



Review

Achieving Rigor in Qualitative Analysis: The Role of Active Categorization in Theory Building

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AMR-2018-0482-Original.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Theoretical Perspectives:	Field theory, Sensemaking and Cognition, General economic theories (micro, macro, etc.)
Topic Areas:	Identity and Categorization < Organization and Management theory, Discourse and Rhetoric < Organization and Management theory, Organizational behavior (General) < Organizational Behavior
Abstract:	<p>Scholars have long debated how rigor can be achieved in qualitative analysis. To answer this question, we need to better understand how theory is generated from data. Qualitative analysis is, at its core, a categorization process. Nevertheless, despite a surge of interest in categorization within the social sciences, insights from categorization theory have not yet been applied to our understanding of qualitative analysis. Drawing from categorization theory, we argue that the movement from data to theory is an active process in which researchers choose between multiple moves that help them to make sense of their data. In addition, we develop a framework of the main moves that people use when they categorize data and demonstrate that evidence of these moves can also be found in past qualitative scholarship. Our framework emphasizes that if we are not sufficiently reflexive and explicit about the active analytical processes that generate theoretical insights, we cannot be transparent and, thus, rigorous about how we analyze data. We discuss the implications of our framework for increasing rigor in qualitative analysis, for actively constructing categories from data, and for spurring more methodological plurality within qualitative theory building.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Achieving Rigor in Qualitative Analysis: The Role of Active Categorization in Theory Building

Stine Grodal
grodal@bu.edu
Boston University
Boston, MA, 02215

Michel Anteby
manteby@bu.edu
Boston University
Boston, MA, 02215

Audrey L. Holm
auholm@bu.edu
Boston University
Boston, MA, 02215

ABSTRACT

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Scholars have long debated how rigor can be achieved in qualitative analysis. To answer this question, we need to better understand how theory is generated from data. Qualitative analysis is, at its core, a categorization process. Nevertheless, despite a surge of interest in categorization within the social sciences, insights from categorization theory have not yet been applied to our understanding of qualitative analysis. Drawing from categorization theory, we argue that the movement from data to theory is an active process in which researchers choose between multiple moves that help them to make sense of their data. In addition, we develop a framework of the main moves that people use when they categorize data and demonstrate that evidence of these moves can also be found in past qualitative scholarship. Our framework emphasizes that if we are not sufficiently reflexive and explicit about the active analytical processes that generate theoretical insights, we cannot be transparent and, thus, rigorous about how we analyze data. We discuss the implications of our framework for increasing rigor in qualitative analysis, for actively constructing categories from data, and for spurring more methodological plurality within qualitative theory building.

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Associate Editor Heather Haveman for her guidance as well as Beth Bechky, Christine Beckman, Julia DiBenigno, Karen Golden-Biddle, Gerardo Okhuysen, Siobhan O'Mahony, Melissa Mazmanian, John Van Maanen and Mark Zbaracki for their feedback on this paper.

INTRODUCTION

Qualitative analysis is a central tool for developing new theory (Edmondson & McManus, 2007; Eisenhardt, 1989). In recent years, there has been a call for increasing the rigor of qualitative research (Lamont & White, 2008; Lubet, 2017; Pratt, Kaplan, & Whittington, 2020; Small, 2013). This debate on rigor has led some organizational scholars to ask, more specifically, “How can inductive researchers apply systematic conceptual and analytical discipline that leads to credible interpretations of data and also helps to convince readers that the conclusions are plausible and defensible?” Scholars often assess rigor in qualitative research by examining qualitative analysts’ descriptions of how they moved from data to theory (Bansal & Corley, 2011). To demonstrate rigor, then, qualitative scholars need to detail more effectively “the actual strategies used for collecting, coding, analyzing, and presenting data when generating theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 244). When conducting qualitative analysis, we identify categories in our data. These categories are generally labeled “codes” or groupings of codes, such as the first- and second-order codes and overarching categories described in classical grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These categories generate the concepts and mechanisms that form the foundation for theory building (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2003).

Given the centrality of categorization to qualitative analysis, it is surprising that we have not yet drawn more purposely on categorization theory to penetrate the challenges faced by qualitative scholars. A longstanding and vibrant line of inquiry among psychologists, sociologists, and management scholars has focused on understanding how humans construct and categorize the components of their world (Bingham & Kahl, 2013; Bloom, 2000; Khaire & Wadhvani, 2010; Lamont & Molnar, 2002; Murphy & Lassaline, 1997; Rosch, 1978; Vergne & Wry, 2014). Categorization is the process through which individuals group elements together to

1
2
3 generate an understanding of their world (Bowker & Star, 2000). Importantly, individuals have
4
5 been shown to actively construct categories based on the existing knowledge and the intentions
6
7 they bring to the categorization process (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Searle & Willis, 1995). Yet,
8
9 often this active categorization process is not evident in how qualitative researchers report their
10
11 research, which makes it difficult for readers to assess the researchers' analytical process.
12
13
14 Instead, many qualitative researchers draw on seemingly proven templates when describing their
15
16 work although the structure of these templates might be a far cry from the researchers' actual
17
18 analytical process.
19
20

21
22 Bringing categorization theory into the debate on how qualitative scholars achieve rigor
23
24 allows us to reflect on the active role that we as researchers play in the construction of the
25
26 categories critical to theory building. Such reflexivity allows us to articulate exactly what we did
27
28 so that others can better understand how we moved from data to theory. Oftentimes, "we do not
29
30 really know how the researcher got from 1,000 pages of field notes and transcriptions to the final
31
32 conclusions, as sprinkled with vivid illustrations as they may be" (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña,
33
34 2014: 5). This is problematic for all scholars trying to evaluate the results of such pursuits, but
35
36 even more so for junior scholars, who look to and try to learn from published pieces for guidance
37
38 on how to generate theoretical insights. The current lack of reflexivity also stands in the way of
39
40 theory development by limiting the repertoire into which scholars currently tap when analyzing
41
42 data and by artificially constraining the pathways that newcomers drawing upon qualitative data
43
44 believe they can pursue.
45
46
47
48

49
50 In this article, we integrate insights from both categorization theory and existing
51
52 scholarship on qualitative analysis to develop a framework emphasizing the researchers' active
53
54 role in theory building. The framework includes the main analytical moves upon which scholars
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 might rely to sift through their data and serves as an invitation for them to both be more reflexive
4
5 and more transparent about their analytical processes. (Table 1 provides an overview of this
6
7 framework). We define *moves* as the micro-processes that researchers undertake during
8
9 qualitative theory building. By integrating categorization theory with insights from existing but
10
11 at times neglected qualitative scholarship, we identify specific moves. In other words, while
12
13 evidence of corresponding analytical strategies exists within qualitative scholarship, these moves
14
15 have not, as such, been explicated. Specifically, we highlight eight main moves—*asking*
16
17 *questions, focusing on puzzles, dropping categories, merging categories, splitting categories,*
18
19 *relating and/or contrasting categories, sequencing categories, and developing and/or dropping*
20
21 *working hypotheses*—that can provide analytical scaffolding to facilitate the often-daunting task
22
23 of analyzing qualitative data and crafting theoretical contributions. (Table 2 provides an
24
25 overview of each move, including a definition of it and examples of how it has been applied in
26
27 qualitative data analysis.)
28
29
30
31

32
33 - Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here -
34
35
36
37

38 Ultimately, we suggest that researchers can demonstrate rigor by detailing more precisely
39
40 how they have purposefully drawn on a broad and diverse set of moves to engage with their data.
41
42 This approach advocates that we are more candid and explicit about both the goals and the
43
44 process driving theory development. Moreover, we argue that different moves can be used to
45
46 generate insights during different phases of the research process and that no one template should
47
48 be reified as the true way to achieve rigor (Abbott, 2004, p. 52). That is true for Table 1 as
49
50 well—this is not a framework that should be applied as a template. Instead researchers should
51
52 apply the moves that allow them to generate insightful categories from their data and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subsequently report verbally and/or visually the often messy process that resulted. In short, we
4
5 not only answer the call for increased rigor but also encourage scholars to deploy their full and
6
7 diverse analytical imagination in pursuit of strong theoretical insights.
8
9

10 11 **ACHIEVING RIGOR IN QUALIATIVE ANALYSIS** 12

13 Qualitative scholars have long tried to achieve a better understanding of how readers are
14
15 convinced by ethnographic texts and how limited cases can lend themselves to rigorous
16
17 interpretation (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 1993; Small, 2009, 2013; Staw, 1995). A debate has
18
19 recently ignited about how to improve methodological rigor (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013).
20
21 To pre-empt skepticism about qualitative rigor, scholars have articulated broad guidelines on
22
23 how to conduct qualitative research properly by calling on scholars to develop “a coding scheme
24
25 and, insofar as possible, provide a sample of likely coding categories” (Lamont & White, 2008:
26
27 143), yet they have been less explicit about how to do so.
28
29
30

31
32 In practice, many management scholars have translated the call for rigor into a need to
33
34 follow seemingly proven and tested templates in written accounts of their analytical processes
35
36 (Bansal & Corley, 2011; Langley & Abdallah, 2015). While templates might prove useful in
37
38 some circumstances, they can also obfuscate the researcher’s generative role in the analytical
39
40 process when applied indiscriminately. Moreover, using templates can hinder scholarly output
41
42 because it constrains the multiple ways in which rich qualitative data can be mined for insights
43
44 and have the unintended consequence of generated undue homogeneity in qualitative theory
45
46 building. As Swidler and Lamont (2014) argue, “Method debates are in fact theory debates” (p.
47
48 157). Even Strauss and Corbin (1990) caution against the use of templates: “We realize that
49
50 beginners need structure and that placing the data into discrete boxes makes them feel more in
51
52 control of their analyses” (p. 129). They then add, “Analysts who rigidify the process are like
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 artists who try too hard: Although their creations might be technically correct, they fail to capture
4 the essence of the objects represented, leaving viewers feeling slightly cheated. Our advice is to
5 let it happen. The rigor and vigor will follow." Put otherwise, qualitative scholars may adopt
6 different approaches when moving from data to theory; we argue that these various approaches
7 may nonetheless be rigorous.
8
9

10
11 Here, we draw on categorization theory to explicate how researchers decipher their data
12 and actively construct categories at different stages of the analytical process. In the process, we
13 unpack how a qualitative scholar might "let it happen" (in Strauss and Corbin's terminology)
14 while still ensuring that readers can both evaluate the scholar's analytical process and be better
15 guided in their own future pursuits. Instead of promoting a unique template, we posit that
16 rigorous qualitative analysis can be achieved by being transparent and detailed about individuals'
17 active categorization choices during the process of discovery (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 244).
18 Such an approach to rigor means that readers assessing the move from data to theory are able to
19 grasp and evaluate more clearly the many decisions made by researchers in their analytical
20 pursuits (Eisenhardt, Graebner, & Sonenshein, 2016). This approach also encourages us to be
21 more reflexive about our own research processes and how we build insights from our data
22 (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), which can help us achieve a stronger theoretical contribution.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Qualitative Analysis as a Categorization Process**

