



# Grounded Theory in Practice and Learning: Reflexivity and Innovative Approaches for Modern Qualitative Studies

Michael Mncedisi Willie

Council for Medical Schemes, Pretoria, South Africa

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: December 14, 2025

Revised: August 9, 2026

Accepted: August 14, 2026

Published: August 31, 2026

## KEYWORDS

Grounded theory;  
Practice and learning;  
Reflexivity and innovative  
approaches;  
Modern qualitative studies

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Grounded theory remains a foundational qualitative methodology for generating theories from empirical data; however, researchers frequently face challenges regarding paradigmatic variations, literature management, and analytical rigor. **Objective:** This study synthesizes seminal and contemporary literature to clarify core methodological choices, structural tensions, and emerging digital adaptations in grounded theory practice. **Method:** A comprehensive synthesis of scholarly literature was conducted, examining methodological divergences between Glaserian, Straussian, and constructivist frameworks alongside innovative extensions such as netnography. **Results:** The analysis highlights critical operational choices in coding procedures, theoretical sampling, literature review timing, and the integration of digital data environments. Researcher positionality and reflexivity emerge as essential mechanisms for maintaining trustworthiness throughout analysis. **Conclusion:** Embracing methodological pluralism and reflexive documentation enhances transparency and theoretical depth, equipping qualitative researchers to develop rigorous, contextually meaningful theories. **Contribution:** This study contributes an integrative conceptual framework bridging traditional grounded theory traditions, reflexive practice, and netnographic inquiry. This provides a practical pedagogical guide for operationalizing reflexivity and maintaining methodological transparency when analyzing digitally mediated social interactions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Qualitative inquiry across global academic disciplines increasingly relies on methodologies that can rigorously derive conceptual frameworks directly from empirical evidence. Grounded theory serves as a fundamental qualitative methodology developed to generate theory from empirical data systematically. Originating from the seminal work of Glaser and Strauss in the 1960s, it provides a structured yet flexible framework for interpreting complex social phenomena by prioritizing inductive reasoning and iterative data analysis (Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Over time, the methodology has evolved to encompass multiple paradigms, including Straussian, Glaserian, and constructivist variants, each offering distinct perspectives on data coding, memo writing, and theoretical sensitivity (Alammar et al., 2019; Charmaz, 2006). Consequently, understanding these diverse tradition choices is critical

\* **Corresponding Author:** Michael Mncedisi Willie, [m.willie@medicalschemes.co.za](mailto:m.willie@medicalschemes.co.za)

Council for Medical Schemes, Pretoria, South Africa

Address: Block A Eco Glades 2 Office Park, 420 Witch-Hazel Ave, Eco-Park Estate, Centurion, 0157, South Africa

## How to Cite this Article:

Willie, M. M. (2026). Grounded Theory in Practice and Learning: Reflexivity and Innovative Approaches for Modern Qualitative Studies. *Indonesian Journal of Innovative Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 127-133. <https://doi.org/10.64420/ijitl.v3i2.422>



Copyright © 2026 by the Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

for researchers seeking to align their methodological decisions with broader epistemological and practical research standards.

Methodological standards dictate that qualitative researchers align their paradigmatic choices with rigorous analytic procedures to ensure theoretical coherence. The selection between Straussian and Glaserian approaches represents a major decision in grounded theory execution, where Straussian grounded theory emphasizes structured coding procedures to offer a clear roadmap, whereas Glaserian grounded theory advocates for emergent analysis guided by theoretical sensitivity (Glaser, 1992). Furthermore, constructivist approaches highlight the co-construction of meaning between researcher and participants, integrating reflexive insights directly into data interpretation. When implemented properly, these epistemological frameworks systematically guide study design, participant engagement, and data management strategies to yield robust scholarly outcomes.

In actual research practice, however, qualitative scholars frequently encounter significant challenges in maintaining analytical consistency and reflective awareness. Researchers' positionality, prior knowledge, and interpretive frameworks inevitably shape analytical decisions, making reflexivity an ethical and methodological imperative that is often difficult to operationalize (Markham, 2017; Mruck & Mey, 2019; Probst, 2015). While reflexive practice is expected to account for bias, enhance transparency, and document analytical choices, many studies fail to integrate reflexivity systematically, thereby compromising credibility and trustworthiness, particularly when examining vulnerable or marginalized populations. Additionally, contemporary research increasingly engages with digital contexts through netnography or online ethnography to capture digitally mediated interactions (Kozinets, 2019). Nevertheless, integrating digital methodologies creates empirical difficulties regarding ethical considerations, data validity, and maintaining theoretical abstraction within virtual environments.

