

# Compare and Contrast of Grounded Theory and KJ Method

Kenichi Shimura

## Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to compare and contrast grounded theory and KJ (Kawakita Jiro) method. Many Japanese researchers confuse the two methods, and mix them together. For example, a graduate student in education advises another member in an online forum on Internet that grounded theory approach is corresponds to KJ method (Murayama, 2001). To clarify the difference is critical for honoring the scholarship of both originators.

The purpose of social or educational research is to describe particular situations, to numerically describe the mass, to explain unknown phenomena, to verify hypothesis and/or to develop theory. To verify hypothesis and to numerically describe the mass, quantitative research method is used, and to describe particular situations, to explain unknown phenomena or to develop theory, qualitative research method is widely used. Although grounded theory is not only qualitative research (Glaser, 1992), many researchers put it into the qualitative research category.

Glaser and Strauss discovered that grounded theory generates theory from systematically obtained data. Kawakita created a method to organize data from field research and to “abduct” an idea from the data (Kawakita, 1967, p. 4), and he named it KJ method from his name, Kawakita Jiro (Kawakita, 1967). It is interesting that the first grounded theory book and the first KJ method book were both published in 1967. Neither method was intended to verify hypothesis nor to numerically describe data but to generate theory or to abduct an idea from data. In this essay, both methods will be reviewed and compared.

## Background information

A qualitative research textbook mentioned that KJ method and grounded theory have very similar backgrounds (Funashima, 1999). From social work’s perspective, KJ method has been a popular method to organize and to analyze qualitative data (Nakano, 2001). KJ method has also been a popular qualitative research method in nursing for over 20 years (Funashima, 1999), and the method is not only considered a research method, but it is also considered a problem solving tool or planning tool for various field such as management, education and/or social planning (Kawakita, 1970).

Along with the recent constructionism movement, social and behavioral science disciplines, especially human service professionals, are interested in qualitative research methods. Grounded theory became a popular qualitative research method within that movement. The following are the grounded theory literature that has been translated into Japanese.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1965). *Awareness of dying*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

(Translated by Kinoshita in 1988)

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

(Translated by Goto, Ohde, & Mizuno in 1996)

Schatzman & Strauss (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

(Translated by Kawai in 1999)

Strauss, A.L. (1984). *Chronic illness and the quality of life, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.* St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

(Translated by Minami, Kinoshita, & Nojima in 1987)

Chenitz, W.C., & Swanson, J.M. (1986). *From practice to grounded theory*. Reading, MA: Wesley.

(Translated by Higuchi & Inaoka in 1992)

Strauss & Corbin (1990). *Basics for qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

(Translated by Minami in 1999)

Although Glaser and Strauss both taught at the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF), Strauss is more popular among Japanese researchers. Thus, Straussian grounded theory is more popular than Glaserian grounded theory, and more Straussian literatures were translated into Japanese than Glaserian literature. Consequently, for most Japanese grounded theorists, Straussian method became the grounded theory. Because of Strauss's health status before he died, he suggested to Japanese scholars to learn grounded theory from Corbin (Minami, 1999). Strauss earned Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, thus, Dewey's pragmatism and Blumer's symbolic interaction influenced Strauss. Consequently, this Chicago tradition influenced the development of grounded theory (Morioka, 1999).

Setsuo Mizuno, who is a professor of sociology at Hosei University, spent two years at the UCSF as a visiting scholar, and he points out four sociology books from the 1960s as valuable methodology books. These books are "The social construction of reality" by Berger and Luckmann, "Studies in ethnomethodology" by Garfinkel, "Symbolic interaction" by Blumer and "The discovery of grounded theory" by Glaser and Strauss. It is interesting that the first three books have gotten attention from Japanese sociologists from the beginning, but grounded theory has only gotten attention until recently. He was a friend of Strauss, and this friendship supported Mizuno to understand the method and to translate the discovery book into Japanese (Mizuno, 1996).

Yasuhito Kinoshita (Ph.D. from the UCSF), who is a professor of sociology at Rikkyo University, stated that many researchers don't understand completely how grounded theory works, although many of those same researchers think it is great. Thus, to use grounded theory in this situation requires courage, or it isn't very smart (1999). Then to solve the problem, Kinoshita developed mini-grounded theory in 1999 and modified grounded theory approach, which he named it M-GTA in 2003. Kinoshita also mentioned that grounded theory and KJ method have very close relationship (1999). Because these books are written in Japanese, and he serves as a supervisor for researchers who conduct study by grounded theory, M-GTA is now a popular grounded theory among Japanese grounded theorists.