50
51 At its core, the process of qualitative analysis entails sifting through data to generate new
52 categories that can form the foundation for new theoretical insights (Becker, 2008; Charmaz,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1983; Fine, 1993; Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007; Spradley, 1979; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Van
4
5 Maanen, 2011). As Charmaz explains, “As the researcher categorizes, he or she raises the
6
7 conceptual level of the analysis from description to a more abstract theoretical level” (Charmaz,
8
9 2006: 186). Van Maanen (1979: 541) likewise emphasizes “categorizing” as a step to move from
10
11 data to more general findings. In addition, Corbin and Strauss (1990: 7) stress the importance of
12
13 progressing from examining raw data to constructing and labeling larger groupings that capture
14
15 instances of emerging categories to develop theory. To generate “overarching categories,” they
16
17 advocate identifying similarities between subordinate categories and merging them to create
18
19 larger groupings. Importantly, within qualitative data, these categories are sometimes concepts
20
21 and at other times mechanisms, where mechanisms are categories of actions or behaviors that
22
23 relate the concepts to each other (Davis & Marquis, 2005; Hedström & Swedberg, 1996).
24
25
26
27

28
29 The challenge of creating categories is exacerbated when data are rich and layered; this is
30
31 true of much qualitative data. The richer and more layered the data, the more decisions the
32
33 researcher needs to make in order to generate categories that form the basis for novel insights.
34
35 Qualitative data tend to be rich and layered because they are often longitudinal (such that
36
37 categories might vary over time) (Langley, 1999), are collected on an ongoing basis (such that
38
39 the categories created initially no longer prove relevant later in the collection phase) (Lopez &
40
41 Phillips, 2019), or derive from participants or data sources with differing perspectives (such that
42
43 categories across participants or sources might differ) (Lofland & Lofland, 1971). Nevertheless,
44
45 while categorization is at the heart of qualitative analysis, we have not yet looked to theories of
46
47 categorization as a way to reflect on the process of qualitative theory building.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Drawing on Categorization Research to Inform Theory Building**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Scholars have long recognized that humans create categories to reduce the amount of
4 information they need to process in navigating a complex, information-satiated world (e.g.,
5
6 Bowker & Star, 2000; Lakoff, 2008; Rosch, 1978). Categories are actively and socially
7
8 constructed through a complex and multifaceted process that is driven by the knowledge, goals,
9
10 and contexts in which the categorization process unfolds (Barsalou, 1983; Berger & Luckmann,
11
12 1967; Durand & Paoletta, 2013; Murphy & Medin, 1985; Searle & Willis, 1995). For example,
13
14 when antique dealers source pieces to acquire for their collection, they might distinguish them by
15
16 century rather than grouping them by function, thus sorting the pieces, in effect, based on their
17
18 goals and knowledge structures. By contrast, lay people would most likely sort antique furniture
19
20 by salient functional features, for example, grouping all chairs together or all tables together. In
21
22 other words, faced with the same set of elements, and depending on people's goals and existing
23
24 knowledge, the sorting process will proceed differently, and people will ultimately most likely
25
26 generate distinct groupings (Barsalou, 1983). The creation of categories can therefore not be
27
28 decoupled from the person(s) who created them or the context in which they were created.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 This active construction of categories not only shapes which categories are generated but
36
37 also the process through which they are created. As the knowledge and goals of the categorizer
38
39 change, so do the categories created (Vygotsky, 1987). Furthermore, the process of
40
41 categorization is not linear and rational but characterized by iteration, detours, and regression
42
43 (Bloom, 2000). Categories are often later forgotten. Some of these forgotten categories are lost
44
45 forever, whereas others are recreated at a later stage, when the need for the same category arises
46
47 (Siegler, 1998).
48
49
50

51 This active process also shapes the internal relationship between categories. Initially,
52
53 scholars asserted that categories were organized hierarchically: Each overarching category
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 encompassed all the other categories underlying it (Murphy & Lassaline, 1997). For example,
4 “beef,” “lamb,” and “pork” can all be viewed as subsets of the overarching category “meat,”
5
6 which in turn belongs to the overarching category “food.” This view, however, has been
7
8 challenged. First, scholars have found that not all categories are organized around hierarchies
9
10 (Rosch, 1978). Second, recent developments in categorization theory have emphasized that such
11
12 sorting is often contextual and dependent on the goal. If the goal is to consume only grass-fed
13
14 meat (Weber, Heinze, & DeSoucey, 2008), then one might reorder these elements into grass-fed
15
16 and traditionally-fed meat, regardless of the type of animal from which the meat is derived. Such
17
18 a grouping can recast elements into very different categories and produce new relations between
19
20 them.
21
22
23
24
25

26 Applied to qualitative analysis, such agency in generating categories suggests that there
27
28 could be an infinite number of perspectives on a particular data set, depending on the context and
29
30 on the coder’s knowledge and goals. Furthermore, people’s perspectives and goals evolve as
31
32 categories are created, forgotten, and at times resurrected throughout the analysis process.
33
34 Theory development encompasses many decisions that are anything but pre-defined and are
35
36 therefore difficult to fit into templates. The scholar is always at the center of the process and is
37
38 actively involved in making these choices.
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Drawing on Past Qualitative Scholarship to Inform Theory Building**

45
46 While an active perspective on theory building has not been at the center of qualitative analysis
47
48 published in management scholarship (Bansal & Corley, 2011; Langley & Abdallah, 2015), a
49
50 close reading across decades of scholarship on qualitative analysis reveals that there is support
51
52 for the active approach as an analytical strategy (Becker, 2008; Eisenhardt, 1989; Fine, 1993;
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007; Langley, 1999; Miles et al., 2014; Spradley, 1979; Van Maanen,
4
5 2011). We propose that many of the moves used in qualitative analysis mirror processes
6
7 identified in categorization theory. For instance, Becker (2008) outlines “tricks” that qualitative
8
9 researchers can use to build theory. He encourages researchers to actively start elaborating
10
11 categories by asking themselves what questions their data can answer. As he articulates it, “The
12
13 reformulated questions constitute the beginnings of conceptual construction” (p. 122). Overall,
14
15 Becker suggests that asking questions may be what paves the way for theoretical development.
16
17 Similarly, Lofland and his colleagues (2006: 201) advise that “where the rubber hits the road, so
18
19 to speak” is when “you begin to condense and organize your data into categories that make sense
20
21 in terms of your relevant interests, commitments, literatures, and/or perspectives.” Thus, many
22
23 foundational recommendations in qualitative analysis point to a range of ways in which
24
25 qualitative researchers can actively approach their data to derive insights. These
26
27 recommendations inform the moves (detailed next) that constitute the building blocks of our
28
29 proposed active categorization framework.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **AN ACTIVE CATEGORIZATION FRAMEWORK FOR THEORY BUILDING**

39
40 In the following pages, we integrate insights from categorization theory with insights from the
41
42 recommendations provided by at times neglected qualitative scholarship to spotlight eight main
43
44 moves in which qualitative researchers engage when sifting through data and developing theory.
45
46 We detail how these eight moves can generate multiple pathways toward theory development.
47
48 Like different swimming strokes, these moves enable researchers to swim differently through
49
50 their data and reach diverse destinations. As such, they should be viewed as examples of possible
51
52 moves. Analytical moves can be actively recombined in many ways to create multiple paths to
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 insight, depending on the unfolding of the research process and/or the phenomenon in question.
4
5 Researchers will then themselves be able to identify more moves and to recombine them in
6
7 potentially infinite ways to create a rigorous data-analysis description with a fully transparent
8
9 analytical process.
10

11
12 One way to think about the active categorization framework is to consider these eight
13
14 moves in relation to three general stages in the analytical process: *generating initial categories*,
15
16 *refining tentative categories*, and *stabilizing categories*. Since analyzing data is a “live” and
17
18 iterative process (Locke, Feldman, & Golden-Biddle, 2015), all moves can be useful at all stages
19
20 of the process. Some moves, however, might be more relevant and more likely to be deployed at
21
22 specific stages. In Table 1, the shading of each move during a particular analytical stage
23
24 represents our expectations of its likelihood to occur at that time. In the following section, we
25
26 present the moves, following this possible order of appearance.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Generating Initial Categories: Initial Data Collection and Analysis**

34
35 Very few qualitative scholars approach field settings as fully blank slates (Lofland et al., 2006).
36
37 Typically, qualitative scholars engage in early moves aimed at generating insights to prime the
38
39 theory-building process (Spradley, 1979). When they are selecting field topics and starting to
40
41 collect data, they draw on their existing knowledge and experiences to imagine possible
42
43 pathways, setting aside others that do not trigger their curiosity. Thus, the choices and focus that
44
45 researchers bring to their empirical inquiry seed the categorization process. We identified as
46
47 central to this early seeding process two moves associated with generating initial categories:
48
49 *asking questions* and *focusing on puzzles*. Here we define these moves, relate them to
50
51 methodological strategies that we have identified in existing qualitative scholarship, and provide
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 empirical examples.
4
5
6
7