A distinct literature and knowledge gap persists regarding how researchers can systematically integrate researcher reflexivity with digital grounded theory applications. Existing scholarship examines grounded theory paradigms, reflexive techniques, and netnography as isolated domains, yet there is a complete absence of documented frameworks explaining how theoretical sensitivity and reflexive memoing operate when processing unstructured digital data. The literature has not adequately addressed how the methodological boundaries of classical grounded theory adapt when inductive coding is applied to virtual communities without sacrificing analytical depth.

Addressing this literature gap is urgent because the rapid expansion of digital social interactions requires modernized qualitative frameworks that prevent methodological drift and superficial data analysis. This study introduces an innovative integrative synthesis that bridges traditional grounded theory traditions, reflexive practice, and netnographic inquiry. The novelty of this approach lies in offering a unified conceptual model that operationalizes reflexivity within digital data environments, providing qualitative researchers and academic learners with a clear pedagogical strategy to heighten analytical rigour, ethical transparency, and theoretical abstraction

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1 Research Design and Coding Procedures

Grounded theory methodology involves iterative data collection, coding, and theoretical sampling to develop contextually grounded insights. Researchers begin with open coding to identify initial concepts, followed by axial and selective coding to explore relationships and refine emergent categories (Birks & Mills, 2015; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Practical execution relies on translating raw text into conceptual abstractions through structured memo-writing (Urquhart, 2013). Theoretical sensitivity, or the researcher's ability to recognize and interpret meaningful patterns in data, remains central to generating robust theory. This process supports the production of substantive theory that reflects participants lived experiences.

### 2.2 Epistemological Paradigms and Analytic Traditions

Choosing between methodological traditions influences the analytic approach. Straussian grounded theory provides structured coding procedures and emphasizes verification, whereas Glaserian grounded theory prioritizes emergent analysis and constant comparison without preordained categories. Constructivist approaches foreground reflexivity, emphasizing co-construction and researcher-participant interaction, allowing theory to evolve through interpretive engagement. These choices have practical implications for data collection, memo writing, and theoretical saturation.

Sampling Strategies and Netnographic Adaptation Sampling strategies in grounded theory are guided by theoretical rather than statistical considerations. Researchers employ purposive and theoretical sampling to explore emerging categories until saturation is reached (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Flexibility in participant selection ensures

that data collection aligns with evolving theoretical concepts, supporting analytic depth. Netnography extends these strategies to online communities, introducing additional considerations related to ethical data collection, participant consent, and contextually valid interpretation.

### **2.3 Quality Assurance, Reflexivity, and Methodological Rigor**

Quality assurance in grounded theory relies on rigor, transparency, and reflexive documentation. Constructivist and critical realist approaches underscore the need to articulate assumptions, methodological choices, and analytic decisions throughout the research process (Charmaz & Thornberg, 2020; Oliver, 2011). Reflexive memoing, audit trails, and triangulation strengthen the credibility of emergent theory while maintaining openness to revision and reinterpretation. This methodological rigor ensures that grounded theory remains a trusted approach for qualitative research across disciplines.

## **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **3.1 Result**

The literature on grounded theory reveals a rich diversity of methodological perspectives, from its classical formulations to contemporary adaptations. Early formulations emphasised systematic procedures for coding, categorisation, and theoretical sampling to generate grounded, data-driven theory. Constructivist grounded theory emphasises the interpretive role of the researcher, co-constructing meaning with participants rather than seeking an objective “truth”. This epistemological shift reflects broader qualitative trends emphasising reflexivity, context, and participant voice.

Situational analysis and critical realist grounded theory have further expanded the methodological toolkit. Clarke (2005) introduces situational maps and social worlds/arena analysis to situate individual and collective actions within complex social systems, while critical realist perspectives highlight mechanisms, causality, and structural influences in social research. These innovations demonstrate how grounded theory adapts to disciplinary and contextual needs, providing nuanced analytic tools for contemporary social research.

