core framing tasks. Benford and Snow identified four main strategic alignment processes in the collective framing literature. These were the linking of two or more ideologically similar frames in order to provide support to the one at hand (frame bridging); the amplifying of particular ideas and concerns (frame amplification); applying the issue of concern for a particular social world to others to potentially increase its importance (frame extension); and changing old understandings of an issue (frame transformation).

Finally, Benford and Snow found in their review of collective action framing that each of the core tasks needs to be considered through a lens that shows framing to be a contested process. This fits well with Strauss' conceptualization that social worlds are contested arenas where negotiation and realignment take place as a matter of course in the quest for collective agreement and action. Contestations in collective action framing generally take the form of counter-framing, disputes within movements, and, for movements that demonstrate public shows of alignment, differences between collective action frames and collective action events. Each of these forms of contestation reshapes and reforms the collective action frame in an ongoing cycle of reflection and renegotiation.

Situational and social worlds maps are useful techniques for ordering the codes and categories constructed during the collection and constant comparison of data. Frame analysis asks why, how and when individual and collective actors apparent on the maps articulate about the central phenomena of the research study, possibly affiliate their ideas and, finally, negotiate and organize their actions. Individuals/participants' framing of the phenomena of interest can be teased out to clearly locate their constructions in the social world in which they form their own realities. This method to incorporate the literature as a secondary source of data during the concurrent data generation and analysis phase of a grounded theory study is one way to account for the influence of context.

DISCUSSION

Our experience of using situational analysis

Early in the data generation and analysis phase of our study we began experimenting with situationally mapping the 120 codes that had been generated from the first four interviews. The outcome of this was two-fold. First, it inspired a useful reconceptualisation of how this mass of codes could fit together (as well as staving off the analytical paralysis that was threatening) (Clarke 2005). Second, reconceptualising the existing data led us to understand that discourse about the

problem of workforce was influencing how participants constructed mentoring. Leaving us as researchers needing to know more about how and why this was happening.

Gaining more confidence, we then used social worlds/arena maps to identify the individuals/participants and collective groups of actors within the field of inquiry. This meant the development of new codes to reflect the wider concerns that became evident through such a reconceptualization, rereading and reanalysis of the initial interview texts.

On an impulse we also very successfully shared an early version of the situational map with some participants during a second interview. This facilitated a new way of visualizing the researcher's current reconstructions of the interview data for participants, while continuing the cycle of co construction during interview followed by researcher reconstruction during analysis.

While we found situational and social world mapping very useful, we were less successful in using positional maps which are a 'simplification strateg [y] for plotting positions articulated and not articulated in discourses' (Clarke 2005 p.86). In retrospect we would now argue that collective action framing provides an alternative to analyzing such positions in the literature.

At this point we planned to undertake a discourse analysis to consider how discourse entered into the social action/interactions of rural nurses who mentor. However our constructivist approach to grounded theory, underpinned by a commitment to human agency eventually excluded the use of such an approach (Traynor 2006).

Even though discourse analysis as a method did not fit with our research design, how the discourse about the problem of workforce influenced participants' constructions remained an issue to be grappled with. As constructivists we were methodologically less concerned with how the texts that constituted discourse about the problem of workforce were shaped. Rather we were concerned with how 'the changing conditions bearing on interaction, whether "within the heads" of individuals or between individuals, lead in turn to changing objects, meanings, and social universes' (Strauss 1993 p.27)

Clarke encourages grounded theorists to view her work as 'analytic tools that can be used on their own with discourse data and/or along with and complementing other theoretic and analytic approaches' (Clarke, 2005, p. 146). Strauss and Corbin provide some guidance for this eventuality when they argue that the literature can be used as a secondary source of data and include 'descriptive materials concerning events, actions, setting and actors' perspective that can be used as data and analyzed' (Strauss and Corbin 1998 p.58). Rejecting discourse analysis as a way of explaining our situational and social world maps we turned to symbolic interactionism to find an alternative analytical heuristic using the literature as a secondary source of data.

Frame analysis, in particular collective action frame analysis, was the method we adopted to connect the multiple actors (participants/rural nurses, community, advocates, government and academics) that were apparent in the situational and social worlds maps constructed. Using the processes of collective action framing we were able to describe and examine the social world of Australian rural nursing through analyzing the texts produced by the collective groups/actors regarding the problem of workforce and the potential of mentoring to provide a solution (Mills et al. 2006c).