8 *Asking questions.* Categorization theory suggests that how humans make sense of the world
9
10 depends on their prior understanding and initial goals (Barsalou, 1983; Durand & Paoletta, 2013;
11
12 Murphy & Medin, 1985). Deprived of existing categories, we would not be able to integrate or
13
14 understand the world around us. Our existing categories are the foundations for the new
15
16 categories that we form when presented with novel stimuli (Armstrong, Gleitman, & Gleitman,
17
18 1983). In particular, we categorize the same objects differently depending on the goals we are
19
20 trying to achieve and the questions we ask of the world. For example, the categories people
21
22 formulate to prepare to go camping consist of heterogeneous objects—such as boots, tents, and
23
24 sleeping bags—that are united because they are useful for achieving the same goal. By contrast,
25
26 given a different goal (such as going to work), boots and tents would not be viewed as part of the
27
28 same category. *Asking questions* is the move in which researchers draw on their existing
29
30 categories to select and approach their field settings with specific questions to which they would
31
32 like answers. By asking questions, and thereby restricting their goals upfront, researchers begin
33
34 to craft initial (possible) categories while they are collecting and analyzing their data. This is not
35
36 to say that early questions are not revised or that new ones do not surface during analysis, but the
37
38 initial path through the data is determined by which questions are asked.
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Identified methodological strategies.* A close read of existing scholarship on qualitative
45
46 methods reveals that asking questions has been suggested as a move to initiate theory building
47
48 (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Spradley, 1979; Strauss, 1987). Although many qualitative scholars
49
50 allow themselves to be guided by their field data and interactions, they still enter the field with
51
52 some preconceptions and a history of past research designs and questions (Golden-Biddle &
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Locke, 2007). As Cohen (2013) lucidly reports, “many of the choices made in my [qualitative]
4 research design followed directly from past research” (p. 435). This pattern explains why Strauss
5 (1987) labels one common approach to qualitative data analysis a “theory elaboration exercise,”
6 one in which past literature serves as a springboard for asking questions to spur new lines of
7 research “in service of discovering” a new and more encompassing theory (p. 306). Similarly,
8 Spradley (1979) suggests that asking questions is a core part of the early discovery process
9 because it is through questions that researchers create initial categories for the problem they are
10 trying to understand.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Likewise, many scholars recommend ongoing efforts to answer the key question in
22 generalizing beyond the chosen empirical setting: What is this a case of? Asking this question
23 allows for an exploration of the conceptual possibilities offered by the data (Glaser & Strauss,
24 1967: 24), thereby generating theoretical insights that “bump things up a level of generality”
25 (Luker, 2008: 138). Another reason why asking questions is an important part of the research
26 process is that it helps the researcher to manage the complexity and overload of data, which can
27 stand in the way of theoretical insights. Without such questioning, “The result is death by data
28 asphyxiation—the slow and inexorable sinking into the swimming pool which started so cool,
29 clear, and inviting and now has become a clinging mass of maple syrup” (Pettigrew, 1990: 281).
30 Even if questions are not fully articulated, they are nonetheless ubiquitous in the mind of many
31 researchers and offer gateways into the initial process of category construction and theory
32 building.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Empirical examples.* Our analysis of published qualitative papers revealed examples of
50 how authors have used questions to jump-start their theory development. Grodal, Nelson, and
51 Siino (2015) describe their process: “Initially, our observations focused on [the] grand tour
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 question (Spradley,1979): ‘How do helping behaviors unfold?’ Over time, however, as our
4
5 inquiry became more focused on specific aspects of helping behavior, the nature of these
6
7 questions changed to reflect our growing understanding” (p. 140). Because the authors asked this
8
9 question, helping behavior became the focus of their study, even though their data also spoke to
10
11 other phenomena. Deeper into their analysis, they began to wonder how engagement is sustained
12
13 during helping routines. Hence, their questions shifted at each stage and in many ways shaped
14
15 the categories on which they honed in during their finer-grained analysis. This approach of
16
17 iterative questioning is not unique: When describing the analytical process she followed in her
18
19 study of employees’ use of mobile devices, Mazmanian (2013) similarly reports asking questions
20
21 of her data (p. 1231). Likewise, in her study of women doing “unpaid” work in VIP nightclubs,
22
23 Mears (2015) asks the core question “Why do workers participate in their own exploitation?” as
24
25 a trigger to her analytical process (p. 1099). With these questions in mind, these scholars were
26
27 able to spearhead unique trajectories through their data. Asking questions is thus an important
28
29 move in qualitative research because it allows researchers to proactively direct their analysis
30
31 toward a specific theoretical end, making it more likely that the initial categories that emerge
32
33 from the data-analysis process will be of theoretical significance.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 ***Focusing on puzzles.*** Initial categories are also generated by focusing on puzzles, the move in
43
44 which researchers concentrate on the parts of the data they find most surprising or salient. Not all
45
46 information is equally important in the categorization process (Bowker & Star, 2000). To
47
48 categorize the world around us, we bring with us the knowledge we have already accumulated
49
50 about a particular space (Durkheim & Mauss, 2009); thus, we categorize objects by making
51
52 inferences based on the knowledge base we already possess (Hirschfeld & Gelman, 1994;
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Murphy, 2004). If we observe that a particular animal has wings, we assume that it can fly, lays
4 eggs, and tends to its young in nests. When our knowledge of the world is confirmed in actual
5 behavior, we hardly pay attention: These categories have become part of our taken-for-granted
6 understanding of the world (Clark & Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986; Colyvas & Powell, 2006; Vygotsky,
7 1987). When the bird with wings takes off in flight, we happily proceed undisturbed.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Nevertheless, our observations do not always correspond to our existing knowledge about
16 the world. If we encounter a bird with wings that cannot fly (such as a penguin or an ostrich), we
17 pause in puzzlement. The lack of flight is a salient feature in an animal with wings; it forces us to
18 pay attention. “Salience refers to the intensity of a feature, the extent to which it presents a high
19 amplitude” (Sloman, Love, & Ahn, 1998: 193). Salience arises when an observation is at odds
20 with our existing knowledge about a category, and it plays an important role in category
21 formation because salience helps us to focus on the novelty and uniqueness of a specific situation
22 (Ahn, 1999). For example, we might believe that all swans are white. Encountering a black swan
23 creates dissonance with our existing cognitive structures, and we pay attention to the
24 phenomenon in an attempt to find an explanation for the discrepancy. Salience might take the
25 form of a contradictory exemplar—such as a puzzling person, event, or utterance (Smith &
26 Zarate, 1992)—that challenges the conceptual coherence through which we view the world
27 (Sloman et al., 1998). Focusing on puzzles might help us abduct new insights about a novel and
28 untheorized category which *may be* present in the data (Behfar & Okhuysen, 2018; Locke,
29 Golden-Biddle, & Feldman, 2008). In other words, a puzzling piece of data can function as a
30 lightning rod, attracting insights around which new categories can form (Zhao, Ishihara,
31 Jennings, & Lounsbury, 2018).

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 *Identified methodological strategies.* When developing theory, it is important to focus on
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 what is surprising and unexpected in how the data relate to existing theory. Scholars have called
4 such puzzles “negative cases” or “unusual incidents” (Katz, 2001) and have emphasized their
5 importance in the theorizing process, even if there is “only one case” (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw,
6 2011: 193). Focusing on such cases can elucidate the patterns and variations in the meanings that
7 members attribute to a given social setting. Stated otherwise, strong qualitative research might
8 result precisely from focusing on the unexpected. In *Tricks of the Trade*, Becker (2008) describes
9 a move he calls over-focusing on strange elements: He explains how “weird” findings (p. 208) or
10 a “finding that does not fit” (p. 83) prove integral to theory development. Miles, Huberman and
11 Saldaña also call attention to “outliers” and “surprises” when analyzing data (2014: 301). Many
12 other scholars recommend honing in on puzzles as well. For example, Turco (2016) describes
13 generating insight by “reading her field notes and memos several times through” and never being
14 able to “jump right into line-by-line coding.” Instead, she suggests “looking for empirical
15 puzzles” (p. 206). In short, focusing on puzzling cases is an analytical strategy that researchers
16 can use to stimulate new lines of inquiry.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 *Empirical examples.* When Desmond (2012) conducted his ethnography of evicted
36 tenants in high-poverty neighborhoods, he noticed that these tenants relied more on new
37 acquaintances than on kin ties to meet their more pressing needs, regardless of the strength or
38 weakness of those ties (Granovetter, 1973). “During everyday conversation, people in the trailer
39 park and the inner city claimed to have no friends or an abundance of them, to be surrounded by
40 supportive kinsmen or estranged from them,” Desmond explained. “I came to view these
41 accounts skeptically, interpreting them as a kind of data in their own right but not as accurate
42 evaluations of people’s social relationships” (p. 1302). This puzzling observation prompted him
43 to develop the notion of “disposable ties” as a new category of social ties not fully captured by
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the notion of weakness.
4

5 In a similar fashion, when describing her analytical process, Vaughan (1996) highlights
6 how focusing on puzzles led her to generate theory about “normalizing deviance” in
7 organizations. “I began coding [the data],” Vaughan explained about her study of the space
8 shuttle *Challenger* disaster, “but soon realized . . . that this strategy was flawed: Aggregating
9 statements from all interviews by topic (a practice I often used) would extract part of each
10 interview from its whole” (p. 461). Instead, to elaborate her analytical categories, she focused on
11 the puzzle that informants’ statements regarding a critical part of the space shuttle often
12 contradicted the archival record—a move that proved to be core to her theorizing. Focusing on
13 puzzles thus directs researchers’ categorization efforts toward data elements that diverge from
14 expectations and might therefore form the basis for generating new theory.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 During their initial data collection and analysis, researchers generate initial categories by
29 asking questions and focusing on puzzles. This is important in theory development because the
30 initial questions and puzzles arise from discrepancies between what researchers notice in the data
31 in light of their understanding of past theories which can help them abduct new theoretical
32 insights (Locke et al., 2008; Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). In this stage, researchers therefore
33 juxtapose initial categories with past theoretical insights.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Refining Tentative Categories: Further Analyses and Possible Added Data Collection**

46
47 As research progresses, the process of data analysis shifts from generating initial categories
48 toward refining tentative categories through moves such as *dropping categories*, *merging*
49 *categories*, *splitting categories*, *relating and/or contrasting categories*, and *sequencing*
50 *categories*. These moves also help the analyst to begin distinguishing categories that might
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 function as mechanisms from those that function as concepts and to begin mapping out the links
4
5 between them. The combination of these moves starts to elaborate and challenge existing
6
7 theories.
8
9

10
11
12 ***Dropping categories.*** When we categorize the world around us, we must often sort through an
13
14 overwhelming amount of information (Murphy, 2004; Rosch, 1978). A consequence of the
15
16 overload of information is that people initially generate categories that turn out not to be relevant
17
18 to the categorization process. They might, thus, initially create categories that are faulty, biased
19
20 or irrelevant in explaining the phenomena that they are trying to categorize. When humans focus
21
22 in on salient cues to guide in the categorization process these initial categories might be salient
23
24 for accidental reasons instead of representing stable patterns (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld,
25
26 2005). An important part of the categorization process therefore entails dropping initial
27
28 categories to focus the categorization process on categories that are more important and
29
30 meaningful in explaining the phenomena at hand (Murphy, 2004). When people "drop
31
32 categories" they stop paying attention to categories that are no longer relevant in explaining the
33
34 phenomenon that they are paying attention to.
35
36
37
38
39

40 ***Identified methodological strategies.*** In the process of generating categories, researchers
41
42 often create a multitude of categories, only few of which will be essential in explaining the
43
44 puzzle that they have identified in the data. Several qualitative scholars suggest that an important
45
46 part of qualitative analysis is to revise and reduce the number of categories that are used to
47
48 explain the phenomena. Locke (2001, p. 79) for example suggests that "selecting out categories"
49
50 is an important part of the analytical process and that if "analysts feel they have in their theory a
51
52 coherent detailed and worthwhile story to tell then...they should drop the category." Likewise,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014: 82) discuss the possible disconnect between the
4 researcher's emerging understanding of a phenomenon and the categories identified in the early
5 stages of a project. In particular "some codes do not work; others decay. No field material fits
6 them, or the way they slice up the phenomenon is not the way the phenomenon appears
7 empirically." The researcher realizes that "some codes do not work" and the associated
8 categories should be either dropped or transformed to best reflect the data.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 *Empirical examples.* When researchers write their methods sections, they tend to focus on
18 the categories that remained in their analysis more than the ones that were dropped. This is
19 particularly true of published work where methods sections are often shorter than working papers
20 in which authors are more focused on convincing readers of their methodological astuteness.
21
22
23
24
25
26 However, examples from the co-authors' own work suggest the importance of dropping
27 categories for the categorization process.
28
29