The management of literature review in grounded theory has long been debated. Dunne (2011) and Dunne & Üstündağ (2020) emphasise the importance of integrating literature without constraining the inductive nature of theory generation. Early engagement with literature can enhance theoretical sensitivity and methodological rigour, but premature reliance may bias coding and category development. Effective grounded theory requires a dynamic balance between empirical immersion and scholarly awareness, ensuring that emergent theory reflects data while remaining theoretically informed.

Reflexivity emerges as a central theme in contemporary grounded theory practice. Scholars highlight both opportunities and challenges associated with self-reflexivity, including navigating personal biases, ethical considerations, and interpretive authority. Reflexive practices encourage transparency, documenting analytical decisions and researcher positionality, thereby enhancing methodological credibility. These perspectives collectively underscore the ongoing evolution of grounded theory as both a practical and philosophically informed approach to qualitative research.

### **3.2. Discussion**

The synthesis demonstrates that grounded theory maintains its enduring relevance in contemporary qualitative inquiry through its flexibility, inductive orientation, and structural adaptability across diverse research environments (Cullen & Brennan, 2021). The key finding reveals that integrating distinct methodological traditions enables qualitative scholars to align their epistemological stances directly with research objectives, effectively balancing analytical structure with interpretive freedom. Substantively, this indicates that grounded theory execution is not a rigid or monolithic procedure; rather, it functions as an adaptable framework where reflexive engagement directly elevates conceptual depth and ethical transparency throughout data transformation (Hussein et al., 2017; Foley & Timonen, 2014).

This analytical outcome occurs because reflexive practice fundamentally alters the internal cognitive mechanisms and interpretive actions of the researcher during data coding. By systematically accounting for positionality, prior assumptions, and contextual dynamics, researchers refine their theoretical sensitivity, allowing them to perceive subtle conceptual patterns within qualitative data (Ahmed et al., 2025; Lester et al., 2020). In digital environments like netnography, this internal mechanism operates through continuous reflexive memoing, which prevents

premature conceptual closure and ensures that inductive abstraction remains grounded in complex online interactions (Hoda, 2021; Kalpokaite & Radivojevic, 2019).

These empirical insights strongly support and extend constructivist grounded theory frameworks. The findings confirm that theoretical development is a co-constructed process between researchers and data, refining classical assumptions by demonstrating that structured analytic procedures and emergent flexibility can coexist harmoniously. Furthermore, integrating reflexive audit trails bridges the gap between inductive openness and rigorous verification, enriching constructivist paradigms within modern social science research (Carcary, 2021; Coker, 2026).

When compared with previous scholarship, these findings align with classical formulations regarding the necessity of constant comparison, yet they diverge from early rigid views on literature engagement (Cullen and Brennan, 2021; Fram, 2015; Thornberg, 2011). While traditional formulations advocate for delaying literature exposure to avoid theoretical bias, modern literature integration strategies emphasize that early engagement enhances theoretical sensitivity when managed reflexively (Giles et al., 2013; Nathaniel, 2022). Methodologically, this divergence stems from the increasing complexity of contemporary research settings, which demand that qualitative scholars combine empirical immersion with scholarly awareness rather than relying on isolated inductive reasoning (Paavilainen-Mäntymäki & Plakoyiannaki, 2025).

The explicit novelty of this study lies in offering an integrative framework that connects traditional grounded theory variants, reflexive practice, and digital netnographic methodologies. This contribution successfully fills a distinct knowledge and methodological gap, as previous literature treated netnographic data collection and grounded theory reflexivity as separate domains. By operationalizing reflexive documentation within virtual communities, this research resolves longstanding uncertainties regarding how theoretical abstraction and ethical integrity are maintained when processing unstructured social media data.

A critical analysis of the data dynamics reveals an inherent conceptual tension between adhering to systematic coding steps and maintaining interpretive openness. Researchers often experience a cognitive shift, moving away from mechanical text categorization toward deep conceptual abstraction, which can create analytical friction during axial and selective coding. Addressing this tension requires scholars to embrace methodological pluralism, ensuring that structured procedures serve as supportive guidelines rather than rigid constraints that stifle interpretive insight.

This discussion connects empirical findings, analytical mechanisms, theoretical frameworks, and methodological contributions into a unified narrative. Grounded theory continues to evolve as a robust methodology by combining iterative coding, theoretical sampling, and systematic reflexivity to produce contextually rich theory. By synthesizing traditional analytical rigour with digital adaptations, this study provides a comprehensive roadmap that advances both qualitative theory and empirical practice.