Considering the current situation in Japan, I will compare KJ method and Glaser's grounded theory. Glaser's grounded theory has not been introduced properly to Japanese scholars except in

the “Discovery” book, and because Glaser was an originator of grounded theory, it is appropriate to choose for comparison.

## **History**

### **History of KJ method**

KJ method is a popular research method, a problem-solving tool and/or a group or an individual decision-making method in various social and behavioral science, such as nursing, business management and/or education. The creator of KJ method, Dr. Jiro Kawakita is a researcher of ethno-geography, and he conducted ethno-geographic studies in Nepal, and devised this research method in the 1950s (1974). He mentioned, “the fundamental concept of this method is ‘data tell us something,’ instead of data processing by means of certain preconceived ideas or theories” (1974, Preface section). He named the method by using his initials, and it was fixed around 1965 (Kawakita, 1986).

There were three reasons Kawakita devised KJ method (Kawakita, 1986). First, Kawakita, as an ethno-geographic researcher, conducted fieldwork to gather data in various forms that was mostly qualitative. Without the method, he would have been confused by the chaos of the phenomena, lending difficulty to organize these data and lead them to a conclusion (Kawakita, 1986).

Second, Kawakita worried about how he as an individual should live in this changing and complicated society (Kawakita, 1986). He also worried that not only him but whether other members of the group that he belonged to could have consensus to support the development of and to proceed projects (Kawakita, 1986). Finally, he felt people lacked and needed to develop decision-making abilities in order to overcome the confusion and the crisis of our current international society (Kawakita, 1986). These three reasons applied not only to him but also to many people even today.

Kawakita also classified science into three categories. The first category is library science, “SHOSAI-KAGAKU” (Kawakita, 1967, p. 7), in which scholars relay literature. This science also relays on inference or reasoning of the scholars’ mind. The second category is experimental science, “JIKKEN-KAGAKU” (Kawakita, 1967, p. 7), in which scholars should touch real things and observe them (Kawakita, 1967, p. 9). People trusted this experimental science, because scholars test if things are true or not. The core of experimental science is to test and to verify the hypothesis.

The third category is field science, “YAGAI-KAGAKU” in which scholars deal with experience and observations outside of laboratories (Kawakita, 1967, p. 11). The important character of field science is how scholars abduct hypothesis (Kawakita, 1978). Ethno-geography is a field science, and it was necessary for him to think how he could abduct hypothesis from his experience and/or observation.

Kawakita introduced KJ method in writing in 1967 (Kawakita, 1967), and published the application book of method in 1970 (Kawakita, 1970), and published the comprehensive book of KJ method in 1986 (Kawakita, 1986).

Since 1969, Kawakita had provided KJ method workshops at various locations throughout Japan, and attempted to solve the local problem by utilizing KJ method (Kawakita, 1986). He called this workshop “IDO DAIGAKU” (Kawakita, 1986, p. 508), a mobile college, and participants stayed at the field for two weeks to complete the session. Tents were set up and used as a campus.

## History of grounded theory

Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss discovered grounded theory in the 1960's (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The theory was developed while they were conducting research on dying phenomena in hospitals (Glaser, 1998). After publishing the research monograph, "Awareness of dying" (Glaser & Strauss, 1965), they were constantly asked how they did the research, and Glaser suggested writing up the methodology on how they did it (Glaser, 1998).

Glaser's education and training led to the development of grounded theory. Glaser received a Ph.D. from the department of sociology, Columbia University where methodology development is the tradition of the department. Glaser also has a unique background. He explained as follows:

I studied literature at the University of Paris for a year and was trained in the skill of explication de text: reading closely line by line to ascertain what exactly the author is saying without imputing what was said, interpreting it or reifying its meaning (Glaser, 1998, p. 24).

These two different backgrounds were essential for Glaser to discover grounded theory.

Paul F. Lazarsfeld plays three important parts in the discovery of grounded theory. First, he taught Glaser at Columbia qualitative math "that (1) there was no qualitative hypothesis or concept that could not have a mathematical formula developed for it and (2) that most mathematical formulas, particularly statistical can be stated qualitatively" (Glaser, 1998, p. 22). Glaser (1998) mentioned that "Grounded theory uses qualitative math to state probabilities of asserting patterns or preponderance of behavior" (p.22).

Second, Lazarsfeld also taught the importance of searching for what is really going on, and Glaser took the notion from that to develop grounded theory; thus discovering the relationships between the generated categories and properties of qualitative data (Glaser, 1998).