30
31 In her research on constructing social and symbolic boundaries in the nanotechnology
32 field, Grodal (2018, p. 792) describes that she "developed some broad and some very specific
33 codes. Through several rounds of iteration and moving back and forth between broad and
34 specific codes..." This process involved in fact dropping several codes which turned out not to
35 have theoretical traction. For example, the initial category "commercializing scientific
36 knowledge," which was abundant in the data, turned out to be only peripherally related to the
37 overarching theoretical story of how the social and symbolic boundaries of a field expand and
38 contract over time; this category was therefore dropped from the analysis.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Similarly, when studying ghostwriters, Anteby and Occhiuto (2020) initially created the
50 category "previously published" to track whether the ghostwriters they interviewed had
51 published under their own name prior to agreeing to write for others and how ghostwriters spoke
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 about such past publications. The intuition was that ghostwriters who had published under their
4 own name might resent (more than others) being asked to remain invisible from public view.
5
6 Ultimately, however, the category "previously published" proved partly irrelevant to the authors'
7
8 main findings. The ways in which ghostwriters spoke about their own writing did not illuminate
9
10 much their work experience of producing someone else's self or what the authors label "stand-in
11
12 labor." While Anteby and Occhiuto note that they "developed coding categories inductively" (p.
13
14 1295), they could have also added that they dropped several categories while developing their
15
16 theoretical insights.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ***Merging categories.*** When people "merge categories," they unite two or more existing
25
26 categories to create a superordinate one. In categorization theory, people initially tend to create
27
28 elaborate and detailed categorization structures upon encountering unfamiliar objects or actions
29
30 (Bloom, 2000). Subsequently, to refine the initial categorization structure and optimize the
31
32 processing of information, people often merge these detailed categories to form superordinate
33
34 ones. Over time, this merging process can result in intricate hierarchies of categories (Murphy,
35
36 2004). For example, after creating the categories "ants," "cows," and "jellyfish," a person might
37
38 realize that all three can be assigned to a superordinate category, "animal" because they all move
39
40 and depend on oxygen for their survival.
41
42
43

44 ***Identified methodological strategies.*** Historically, many qualitative scholars have
45
46 characterized merging categories as a fundamental move in qualitative analysis (Charmaz, 2006;
47
48 Locke, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These scholars advocate beginning qualitative analysis
49
50 with "open coding," that is, generation of a plethora of specific categories that closely adhere to
51
52 the phrasing articulated in the data. Ultimately, qualitative researchers should merge these
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 categories into superordinate categories that capture the essence of their meaning. For example,
4
5 Strauss and Corbin (1990) recommend that researchers progress from “open coding” to
6
7 ultimately generating “overarching categories” (pp. 223 and 229). As others have clarified, such
8
9 a “clustering” process enables researchers to “clump” items into “classes, categories, bins” and
10
11 to progress from “lower” to “more complex” categories (Miles et al., 2014: 279).
12
13

14
15 More recently, merging categories has become a common way to analyze qualitative data
16
17 in organizational scholarship. Gioia, Corley, and Hamilton (2013: 20) emphasize both merging
18
19 and the value of a “data structure” that depicts the conceptual movement from a multitude to a
20
21 reduced set of categories:
22
23

24 In this 1st-order analysis, which tries to adhere faithfully to informant terms, we
25 make little attempt to distill categories, so the number of categories tends to
26 explode on the front end of a study. There could easily be 50 to 100 1st-order
27 categories. ... As the research progresses, we start seeking similarities and
28 differences among the many categories ... a process that eventually reduces the
29 germane categories to a more manageable number (e.g., 25 or 30). ... Once a
30 workable set of themes and concepts is in hand ... we investigate whether it is
31 possible to distill the emergent 2nd-order themes even further into 2nd-order
32 “aggregate dimensions.”
33
34
35

36
37 *Empirical examples.* Many qualitative papers use the move “merging categories” in their
38
39 data analysis, although they may not label it as such. Some refer to merging as “combining” and
40
41 “bundling” (Huising, 2015: 270); others describe “consolidating” (e.g., Anteby & Molnar, 2012:
42
43 522; Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufmann, 2006: 240), and still others report that they “assemble”
44
45 codes into “aggregate dimensions” (Nelson & Irwin, 2014: 900). Regardless of terminology,
46
47 these researchers proceed from having many categories to having fewer categories, often
48
49 referencing first-order categories, second-order categories, and overarching categories. For
50
51 example, Ramus, Vaccaro, and Brusoni (2017: 1264–65) describe initially creating a large set of
52
53 categories, which they gradually aggregated through subsequent data analysis:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 First, we performed open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 61) of each document
4 to identify initial, empirical themes. ... This stage of analysis drove us to identify
5 many empirical themes ... Once a workable set of conceptual categories had been
6 developed, we moved to more deliberate theorizing in an effort to aggregate
7 categories in an empirically grounded model that explained the process.
8
9

10 As an analytical process, merging categories can thus be found in both the categorization
11 literature and the qualitative methodology literature as a strategy for refining categories. Due to
12 its importance for theory development, this move has been widely used in recent empirical work.
13 It appears to be the most prevalent step that authors currently report when conducting qualitative
14 organizational research. Such an emphasis has generated an almost self-fulfilling prophecy
15 (Merton, 1948), in that the sheer assumption that theory development rests mainly on merging
16 categories minimizes other moves, such as splitting, which we turn to next.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ***Splitting categories.*** From studies of categorization, we know that humans' category formation
29 does not progress uniformly from more categories to fewer through merging; often, progression
30 occurs in the opposite direction, from fewer to more (Murphy, 2004). Researchers studying
31 children's language development have noted that children often "overgeneralize," that is, they
32 use a category more broadly than is generally accepted. Over time, a child splits the
33 overgeneralized category into its component parts to create categories that are aligned with
34 conventional usage (MacWhinney, 1987). For example, a young child might use the word "car"
35 to refer to any object that moves, including a skateboard, a bicycle, and a ball. Over time,
36 however, the child breaks down the category "car" and distinguishes between "skateboard,"
37 "bicycle," and "ball." Splitting categories is a move defined as separating a category into two or
38 more subordinate categories.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 ***Identified methodological strategies.*** Lofland and colleagues (2006: 119–143) assert that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 probing the nuances of categories to create finer distinctions is an important component of theory
4
5 generation. Spradley (1979) also emphasizes that identifying “subsets within a domain and the
6
7 relationship between these subsets” is an important element in qualitative analysis (1979: 144).
8
9 Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014: 285) write about “partitioning” and “unbundling” as
10
11 critical ways to analyze data, adding that “there are many times when *differentiation* is more
12
13 important than integration.” As an illustration, researchers who have identified the category
14
15 “people above” in their data might through further analysis split the category into such
16
17 components as people “earning more” and people with “more ambition” than their informants
18
19 (Lamont, 2000: 102–145). Spradley (1979: 115–116) suggests that the process of splitting
20
21 categories can begin during data collection: If informants mention a category during data
22
23 collection, researchers might ask if they can provide other examples of the category. By means
24
25 of splitting, researchers can reach a more nuanced understanding of the different ways a category
26
27 is manifested (or not) in their data.
28
29
30
31

32
33 *Empirical examples.* Several qualitative studies provide examples of how splitting
34
35 categories can advance theory. For example, a vibrant stream of research has developed around
36
37 the notion of “emotional labor” (Hochschild, 1983); until recently, however, analysis of this form
38
39 of labor remained quite monolithic. In her study of psychotherapy practices, Craciun (2018: 261)
40
41 honed in on a single category, the use of emotions at work, that had emerged from her coding.
42
43 Through further data analysis, she discovered that the use of emotions could be split into three
44
45 categories: (1) “didactic,” as a tool of intervention (e.g., when professionals use emotion to foster
46
47 particular dispositions in their clients); (2) “supportive,” as a tool that helps professionals to
48
49 foster trust in their patients (e.g., when professionals are driven by passion for their work); or (3)
50
51 “inductive” (e.g., when professionals rely on their emotions as epistemic tools to identify
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 problems). Craciun also demonstrated that some professionals rely more heavily on one form of
4 emotional labor than the others, with important implications for their professional standing.
5
6 Likewise, Petriglieri (2015) describes how, in her study of BP executives during and after the
7
8 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil rig explosion and spill, she came to split a category she had developed
9
10 during the first stage of her analysis to gain a more nuanced understanding of the relationship
11
12 between an organization and its members. While she initially developed the category
13
14 “questioning fit between self and organizational identity” as a theme, she realized that dividing
15
16 the category into emotional and cognitive components could lead to even more insights (p. 526).
17
18 Others have also described how they have split categories in order to specify their understanding
19
20 of a category (e.g. Crosina & Pratt, 2019). Broadly speaking, splitting can help researchers to
21
22 recognize nuances in their data and unpack a specific category that has piqued their curiosity.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 ***Relating and/or contrasting categories.*** Categorization scholars have suggested that categories
32
33 are not created independently of each other but often evolve in parallel. In particular, many
34
35 scholars have asserted that categories are typically interrelated in semantic networks (Collins &
36
37 Loftus, 1975; Quillian, 1969). Categories that often co-occur in discourse become more closely
38
39 related in the semantic network, whereas categories that seldom occur together become more
40
41 distantly related. For instance, if the category *dog* is often used in conjunction with the category
42
43 *leash*, the two words will ultimately be closely related in the semantic network. Nevertheless, it
44
45 is not merely categories’ association with one another that creates categorical meaning; it can
46
47 also be their perceived opposition. Categories often exist in contrasting pairs (Douglas, 1966;
48
49 Lévi-Strauss, 1969). For example, people construct the meaning of the category “natural” in part
50
51 from its contrast with the category “artificial” (Weber et al., 2008). The meaning of categories is
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 therefore determined by the way people relate and oppose categories to one another (Kahneman
4 & Tversky, 1984).