Participants in this study individually framed their constructions of mentoring telling stories about

these during interview. It was the influence of the collective voices (apparent in discourse about the problem of workforce) on how they framed mentoring that needed exploring further and to ensure data saturation. Combining situational mapping and social worlds mapping with collective action framing allowed us to do this, while generating valuable richly detailed contextual data. This raised our theoretical sensitivity and ability to think at a more abstract level while developing a theory about the experience of mentoring for Australian rural nurses.

CONCLUSION

Researchers are increasingly conscious of considering their ontological and epistemological beliefs prior to both formulating their questions and choosing a methodology. Grounded theory has been a popular choice for nurses because it seeks to discover issues of importance in participants' lives, but in its traditional postpositivist form it has become harder to reconcile for nurses who value reciprocal relationships between themselves and their participants. Constructivist grounded theory explicitly addresses such concerns through its reformulation of research relationships and its emphasis on making the researcher visible and their theory about the area of interest redolent of the participants words.

Clarke's method of situational analysis challenges us as grounded theorists to locate participants in their social world – a world that is full of actors other than themselves. For constructivist grounded theorists, how the discourses produced by others influence participants' constructions of reality is an important question to be addressed. To do otherwise would result in a theory that did not sufficiently account for context and so would be sadly incomplete.

Situational analysis has provided a breakthrough for constructivist grounded theorists by providing tools for the researcher to use in visually opening up the field of inquiry – illustrating participants' social worlds and their arenas of negotiation. Following on from this frame analysis – in particular collective action framing – is a useful analytical heuristic to use in conjunction with situational and social world maps.

REFERENCES

Benford, R. and Snow, D. (2000) Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology,* **26**, 611-39.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge,* Anchor Books, New York.

Charmaz, K. (1994) Discovering Chronic Illness: Using Grounded Theory. In *More Grounded Theory Methodology: A Reader*(Ed, Glaser, B.) Sociology Press, Mill Valley, California, pp. 65-93.

Charmaz, K. (1995a) Between Positivism and Postmodernism: Implications for Methods. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction,* **17**, 43-72.

Charmaz, K. (1995b) Grounded Theory. In *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*(Eds, Smith, J., Harre, R. and Langenhove, L.) Sage Publications, London, pp. 27-65.

Charmaz, K. (2000) Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*(Eds, Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.) Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 509-535.

Charmaz, K. (2005) Grounded Theory in the 21st Century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*(Eds, Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.) Sage, Thousand Oaks, pp. 507-535.

Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis,* Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Cheek, J. (2000) *Postmodern and Poststructural Approaches to Nursing Research,* Sage Thousand Oaks.

Clarke, A. (2003) Situational Analyses: Grounded Theory Mapping After the Postmodern Turn. *Symbolic Interaction,* **26**(4), 553-575.

Clarke, A. (2005) *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn,* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Corbin, J. (1991) Anslem Strauss: An intellectual biography. In *Social Organisation and Social Process: Essays in Honor of Anselm Strauss*(Ed, Maines, D.) Aldine De Gruyter, New York, pp. 17-42.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (1993) The Articulation of Work Through Interaction. *The Sociological Quarterly,* **34**(1), 71-83.

Crowe, M. (2005) Discourse analysis: towards an understanding of its place in nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* **51**(1), 55-63.

Cutcliffe, J. (2005) Adapt or adopt: developing and transgressing the methodological boundaries of grounded theory. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* **51**(4), 421-428.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory,* Aldine De Gruyter, New York.

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis,* Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.

Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N., (Eds) (1999) *The Discourse Reader,* Routledge, London.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (2005) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*(Eds, Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.) Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, pp. 191-215.

Mills, J., Bonner, A. and Francis, K. (2006a) Adopting a Constructivist Approach to Grounded Theory: Implications for Research Design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice,* **12**(1), 8-13.

Mills, J., Bonner, A. and Francis, K. (2006b) The Development of Constructivist Grounded Theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* **5**(1), Article 3.

Mills, J., Francis, K. and Bonner, A. (2006c) The problem of workforce for the social world of Australian rural nurses: a collective action frame analysis. *Journal of Nursing Management,* **14**, 1-11.

National Nursing Workforce Forum (2000) Rethinking Nursing: National Nursing Workforce Forum. Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care, Canberra, pp. 1-69.

Scheurich, J. and McKenzie, K. (2005) Foucault's Methodologies: Archaeology and Genalogy. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*(Eds, Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.) Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Strauss, A. (1958/1997) *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity,* Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.

Strauss, A. (1993) *Continual Permutations of Action,* Aldine De Gruyter, New York.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques,* Sage Publications, Newbury Park.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory,* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Traynor, M. (2006) Discourse analysis: theoretical and historical overview and review of papers in the *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 1996-2004. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62-72.