## 4. IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

### 4.1 Research Implication

The findings of this study provide methodological and practical implications for the field of grounded theory methodology and modern qualitative research by synthesizing that the systematic integration of researcher reflexivity and methodological flexibility preserves theoretical abstraction and ethical transparency, particularly when applied to digital data environments (netnography). The findings fill a Literature Gap / Methodological Gap regarding the lack of an integrated framework explaining how theoretical sensitivity and reflexive memoing operate when processing unstructured digital data without sacrificing qualitative analytical depth.

### 4.2 Research Contribution

The findings of this study contribute as a new source of scientific knowledge in the field of Qualitative Research Methodology and Social Sciences by synthesizing a novel framework regarding the integration of grounded theory traditions, reflexive practice, and netnographic inquiry, which can be utilized to guide qualitative researchers in operationalizing reflexivity and maintaining methodological transparency when analyzing digitally mediated social interactions through the accumulation of findings from prior studies.

## 5. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

### 5.1 Research Limitations

Despite these contributions, several inherent limitations of this study must be acknowledged. Because this paper is a literature synthesis, its insights rely entirely on secondary conceptual and empirical literature rather than primary empirical data gathered directly from field-based interventions or live user interactions. Additionally, the scope of this synthesis centers primarily on the operationalization of reflexivity and netnography within qualitative paradigms, which may not fully encompass domain-specific adaptations across non-social science disciplines. Finally, given the rapid evolution of the digital landscape, emerging technological platforms and artificial intelligence interactions may present novel empirical complexities that extend beyond the parameters captured in current qualitative literature.

### 5.2 Recommendations for Future Research

To advance this line of inquiry, future scholarly work should focus on empirically testing and refining this integrative framework by applying reflexive memoing strategies directly to active netnographic studies across diverse virtual communities. Researchers are also encouraged to further explore the synthesis of critical realist and constructivist paradigms to enhance causal explanations while retaining interpretive richness in digital qualitative research. Lastly, scholars should work toward establishing standardized reporting guidelines for digital qualitative adaptations, thereby ensuring elevated standards of transparency in reflexive audit trails, data management, and ethical oversight across virtual research environments.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Grounded theory offers a systematic yet remarkably flexible framework for qualitative inquiry, enabling researchers to generate empirically grounded theories while maintaining analytical rigor and reflexive practice. Methodological choices whether adopting Straussian, Glaserian, or constructivist approaches dictate coding mechanics, theoretical sampling pathways, and conceptual development, thereby underscoring the critical importance of informed decision-making from the study's inception. Furthermore, incorporating reflexive engagement, ethical awareness, and analytical transparency fortifies research credibility. This deliberate methodological posture ensures that emergent conceptual frameworks remain deeply faithful to participants lived experiences while bridging raw empirical observations with higher-level theoretical abstraction.

As the qualitative research landscape rapidly expands into digital environments and netnographic settings, grounded theory methodologies must continuously adapt to capture complex, technology-mediated social interactions. Researchers are required to navigate operational tensions regarding literature review timing, theoretical sensitivity, and ethical data collection in virtual spaces while balancing methodological rigor against practical field constraints. To advance this methodology, future research should explore the integration of critical realist and constructivist paradigms, refine digital qualitative adaptations, and establish elevated standards of methodological transparency. Ultimately, sustained innovation and reflexive accountability will ensure the generation of robust, contextually meaningful theories, further solidifying grounded theory's enduring relevance in contemporary social research.

## Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the invaluable support and insightful contributions of colleagues and academic peers. Their constructive feedback, intellectual camaraderie, and thoughtful critiques during the development of this paper significantly improved its quality and clarity.

## Author Contribution Statement

The author declares that the entire research and writing process for this article was conducted independently. The author assumes full responsibility for all data associated with this research. No other individual contributed as a co-author or made any significant contribution to the content of this work.

## Declaration of Generative AI (GenAI) Usage in Scientific Writing

QuillBot and Grammarly were used solely for language editing and improving clarity. The intellectual content, analysis, and interpretation remain entirely the author's own work. All instances of Generative AI usage in this article were conducted by the authors in accordance with the [IJITL GenAI Tool Usage Policy](#), with the authors assuming full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the work."

## Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declare that they have no significant competing financial, professional or personal interests that might have influenced the performance or presentation of the work described in this manuscript

## Funding Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., Ameen, B. M. and Khidhir, R. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine Surgery and Public Health*, 6, 100198–100198. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198>
- Alammar, F. M., Intezari, A., Cardow, A., & Pauleen, D. J. (2019). Grounded theory in practice: Novice researchers' choice between Straussian and Glaserian. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492618770743>
- Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015). *Grounded theory: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2007). *The Sage handbook of grounded theory*. Sage Publications.
- Carcary, M. (2021). The Research Audit Trail: Methodological Guidance for Application in Practice. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.34190/jbrm.18.2.008>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage Publications.
- Charmaz, K., & Thornberg, R. (2020). The pursuit of quality in grounded theory. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 17(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1780357>
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn. Sage.
- Dunne, C. (2011). The place of the literature review in grounded theory research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2010.494930>
- Coker, D. C. (2026). Rigor, Trustworthiness, and Credibility in Qualitative Research: The Qualitative Forensic Audit Trail Tool—Artificial Intelligence (QFATT-AI). *International Research in Education*, 14(1), 21–21. pp. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ire.v14i1.23507>
- Cullen, M. M. and Brennan, N. (2021). Grounded Theory: Description, Divergences and Application. *Accounting Finance & Governance Review/Accounting Finance & Governance Review*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.52399/001c.22173>
- Dunne, C., & Üstündağ, B. G. (2020). Successfully managing the literature review and write-up process when using grounded theory methodology: A dialogue in exploration. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 21(1), Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-21.1.3338>
- Foley, G. and Timonen, V. (2014). Using Grounded Theory Method to Capture and Analyze Health Care Experiences. *Health Services Research*, 50(4), 1195–1210. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12275>
- Fram, S. (2015). The Constant Comparative Analysis Method Outside of Grounded Theory. *The Qualitative Report*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2013.1569>
- Giles, T., King, L. and Lacey, S. de. (2013). The Timing of the Literature Review in Grounded Theory Research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 36(2). <https://doi.org/10.1097/ans.0b013e3182902035>
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Sociology Press.
- Hoda, R. (2021). Socio-Technical Grounded Theory for Software Engineering. *arXiv (Cornell University)*, 48(10), 3808–3832. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tse.2021.3106280>
- Hussein, M. E., Kennedy, A. and Oliver, B. (2017). Grounded Theory and the Conundrum of Literature Review: Framework for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2017.2661>

- Kalpokaite, N. and Radivojevic, I. (2019). Demystifying Qualitative Data Analysis for Novice Qualitative Researchers. *NSUWorks (Nova Southeastern University)*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.4120>
- Kozinets, R. V. (2019). Netnography: The essential guide to qualitative social media research. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003001430-2>
- Lester, J. N., Cho, Y. and Lochmiller, C. R. (2020). Learning to Do Qualitative Data Analysis: A Starting Point. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(1), 94–106. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320903890>
- Markham, A. (2017). Reflexivity: Some techniques for interpretive researchers. *Qualitative Inquiry*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1077800417695151>
- Mruck, K., & Mey, G. (2019). Grounded theory and self-reflexivity in the qualitative research process. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of current developments in grounded theory* (pp. 470–495). Sage.
- Nathaniel, A. K. (2022). When and How to Use Extant Literature in Classic Grounded Theory. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 6(2), 45–59. pp. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/12441>
- Oliver, C. (2011). Critical realist grounded theory: An innovative approach for social work research. *British Journal of Social Work*, 42(2), 371–387. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr064>
- Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, E. and Plakoyiannaki, E. (2025). Enhancing qualitative research in international business: challenges and best practices from fieldwork to publication. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 21(5), 708–723. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-04-2025-0103>
- Probst, B. (2015). The eye regards itself: Benefits and challenges of reflexivity in qualitative social work research. *Social Work Research*, 39(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svu028>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publications.
- Thornberg, R. (2011). Informed Grounded Theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 56(3), 243–259. pp. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.581686>
- Urquhart, C. (2013). *Grounded theory for qualitative research*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402196>

## Article Information

### Copyright holder:

© Willie, M. M. (2026)

### First Publication Right:

Indonesian Journal of Innovative Teaching and Learning

### Article info:

<https://ojs.aeducia.org/index.php/ijitl/article/view/199>

Word Count: 3539

### Publisher's Note:

The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of AEDUCIA and/or the editor(s). AEDUCIA and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

This Article is licensed under: **CC-BY-SA 4.0**