5
6
7
8 Relating and/or contrasting categories is the move that researchers use when they
9
10 compare several categories to specify the relationships (or lack thereof) among them. It is
11 important to clarify how relating and/or contrasting categories differs from merging: Merging
12 identifies underlying features that belong to the same category; relating and/or contrasting
13 categories identifies relationships among categories that might not belong to the same
14
15 overarching category.
16
17
18
19
20

21 *Identified methodological strategies.* Many qualitative scholars have emphasized the
22 importance of comparing and/or contrasting categories (Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2007: 45;
23 Suddaby, 2006), thus implicitly acknowledging that categories can only operate in relation to one
24 another. Strauss and Corbin (1990: 125) note that categories are “related”; Becker similarly calls
25 all categories “relational” (2008: 132–133), pointing out that “working class” and “middle class”
26 labels have meaning only in relation to each other. Glaser and Strauss (1967: 106) thus provide
27 the following recommendation:
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 While coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in
38 the same and different groups coded in the same category. This constant
39 comparison of the incidents very soon starts to generate theoretical properties of the
40 category. The analyst starts thinking in terms of the full range of types or continua
41 of the category ... [including] its relation to other categories, and its other
42 perspectives.
43
44

45 Many other qualitative scholars would concur: The recommendation of Booth and
46 colleagues (2003: 46) to scholars progressing from a focused topic to a research question is
47 to “identify the parts [of a topic]” and “how they relate to each other”; Miles, Huberman,
48 and Saldaña (2014: 287) suggest that once one is “reasonably clear about what variables
49 may be in play in a situation, the natural next query is, How do they relate to each other?”
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Empirical examples.* Powerful examples of how categories relate to one another appear in
4 Lévi-Strauss's *The Raw and the Cooked* (1969) and Douglas's *Purity and Danger* (1966). Lévi-
5 Strauss' study illustrates that myths cannot be understood in isolation: He describes a collection
6 of myths from tropical South America and points out how duality and oppositions (such as raw
7 versus cooked) are fundamental to humans' understanding of society. Douglas' (1966) seminal
8 work on purity makes a similar relational point: That the categories of "pure" and "impure"
9 function as a dyad, creating oppositions that enable individuals to make sense of their worlds; in
10 other words, we know what is impure by comparing it to what is pure.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 A more recent example of such relational dynamics between categories appears in a study
23 of professionals' social standing in organizations. The study examines commander–medical-
24 provider interactions in a military setting. As DiBenigno (2018: 18) explains, she coded whether
25 observed interactions entailed "developing personalized relationships across groups" or
26 "anchoring group members in their home group identity." These two categories can be
27 understood separately, but they only fully make sense in relation to each other: One entails
28 anchoring oneself in an existing identity; the other involves building ties across identity groups.
29 Importantly, only anchoring contributed to taming inter-group conflict and encouraging the
30 medical providers to properly serve the soldiers. Relating and/or contrasting categories helps
31 researchers to identify in their data the boundaries of the categories and the relationships between
32 categories.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Sequencing categories.* Categories are not static; they are dynamically related to the world that
50 people inhabit. An essential part of the categorization process is to create dynamic
51 understandings of this unfolding reality (Durand & Paoletta, 2013; Nakamura, 1985). Categories
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are not merely cross-sectional groupings of objects; they encode causal relationships between
4
5 objects and actions (Murphy & Medin, 1985). We categorize an event as a "birthday party" not
6
7 only due to the presence of a birthday cake and presents but also because the event follows a
8
9 sequence of actions: a) the arrival of guests, b) the guests make congratulatory statements, c) the
10
11 guests sing a birthday song, d) cake is served, e) candles are blown, f) cake is eaten and g) guests
12
13 leave. Breaking this sequence (for example by serving and eating cake before the guests arrive)
14
15 violates elements of the category "birthday party" and raises questions about whether the event
16
17 falls into this category. Indeed, a central part of the categorization process is to create sequential
18
19 relationships among categories, be they concepts or mechanisms (Ahn, 1999; Murphy & Medin,
20
21 1985). In qualitative theory building, researchers can use the sequencing move to temporally
22
23 organize the categories they have identified in the data. The categories created by researchers
24
25 consist of sequences of actions (mechanisms), objects, persons, and events (concepts) that
26
27
28
29
30
31 together form complex theories of reality.

32
33 *Identified methodological strategies.* A rich tradition in qualitative research has focused
34
35 on sequential processes as a lens through which to achieve a better understanding of various
36
37 phenomena (Langley, 1999; Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013; Tsoukas &
38
39 Chia, 2002). From this viewpoint, the sequencing of categories matters decisively: An [A–B–C]
40
41 sequence might differ from a [C–B–A] sequence. As Locke notes, process-oriented research can
42
43 be described in many ways, but all “reflect a common element, namely time” (Locke, 2001, p.
44
45 42). Langley reminds us that events, phases, incidents, and ordering are all fundamental to the
46
47 coding process (1999: 696). Process scholars position time at the forefront of their analysis, but
48
49 many other qualitative researchers also recognize the importance of time in theory elaboration. In
50
51
52
53 *Discovering Grounded Theory*, Glaser and Strauss discuss sequencing in conjunction with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 studying research productivity (1967: 213–214). Longer hours spent on research, they note, can
4 foster a higher level of motivation and, thus, superior performance, but those who perform at a
5 higher level might be more motivated than their peers and might therefore spend more time
6 conducting research. Thus, how the categories “hours spent at work,” “motivation,” and
7 “productivity” are temporally aligned can yield two very different theoretical stories, one led by
8 the hours worked and the other by high performance. Such distinct theoretical interpretations
9 suggest why qualitative researchers need to pay close attention to the sequencing of categories
10 when analyzing their data.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 *Empirical examples.* Sequencing is important in qualitative analysis because the
22 interrelationship between categories is essential to identifying processes and their temporality. In
23 Jarzabkowski’s (2008) investigation of top managers’ strategizing behavior, an important part of
24 the analysis was to create a temporal sequence. The author describes how she “decomposed each
25 chronology into analytical periods time 1, time 2, and, if relevant, time 3 according to key
26 strategic responses or a discernable shift in top manager behavior” (p. 626). She then generated
27 categories to characterize the behavior within each period and sequenced them in time. Similarly,
28 to understand how organizations legitimated the new market category “satellite radio,” Navis and
29 Glynn (2010) compared patterns of categories associated with data collected over a period of six
30 years. By sequencing categories, the authors uncovered specific shifts in organizational identity
31 and audience attention. Finally, Barley’s (1986) examination of technology change as an
32 occasion for social structuration relied on data analysis that “traced the analytic logic suggested
33 by the sequential model of the structuring process” (p. 86); this indicates that the sequencing of
34 scripts (or categories) mattered as much as the categories per se. In all three examples,
35 sequencing enabled the researchers to develop novel insights into the temporal relationship
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between categories.
4

5 In the process of juggling these merging, splitting, relating and/or contrasting, and
6 sequencing moves, the researcher begins to tease out some categories that function more like
7 mechanisms and others that function more like concepts. This is important because one of the
8 fundamental elements of theory development is not only to identify categories but also to offer a
9 novel perspective on the interrelationship between concepts and mechanisms (Davis & Marquis,
10 2005; Hedström & Swedberg, 1996). Such efforts can add to or even contradict what other
11 theoretical lenses would predict, thereby fulfilling the goal of achieving a more comprehensive
12 understanding of our social worlds.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Stabilizing Categories: Re-Analyses and Theoretical Integration**

27

28 In the final analytical stage, the researcher aims to create a theoretical scaffold to explain the
29 studied phenomena by re-analyzing existing categories and integrating identified mechanisms
30 and concepts. This stabilizing stage often allows researchers to provide answers to or
31 explanations for their initial questions or puzzles. One of the critical moves in this stage entails
32 developing or dropping working hypotheses. This move allows the researcher to examine
33 whether the data truly support the theoretical conclusions reached in the prior stages and to be
34 more actively reflexive of how these conclusions were reached.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 ***Developing or dropping working hypotheses.*** Categories are part of larger “theories” or
48 “working hypotheses” that we have formed to explain how the world works on the basis of prior
49 experiences (Hirschfeld & Gelman, 1994; Murphy, 2004). We know, for example, that when
50 apples are dropped, they fall to the ground because of gravity. When encountering other
51 instances of dropped objects, we assume that gravity is also involved and look for evidence of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 gravity in these new contexts. Gravity is thus part of our theory of the category “apple,” and we
4
5 would pause in astonishment if an apple did not fall but flew into the sky when dropped. In this
6
7 instance, we would probably begin to question whether the object we had dropped actually
8
9 belonged to the category “apple” because its behavior did not conform to our “theory” of the
10
11 apple category. Thus, how we construct categories cannot be decoupled from the broader
12
13 theoretical conjectures that form an integral part of a category (Durand & Paoletta, 2013;
14
15 Murphy & Medin, 1985). In our interactions with the world, we are constantly updating our
16
17 working hypotheses and fitting them to our lived experiences (Hirschfeld & Gelman, 1994).
18
19 Such updating might lead us to replace hypotheses about relationships that we once considered
20
21 true with new ones (Ahn, 1999). In developing and/or dropping a working hypothesis,
22
23 researchers formulate an overarching understanding of their data. As they iterate through their
24
25 data, they find either confirmatory evidence, spurring them to elaborate the hypothesis, or
26
27 contradictory/unsupportive evidence, prompting them to drop it.
28
29
30
31
32

33 *Identified methodological strategies.* Past advice on how best to approach qualitative data
34
35 analysis emphasizes the need to develop, but also to drop, working hypotheses. As Luker
36
37 elegantly articulates it, “We make private bets with ourselves about what features ... will turn
38
39 out to be actual patterns. We know we will often be wrong ... but we hang in there” (2008, p.
40
41 199). The frequent recommendation is for qualitative scholars to “abduct” insights from their
42
43 data (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012) without fully committing to them, so as to be able to
44
45 redirect their analytical eye and remain open to surprises. Locke and her co-authors (2008: 907)
46
47 note the coexistence of “doubt and belief” when analyzing data, suggesting that both knowing
48
49 and not knowing are central to the research process. The sense of knowing might lead to what
50
51 some authors call “propositions,” but propositions ought to be grasped loosely until each is either
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 supported by further data analysis or dropped (Lofland et al., 2006: 176). This “back-and-forth
4
5 ... in which concepts, conjectures, and data are in continuous interplay” serves as the backbone
6
7 of many analyses (Van Maanen, Sørensen, & Mitchell, 2007: 1146). This shifting picture
8
9 explains why Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014: 99) recommend developing propositions to
10
11 “formalize and systematize the researcher’s thinking into a coherent set of explanations” yet
12
13 immediately warn researchers to adopt “safeguards against premature and unwarranted closure.”
14
15 One way to build such safeguards, they observe, is to purposely rate each conjecture as strong,
16
17 qualified, neutral, or contradictory, thus allowing the researcher to scrutinize those most likely to
18
19 emerge from the data and discard those that no longer fit.
20
21
22

23
24 *Empirical examples.* In their study of women crying at work, Elsbach and Bechky (2018:
25
26 134–135) started their analysis by identifying and coding events when women cried at work to
27
28 form a richer understanding of this phenomena. After the initial coding, they “developed a
29
30 preliminary model of defining the common situations in which women cried at work” and
31
32 hypothesized that the forms of situational emotional display could predict the observers’
33
34 reactions. They then returned to the literature to make sense of their data and began to
35
36 understand their data in light of the theory of “emotional display rules.” They found, however,
37
38 that their data “did not fit with these simplistic rules.” Instead, through engagement with existing
39
40 theory, they went on to create the new hypothesis that observers’ reactions could be explained by
41
42 their own “cognitive scripts.” After forming this new hypothesis, they returned to the data and
43
44 found support for this hypothesis.
45
46
47
48

49
50 Unsupported working hypotheses, however, often disappear from the public view:
51
52 Typically, only successful hypotheses graduate to presentation in print. Some authors’
53
54 retrospective comments on published pieces allow us nonetheless to see how working hypotheses
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 wax and wane. For instance, Chan and Anteby (2016) began studying front-line officers at the
4 U.S. Transportation Security Administration a decade after its creation. Initially, they focused on
5 developing categories capturing how employees had been socialized into a possible new
6 profession. Finding little support for the hypothesis that their data spoke to this theme, however,
7 they rapidly refocused the categorical analysis onto what interviewees deemed most salient,
8 gender discrimination and surveillance at work, and developed new working hypotheses (Anteby
9 & Chan, 2018; Chan & Anteby, 2016). In general, when researchers progress from data analysis
10 to theory development, developing and/or dropping working hypotheses is an important move: It
11 prompts researchers via multiple iterations through the data either to marshal strong support and
12 validity for their assumptions or to realize that their initial assumptions were faulty and to
13 discover new ways of interpreting their data (Locke et al., 2015). Once categories are stabilized
14 and hypotheses are supported, researchers can propose a scaffold that both fits their data and
15 advances theory.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **DISCUSSION**

35
36 The most important, yet mysterious, aspect of qualitative data analysis is rigorous theory
37 generation. In this paper, we integrate insights from categorization theory with often neglected
38 methodological strategies to develop a framework for how scholars can achieve and demonstrate
39 rigor in qualitative analysis. By being reflexive about their active role in confronting and creating
40 categories, scholars can be more transparent about their choice of moves, and thus increase the
41 rigor of their analytical process by making it easier for readers to assess the work. The
42 framework provides an overview of how researchers' purposeful use of multiple moves can
43 generate theory from data. By spotlighting the various moves in which qualitative researchers
44 engage, our hope is both to help fuel more rigorous scholarship and to allow readers of
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 qualitative research to evaluate qualitative research efforts more effectively.
4

5 Although any of the moves can occur at any point in time during the analytical process,
6
7 the generation of initial categories often occurs when researchers *ask questions* that elicit insights
8
9 from the data or when they *focus on puzzles* in which the data conflict with existing theories.
10
11 After this initial stage, and in order to refine tentative categories, qualitative scholars can *drop*,
12
13 *merge* or *split* categories to make them more or less encompassing or organize categories, either
14
15 by *sequencing* them temporally or by *relating and/or contrasting* them with each other. Finally,
16
17 in order to stabilize categories, researchers *develop and/or drop working hypotheses* as they build
18
19 on their analysis to progress toward theoretical insights. The model of theory development that
20
21 we suggest is active and iterative: Researchers constantly cycle through multiple and distinct
22
23 moves while purposefully probing and revisiting initial categories. We argue that qualitative
24
25 researchers who adopt such an approach to data analysis will not only improve the transparency
26
27 and rigor of their work but also be better equipped to develop powerful theories that break with
28
29 existing understandings of the world. When researchers become more reflexive, they open the
30
31 black box of qualitative analysis to gain greater insight into their own analytical process, which
32
33 allows them to question and challenge their own assumptions. It is this prodding that might allow
34
35 them to develop greater theoretical insights.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Rigor via Reflexivity on Scholars' Active Role in Categorization**

46
47 Qualitative researchers have long been attuned to the challenges associated with achieving rigor
48
49 in their work and the need to detail their movement from data to theory carefully (Glaser &
50
51 Strauss, 1967: 244). Indeed, the most significant challenge for qualitative researchers “is not to
52
53 find more rigorous methods ... [instead] the challenge ... is to convince its practitioners that they
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 owe it to themselves ... to explicate their procedures fully” (Comaroff, 2005: 38). Nevertheless,
4
5 recent debates, inspired in part by the rise of the behavioral sciences, have made it more urgent
6
7 to address these concerns (Pratt, Kaplan & Whittington, 2020). We argue that by being more
8
9 reflexive about the active process of categorization, scholars can better demonstrate transparency
10
11 in their movement from data to theory, which will allow readers to better evaluate the rigor of
12
13 their work.
14
15

16
17 Taking an active perspective on the process of analyzing qualitative data suggests that
18
19 researchers bring their own experiences and goals to bare on the analytical process. Some
20
21 scholars have argued that a sign of rigor in qualitative analysis is the ability of others to replicate
22
23 the *same* theoretical contribution when presented with the same data (Aguinis & Solarino, 2019).
24
25 Others, however, have posited that this concept of “replicability,” which is borrowed from
26
27 quantitative research, should be interpreted differently within qualitative scholarship (Pratt et al.,
28
29 2020). As Small (2009, p. 28) notes, qualitative researchers might need to embrace “alternative
30
31 epistemological assumptions better suited for their unique questions rather than retreat toward
32
33 models designed for statistical descriptive research.”
34
35
36
37

38 In sum, unless we assume that all scholars have the same cognitive/experiential
39
40 predispositions, the question of replicability becomes partly mute. Instead of focusing on
41
42 replicability as the path to rigor, we suggest that scholars can achieve and demonstrate rigor in
43
44 qualitative research by being first more reflexive and subsequently more transparent about their
45
46 metacognitive knowledge, that is, knowledge about their own knowledge and goals (Pintrich,
47
48 2002). As researchers, we might obtain a greater degree of rigor in our work if we are explicit
49
50 about and carefully detail our own knowledge and goals before and during our data collection
51
52 and analysis. It is thus important that researchers find ways to report and represent their data that
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 increases the transparency of their research process. Researchers can do this either verbally by
4 detailing the moves that they engaged in and the consequences each move had for their
5 theoretical development. They can also create visual representations of the analytical process that
6 are true to how the research unfolded and which shows the complexity and messiness of the
7 categorization process.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Unfolding the Analytical Process: An Opportunity for Theory Building**

18
19 We argue that instead of mapping out all the possible and replicable categories in any given
20 dataset, qualitative researchers achieve rigor by tracing and detailing their unique pathway
21 through the data. Additionally, we argue that active categorization is more likely to yield
22 theoretical insights. Following categorization theory, we suggest that entering the field with
23 some theoretical understanding is both unavoidable and generative, and that not all data are
24 equally valuable for generating theory. For example, categorization theory suggests that the
25 process of categorizing fundamentally forces us to *not* pay attention to the stimuli we encounter
26 (Murphy, 2004). If we paid attention to all the information at once, we would suffer from
27 cognitive overload and be unable to create a coherent representation of the world, let alone
28 navigate through it (Rosch, 1978). Likewise, because most areas of organizational life are
29 already explained by existing theories, it is important for qualitative researchers to *not* focus on
30 the elements of their data that can be explained within existing theories. Instead, we need to
31 focus on the questions and puzzles that challenge the current understanding of the phenomenon
32 at hand and clearly explain the path that helped us to reach our conclusions: That is, we need to
33 focus on salient elements of the data that cannot be explained within our existing categorical
34 apparatus (Ahn, 1999; Sloman et al., 1998).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Theory represents an abstracted and simplified lens on reality that contributes to a
4 specific body of literature (Merton, 1973). Strong theoretical pieces shine because of what they
5 teach us: They help us to see new connections, revisit our preconceived viewpoints, and develop
6 new takes on old questions. When reading seminal academic articles and books, we focus on
7 their theoretical insights and can easily gloss over the analytical choices that underpin these
8 findings. Nevertheless, these insights are enabled by how scholars have generated theory from
9 data. This is particularly true of qualitative data analysis, which relies on researchers'
10 interpretations of their data and the analytical moves they make to generate theory from data.
11 Such an approach counters the illusion of a fully detached and comprehensive induction of
12 theory from data (Eisenhardt, 1989). The comprehensive, yet unintentional categorization of
13 qualitative data is unlikely to yield novel theoretical insights because it will mostly reproduce an
14 existing understanding.

15
16
17 An active categorization framework recognizes the unfolding of the research process and
18 implies that researchers select different moves at different times in the analytical process to
19 generate rigorous theory. For example, "asking questions" might be particularly well suited to
20 early phases of data analysis, prior even to developing categories, or to very late phases in which
21 researchers feel stuck. Similarly, the development of working hypotheses is most likely to occur
22 after several categories have emerged and been placed in relation to each other. Thus, focusing
23 exclusively on one move only tilts a scholar's efforts and attention toward a single phase of the
24 analytical process, which, although important, might not stand alone. By spotlighting a
25 researcher's potential toolkit of moves, we emphasize the sequential and iterative nature of any
26 analysis and underline that concentrating on a single phase/move might restrict our ability to
27 theorize in all phases of the research. This is not to say that questions or puzzles do not evolve.

1
2
3 Nonetheless, driving the analytical process with tentative questions or puzzles is critical to theory
4 development.
5
6
7

8 9 **Plurality Within Qualitative Analysis**

10
11 Adopting an active categorization frame means that researchers can approach the same data with
12 different goals and analyze it in different ways. The theoretical insights that are drawn from the
13 data are thus not simply “given” in the data but actively constructed by researchers to address
14 puzzles that they find interesting and important. Other researchers might view the same data very
15 differently: As we know, many valuable insights emerge from the interaction of different
16 individuals in distinct fields (Anteby, 2013; de Rond & Tunçalp, 2017; Hudson & Okhuysen,
17 2014; Ketokivi & Mantere, 2010; Louis & Bartunek, 1992). Building on the discussion by
18 Lamont and Swidler (2014) of diversity in qualitative methodologies, we call for more plurality
19 both within and across qualitative studies to fully leverage the richness and potential of qualitative
20 data. By combining analytical moves in different ways, researchers are ultimately likely to
21 generate more diverse insights from the same dataset, thus contributing to a broader range of
22 literature.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Beyond the fact that different paths can be taken through the data, if researchers
40 foreground certain moves over others, it might shape their theory development. A plurality of
41 analytical approaches is therefore likely to foster more diversity in contributions. For example, if
42 researchers focus more on puzzles, they are more likely to generate theory that challenges
43 existing theoretical understanding because the puzzling phenomena in the data derive precisely
44 from the contrast they present when juxtaposed with existing theories. This is the case in the
45 analysis by McPherson and Sauder (2013: 165) of how occupational groups can advantageously
46 hijack one another’s occupational logics. By focusing on the puzzle of why some occupational
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 groups did not uniformly display their own occupational logics, McPherson and Sauder (2013)
4
5 were able to demonstrate that logics can be used for strategic purposes to “manage institutional
6
7 complexity, reach consensus, and get the work ... done.” Thus, because the authors focused on a
8
9 specific puzzle in their data, they developed an insight that broke with the prevailing
10
11 understanding of how logics operate.
12
13

14
15 Likewise, if researchers ask questions of their data, they will develop theory that might be
16
17 more likely to expand existing understanding. As an illustration, Tripsas and Gavetti (2000)
18
19 asked how cognitions (and not capabilities) might shape firms’ abilities to manage technological
20
21 discontinuities. From this point of departure, they were able to develop a perspective that
22
23 departed radically from prior views of how firms manage technological transitions. If researchers
24
25 start by merging or splitting categories, without asking questions or focusing on puzzles, it is
26
27 often difficult for them to gain theoretical traction because, without a guiding question or puzzle,
28
29 they can easily become overwhelmed by the multiplicity of possibilities and asphyxiate in their
30
31 data (Pettigrew, 1990).
32
33

34
35 The role of dropping, merging, splitting, relating and sequencing categories is to refine
36
37 categories that are created around an initial puzzle. These moves are likely to generate more
38
39 specificity in the resulting theory because they provide the researcher with more nuances in the
40
41 created categories. However, prioritizing any of these moves are likely to generate different
42
43 theoretical outcomes. An emphasis on dropping will for example narrow researchers' focus on a
44
45 smaller part of the data allowing them to develop a more detailed explanation of a smaller piece
46
47 of the reality that is captured in the data. This is often a cornerstone of qualitative analysis as any
48
49 given qualitative dataset is multifaceted and complex and can be used to address a wide variety
50
51 of theoretical questions. If researchers emphasize merging and splitting, the resulting theory is
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actively formed. To obtain rigor in qualitative analysis, we need to be transparent about these
4
5 active moves because otherwise readers cannot assess the precision of our work. We also suggest
6
7 that adopting an active categorization framework has critical consequences for how qualitative
8
9 analysis unfolds and for the theoretical insights we generate. If we do not problematize the
10
11 creation of analytical categories, we will be limited in the kinds of theoretical insights we are
12
13 able to develop. In other words, an active categorization framework can liberate scholars to
14
15 discover pathways through the data that might be less heavily traveled and, thus, more
16
17 innovative. Moving in lockstep, using identical tools, we may appear aligned and convey an
18
19 impression of rigor when in reality we are trampling on the seeds of our own imaginations.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: An Active Categorization Framework for Theory Development

Categorization process	Analytical stages	Researchers' active moves								Contribution to theory development
		Asking Questions	Focusing on puzzles	Dropping categories	Merging categories	Splitting categories	Relating categories	Sequencing categories	Developing or dropping hypotheses	
Generating initial categories	Initial data collection and analyses									Linking initial categories to past theoretical insights
Refining tentative categories	Further analyses and possible added data collection									Linking tentative categories to elaborate/challenge existing theories
Stabilizing categories	Re-analyses and theoretical integration									Creating a theoretical scaffold

Note: On the figure the darker the shading the more attention is paid to that particular move during a given analytical stage.

Table 2: An Overview of Eight Possible Analytical Moves

Move	Definition	Example
Asking questions	Approaching the data with specific questions that researchers want answers to	How do actors “construct, navigate, and capitalize on timing norms in their attempts to change institutions”? (Granqvist & Gustanfsson, 2016)
Focusing on puzzles	Focusing on the part of the data that is most surprising or salient to the researchers	It is puzzling that parties challenging established social systems collaborate with defenders of those same systems (O’Mahony & Becky, 2008).
Dropping categories	Dropping categories that were generated during the initial part of data analysis but that turned out not to have theoretical traction.	Upon attending his first role-playing game event, the researcher noted that “there was no organization to the group: there was no membership chairman, no one that one had to meet to gain access; one simply walked in...” (Fine, 1983: 244). Yet rapidly that category lost relevance as others gained more theoretical traction.
Merging categories	Uniting two or more existing categories to create a superordinate category	“In reviewing our first-level constructs and relating these to prior research, we concluded that all of them represented different phases and forms of identity work.” Thus “identity work” was adopted as the label of a merged code (Creed, Dejordy, & Lok, 2010: 1342)
Splitting categories	Separating a category into two or more subordinate categories	Splitting the category of Total Quality Management (TQM) “tools” into four sub-categories, ranging from the least technical (general TQM methods) to the most technical (statistical tools) (Zbaracki, 1998: 610)
Relating and/or contrasting categories	Comparing several categories with each other to identify relationships between them (or the lack of such relationships)	Contrasting “grass-fed” and “conventional” to identify their similarities and differences (Weber et al., 2008)
Sequencing categories	Temporally organizing categories that researchers have identified in the data	Researchers “sought evidence of boundary and practice work patterns that co-occurred in time, by actor type and by objective. We identified four cycles of interconnected boundary work and practice work... We constructed raw data tables for each cycle to provide another iteration between the raw data and this higher level of abstraction.... These cycles together formed a complete lifecycle of institutional stability and change” (Zietsma & Lawrence, 2010, p. 200).
Developing and/or dropping working hypotheses	Formulating an overarching theory and, by iterating through the data, either finding increasing evidence for it, leading to its elaboration, or finding contradictory or unsupportive evidence leading to its abandonment	“Throughout this cyclical process, we actively and continually called into question our emerging theoretical understanding by exposing it to further data analysis” (de Rond & Lok, 2016: 1971)

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Solarino, A. M. 2019. Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40: 1291–1315.
- Ahn, W.-K. 1999. Effect of causal structure on category construction. *Memory & Cognition*, 27(6): 1008–1023.
- Anteby, M. 2013. Relaxing the taboo on telling our own stories: Upholding professional distance and personal involvement. *Organization Science*, 24(4): 1277–1290.
- Anteby, M., & Chan, C. K. 2018. A self-fulfilling cycle of coercive surveillance: Workers' invisibility practices and managerial justification. *Organization Science*, 29(2): 247–263.
- Anteby, M., & Molnar, V. 2012. Collective memory meets organizational identity: Remembering to forget in a firm's rhetorical history. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3): 515–540.
- Anteby, M., & Occhiuto, N. 2020. Stand-in labor and the rising economy of self. *Social Forces*, 98(3): 1287–1310.
- Armstrong, S. L., Gleitman, L. R., & Gleitman, H. 1983. What some concepts might not be. *Cognition*, 13(3): 263–308.
- Bansal, P. (Tima), & Corley, K. 2011. From the editors: The coming of age for qualitative research: Embracing the diversity of qualitative methods. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 233–237.
- Barley, S. R. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1): 78–108.
- Barsalou, L. W. 1983. Ad hoc categories. *Memory & Cognition*, 11(3): 211–227.
- Becker, H. S. 2008. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about your Research while you're Doing it*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Behfar, K., & Okhuysen, G. A. 2018. Discovery within validation logic: Deliberately surfacing, complementing, and substituting abductive reasoning in hypothetico-deductive inquiry. *Organization Science*, 29(2): 323–340.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. 1966. *New York: Anchor*.

- 1
2
3 Bingham, C. B., & Kahl, S. J. 2013. The process of schema emergence: Assimilation, deconstruction,
4 unitization and the plurality of analogies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(1): 14–34.
5
6
7 Bloom, P. 2000. *How Children Learn the Meanings of Words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
8
9 Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. 2003. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: University of
10 Chicago press.
11
12 Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of
13 Chicago Press.
14
15
16 Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. 2000. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*.
17 Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
18
19
20 Chan, C. K., & Anteby, M. 2016. Task segregation as a mechanism for within-job inequality: Women and
21 men of the Transportation Security Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(2):
22 184–216.
23
24
25 Charmaz, K. 1983. The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. M. Emerson
26 (Ed.), *Contemporary Field Research*: 109–126. Boston: Little Brown.
27
28
29 Charmaz, K. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*.
30 Los Angeles: Sage.
31
32
33 Clark, H. H., & Wilkes-Gibbs, D. 1986. Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition*, 22(1): 1–39.
34
35
36 Cohen, L. E. 2013. Assembling jobs: A model of how tasks are bundled into and across jobs.
37 *Organization Science*, 24(2): 432–454.
38
39
40 Collins, A. M., & Loftus, E. F. 1975. A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing.
41 *Psychological Review*, 82(6): 407.
42
43
44 Colyvas, J. A., & Powell, W. W. 2006. Roads to institutionalization: The remaking of boundaries between
45 public and private science. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27: 305–353.
46
47
48 Comaroff, J. 2005. Notes on anthropological method, mainly in the key of E. *Workshop on*
49 *Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research*, 28–36. Washington D.C.:
50 National Science Foundation.
51
52
53 Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. 1990. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative
54 criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1): 3–21.
55
56
57 Craciun, M. 2018. Emotions and Knowledge in Expert Work: A Comparison of Two Psychotherapies.
58 *American Journal of Sociology*, 123(4): 959–1003.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Creed, W. E. D., Dejordy, R., & Lok, J. 2010. Being the change: Resolving institutional contradiction
4 through identity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1336–1364.
5
6
7 Crosina, E., & Pratt, M. G. 2019. Toward a Model of Organizational Mourning: The Case of Former
8 Lehman Brothers Bankers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(1): 66–98.
9
10 Davis, G. F., & Marquis, C. 2005. Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century:
11 Institutional fields and mechanisms. *Organization Science*, 16(4): 332–343.
12
13
14 de Rond, M., & Lok, J. 2016. Some things can never be unseen: The role of context in psychological
15 injury at war. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6): 1965–1993.
16
17
18 de Rond, M., & Tunçalp, D. 2017. Where the wild things are: How dreams can help identify
19 countertransference in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(3): 413–
20 437.
21
22
23 Desmond, M. 2012. Disposable ties and the urban poor. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5): 1295–
24 1335.
25
26
27 DiBenigno, J. 2018. Anchored personalization in managing goal conflict between professional groups:
28 The case of US Army mental health care. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63(3): 526–569.
29
30 Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London ;
31 New York: Routledge.
32
33
34 Durand, R., & Paoella, L. 2013. Category stretching: Reorienting research on categories in strategy,
35 entrepreneurship, and organization theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(6): 1100–1123.
36
37
38 Durkheim, E., & Mauss, M. 2009. *Primitive Classification (Routledge Revivals)*. London: Routledge.
39
40 Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. 2007. Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy*
41 *of Management Review*, 32(4): 1246–1264.
42
43 Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*,
44 14(4): 532–550.
45
46
47 Eisenhardt, K. M., Graebner, M. E., & Sonenshein, S. 2016. Grand challenges and inductive methods:
48 Rigor without rigor mortis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(4): 1113–1123.
49
50
51 Elsbach, K. D., & Bechky, B. A. 2018. How observers assess women who cry in professional work
52 contexts. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(2): 127–154.
53
54
55 Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University
56 of Chicago Press.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fine, G. A. 1983. *Shared Fantasy: Role-Playing Games as Social Worlds*. Chicago: University of
4 Chicago Press.
5
6
7 Fine, G. A. 1993. Ten lies of ethnography: Moral dilemmas of field research. *Journal of Contemporary*
8 *Ethnography*, 22(3): 267–294.
9
10 Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., et al. 2017. Finding theory–method
11 fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building. *Journal of Management*
12 *Inquiry*.
13
14
15 Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. 2013. Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research:
16 Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1): 15–31.
17
18
19 Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative*
20 *Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
21
22
23 Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts
24 convince. *Organization Science*, 4(4): 595–616.
25
26
27 Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. 2007. *Composing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
28
29 Graebner, M. E., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 2004. The seller’s side of the story: Acquisition as courtship and
30 governance as syndicate in entrepreneurial firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49(3): 366–
31 403.
32
33
34 Granovetter, M. S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6): 1360–1380.
35
36 Grodal, S., Nelson, A. J., & Siino, R. M. 2015. Help-seeking and help-giving as an organizational routine:
37 Continual engagement in innovative work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(1): 136–168.
38
39
40 Hedström, P., & Swedberg, R. 1996. Social mechanisms. *Acta Sociologica*, 29: 281–308.
41
42 Hirschfeld, L. A., & Gelman, S. A. 1994. *Mapping the Mind: Domain Specificity in Cognition and*
43 *Culture*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
44
45
46 Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley:
47 University of California Press.
48
49 Hudson, B. A., & Okhuysen, G. A. 2014. Taboo topics: Structural barriers to the study of organizational
50 stigma. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(3): 242–253.
51
52
53 Huising, R. 2015. To hive or to hold? Producing relational authority through scut work. *Administrative*
54 *Science Quarterly*, 60(2): 263–299.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jarzabkowski, P. 2008. Shaping strategy as a structuration process. *Academy of Management Journal*,
4 51(4): 621–650.
5
6
7 Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. 1984. Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, 39(4): 341.
8
9 Katz, J. 2001. Analytic induction revisited. *Contemporary Field Research: Perspectives and*
10 *Formulations*, 331–334.
11
12 Kellogg, K. C. 2009. Operating room: Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in surgery.
13 *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(3): 657–711.
14
15
16 Kellogg, K. C. 2019. Subordinate activation tactics: Semi-professionals and micro-level institutional
17 change in professional organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(4): 928–975.
18
19 Ketokivi, M., & Mantere, S. 2010. Two strategies for inductive reasoning in organizational research.
20 *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2): 315–333.
21
22
23 Khaire, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. 2010. Changing landscapes: The construction of meaning and value in a
24 new market category—Modern Indian art. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6): 1281–1304.
25
26
27 Lakoff, G. 2008. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
28
29 Lamont, M. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and*
30 *Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
31
32
33 Lamont, M., & Swidler, A. 2014. Methodological pluralism and the possibilities and limits of
34 interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology*, 37(2): 153–171.
35
36
37 Lamont, M., & White, P. 2008. *The Evaluation of Systematic Qualitative Research in the Social*
38 *Sciences*. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
39
40
41 Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4):
42 691–710.
43
44
45 Langley, A., & Abdallah, C. 2015. Templates and turns in qualitative studies of strategy and management.
46 In G. B. Dagnino & M. C. Cinici (Eds.), *Research methods for strategic management*: 155–184.
47 London: Routledge.
48
49
50 Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. 2013. Process studies of change in
51 organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of*
52 *Management Journal*, 56(1): 1–13.
53
54
55 Lévi-Strauss, C. 1969. *The Raw and the Cooked*. New York: Harper & Row.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Locke, K. 2001. *Grounded Theory in Management Research*. London: Sage.
- 4
5 Locke, K., Feldman, M. S., & Golden-Biddle, K. 2015. Handbook of Qualitative Organizational
6 Research: Innovative Pathways and Methods. *Discovery, validation, and live coding*: 371–380.
7
8 New York: Routledge.
- 9
10 Locke, K., Golden-Biddle, K., & Feldman, M. S. 2008. Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of
11 doubt in the research process. *Organization Science*, 19(6): 907–918.
- 12
13
14 Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L. H. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to*
15 *Qualitative Observation and Analysis* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- 16
17
18 Lopez, S. H., & Phillips, L. A. 2019. Unemployed: White-collar job searching after the Great Recession.
19 *Work and Occupations*, 46(4): 470–510.
- 20
21
22 Louis, M. R., & Bartunek, J. M. 1992. Insider/outsider research teams: Collaboration across diverse
23 perspectives. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 1(2): 101–110.
- 24
25
26 Lubet, S. 2017. *Interrogating Ethnography: Why Evidence Matters*. Oxford University Press.
- 27
28
29 Luker, K. 2008. *Salsa Dancing into the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 30
31
32 MacWhinney, B. (Ed.). 1987. *Mechanisms of Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 33
34
35 Mazmanian, M. 2013. Avoiding the trap of constant connectivity: When congruent frames allow for
36 heterogeneous practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5): 1225–1250.
- 37
38
39 McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. 2013. Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug
40 court. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(2): 165–196.
- 41
42
43 Mears, A. 2015. Working for free in the VIP: Relational work and the production of consent. *American*
44 *Sociological Review*, 80(6): 1099–1122.
- 45
46
47 Merton, R. K. 1948. The self-fulfilling prophecy. *The Antioch Review*, 8(2): 193–210.
- 48
49
50 Merton, R. K. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago:
51 University of Chicago press.
- 52
53
54 Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*.
55 Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- 56
57
58 Murphy, G. L. 2004. *The Big Book of Concepts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 Murphy, G. L., & Medin, D. L. 1985. The role of theories in conceptual coherence. *Psychological*
4 *Review*, 92(3): 289.
5
6
7 Nakamura, G. V. 1985. Knowledge-based classification of ill-defined categories. *Memory & Cognition*,
8 13(5): 377–384.
9
10 Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. 2010. How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynamics of legitimacy,
11 identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,
12 55(3): 439–471.
13
14
15 Nelson, A. J., & Irwin, J. 2014. “Defining what we do—All over again”: Occupational identity,
16 technological change, and the librarian/Internet-search relationship. *Academy of Management*
17 *Journal*, 57(3): 892–928.
18
19
20 Ozcan, P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 2009. Origin of alliance portfolios: Entrepreneurs, network strategies, and
21 firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2): 246–279.
22
23
24 Petriglieri, J. L. 2015. Co-creating relationship repair: Pathways to reconstructing destabilized
25 organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(3): 518–557.
26
27
28 Pettigrew, A. M. 1990. Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. *Organization*
29 *Science*, 1(3): 267–292.
30
31
32 Pintrich, P. R. 2002. The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory*
33 *into Practice*, 41(4): 219–225.
34
35
36 Pratt, M. G., Kaplan, S., & Whittington, R. 2020. The tumult over transparency: Decoupling transparency
37 from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research. *Administrative Science*
38 *Quarterly*, 65(1): 1–19.
39
40
41 Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufmann, J. B. 2006. Constructing professional identity: The role of
42 work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents.
43 *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 235–262.
44
45
46 Quillian, M. R. 1969. The teachable language comprehender: A simulation program and theory of
47 language. *Communications of the ACM*, 12(8): 459–476.
48
49
50 Ramus, T., Vaccaro, A., & Brusoni, S. 2017. Institutional complexity in turbulent times: Formalization,
51 collaboration, and the emergence of blended logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(4):
52 1253–1284.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rosch, E. 1978. *Principles of categorization. Cognition and categorization, ed. By Eleanor Rosch &*
4 *Barbara B. Lloyd, 27-48.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5
6
7 Searle, J. R., & Willis, S. 1995. *The Construction of Social Reality.* New York: Simon and Schuster.
8
9 Sieglar, R. S. 1998. *Emerging Minds: The Process of Change in Children's Thinking.* New York:
10 Oxford University Press.
11
12 Sloman, S. A., Love, B. C., & Ahn, W.-K. 1998. Feature centrality and conceptual coherence. *Cognitive*
13 *Science*, 22(2): 189–228.
14
15
16 Small, M. L. 2009. How many cases do I need?' On science and the logic of case selection in field-based
17 research. *Ethnography*, 10(1): 5–38.
18
19
20 Small, M. L. 2013. Causal thinking and ethnographic research. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(3):
21 597–601.
22
23
24 Smith, E. R., & Zarate, M. A. 1992. Exemplar-based model of social judgment. *Psychological Review*,
25 99(1): 3.
26
27 Spradley, J. P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
28
29 Staw, B. M. 1995. Repairs on the road to relevance and rigor. In L. L. Cummings & P. J. Frost (Eds.),
30 *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences:* 85–97. London: Sage.
31
32
33 Strauss, A. L. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
34 Press.
35
36
37 Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and*
38 *Techniques.* Los Angeles: Sage.
39
40
41 Suddaby, R. 2006. What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4): 633–642.
42
43 Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. 2012. Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory
44 to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3): 167–186.
45
46
47 Tripsas, M., & Gavetti, G. 2000. Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging.
48 *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11): 1147–1161.
49
50 Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. 2002. On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change.
51 *Organization Science*, 13(5): 567–582.
52
53
54 Turco, C. J. 2016. *The Conversational Firm: Rethinking Bureaucracy in the Age of Social Media.* New
55 York: Columbia University Press.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Van Maanen, J. 1979. The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science*
4 *Quarterly*, 24(4): 539–550.
5
6
7 Van Maanen, J. 2011. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago
8 Press.
9
10 Van Maanen, J., Sørensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. 2007. The interplay between theory and method.
11 *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1145–1154.
12
13
14 Vaughan, D. 1996. *The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at*
15 *NASA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
16
17
18 Vergne, J.-P., & Wry, T. 2014. Categorizing categorization research: Review, integration, and future
19 directions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(1): 56–94.
20
21
22 Vygotsky, L. S. 1987. *Thought and Language*. New York: Plenum Press.
23
24 Weber, K., Heinze, K. L., & DeSoucey, M. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement
25 for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 529–567.
26
27
28 Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. 2005. Organizing and the process of sensemaking.
29 *Organization Science*, 16(4): 409–421.
30
31
32 Yin, R. K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
33
34 Zbaracki, M. J. 1998. The rhetoric and reality of total quality management. *Administrative Science*
35 *Quarterly*, 43(3): 602–636.
36
37 Zhao, E. Y., Ishihara, M., Jennings, P. D., & Lounsbury, M. 2018. Optimal distinctiveness in the console
38 video game industry: An exemplar-based model of proto-category evolution. *Organization*
39 *Science*, 29(4): 558–611.
40
41
42 Zietsma, C., & Lawrence, T. B. 2010. Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field:
43 The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(2):
44 189–221.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Stine Grodal (grodal@bu.edu) is an associate professor of strategy and innovation at Boston University's
5 Questrom School of Business and (by courtesy) sociology at Boston University's College of Arts &
6 Sciences. Her research examines the emergence and evolution of markets, industries and fields with a
7 specific focus on the strategies firms and other industry stakeholders use to shape and exploit new market
8 categories.
9

10 Michel Anteby (manteby@bu.edu) is an associate professor of organizational behavior at Boston
11 University's Questrom School of Business and (by courtesy) sociology at Boston University's College of
12 Arts & Sciences. His research looks at how people relate to their work, their occupations, and the
13 organizations to which they belong. Recent empirical foci of his inquiries have included correctional
14 officers, ghostwriters, and subway drivers.
15

16
17 Audrey L. Holm (auholm@bu.edu) is a doctoral candidate in Management and Organizations at Boston
18 University's Questrom School of Business. Her research focuses on shifting occupational dynamics,
19 evolving relationships at work, and new labor market challenges. Her dissertation looks more specifically
20 at how members of intermediary-organizations (such as back-to-work programs) accompany returning
21 citizens in their job searches.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60