Finally, when Lazarsfeld and Thielens, Jr. studied social scientists in the 1950s, he found the core category, which was constantly related to others by comparing categories and its properties. Lazarsfeld did this quantitatively, but Glaser took the idea and did it qualitatively. Grounded theory utilizes the constant comparative method to analyze qualitative data. Glaser developed the constant comparative method of qualitative analysis while he was conducting the study of terminal care in hospitals (Glaser, 1965). While Glaser studied from Lazarsfeld, he was also taught by Robert K. Merton in the construction of theory. One of the lessons he took was theoretical coding, which now can also be seen in grounded theory (Glaser, 1998).

After being trained by these individuals and receiving his Ph.D., Glaser joined the University of California at San Francisco. Glaser met Strauss who was trained in symbolic interaction by Herbert Blumer and Everet Hughes (Glaser, 1998), and they conducted research together in the field of health care. Glaser had experience in analyzing quantitative data by constant comparison and theoretical coding, and now he got a chance to analyze qualitative data, such as the data obtained from interviews with nurses, by applying the quantitative research methods of Columbia University (Glaser, 1998). Glaser (1998) stated that "the systematic generation of theory from data that explain most of the variation in that data was launched" (p. 32), and their worldwide selling book, "Awareness of dying" (Glaser & Strauss, 1965) was written. Thus, grounded theory was discovered. Although Glaser and Strauss co-authored "The Discovery of Grounded Theory,"

Glaser developed a majority of the method. Glaser actually wrote 90% of grounded theory and 8 out of the 11 chapters of the book (Glaser, 1998).

## **Preparation**

### **Preparation of KJ method**

The first step of KJ method is to raise a problem (Kawakita, 1967). To raise a problem is an intuitive activity, and it is not only an academic activity. To raise a problem is also a trigger for starting new project (Kawakita, 1967). To raise a problem, the person has to explore within him or herself, and Kawakita named this step "NAIBU TANKEN" or internal exploration (Kawakita, 1967, p. 28). It is best to write down whatever the person has on his/her mind without being concerned if it is true or false (Kawakita, 1986). Through this brainstorming process, the problem becomes clear and specific.

### **Preparation of grounded theory**

The first step of grounded theory is to prepare a general sociological topic (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Usually research starts with a research question, the hypotheses statement developed from previous research or an application of an existing theory. This research question and hypotheses most likely contain preconceptions or fixed ideas. The researcher may only collect or quest data within the related area, which may not be relevant to the subject. Glaser and Strauss stated that in grounded theory, "the initial decisions for theoretical collection of data are based only on a general sociological perspective and on a general subject or problem area" (1967, p. 45). The researcher just wants to know what is going on in a substantive area.

Most research begins with a literature review. However, in grounded theory the literature review is delayed until the researcher has confidence that the major properties and variations around the core variable have emerged. Literature reviews increase preconception in the area of interest, and may induce the researcher to consciously or unconsciously use pre-determined concepts and theory from the reviewed literature. Preconceived concepts and theory derail the coding process and may cause the researcher to force the core variable rather than allowing it to emerge from the data.

## **Data collection**

### **Data collection of KJ method**

After the problem becomes clear and specific, the next step is to explore externally (Kawakita, 1967). The researcher has to collect information that is not only related to the problem, but that may also be related to the problem (Kawakita, 1967). The researcher may not know where the information is, thus Kawakita uses the word "TANKEN" or exploration (Kawakita, 1976, p. 32). Kawakita suggested using the word exploration scientifically (1967, p. 33), and any information should be collected from multidimensional perspectives about the problem (1967, p. 33).

External exploration is done by fieldwork, and data would be collected by field observation. From The KJ method perspective, information about the data should include when the data was observed, where the data came from, how the data was collected and who collected the data (Kawakita, 1967).

When observing human action, the following seven points become important (Kawakita, 1967).

1. Typological action: walking, eating, discussing, fighting
2. Circumstances: situation, background, reason, cause
3. Subject: who or what
4. Object: to whom or to what
5. Process: how
6. Purpose: for what
7. Result: what happened after

It may be impossible or irreverent for some cases, but it provides a basic guideline.

### **Data collection of grounded theory: Theoretical sampling**

Beginning with a general area of interest allows the researcher to initiate data collection with a general idea or a common sense about the field. For example, before conducting a study at a college, the researcher would know already that there are professors, assistant professors, lecturers, and students in one or more academic departments. These general ideas or common senses are a “beginning foothold” for research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45); however, the researcher has no preconceived notions of problems or existing issues within the areas; if not, the researcher should suspend the knowledge.

Once the initial data is collected, theoretical sampling begins. Glaser defined theoretical sampling as the following:

Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory whereby analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45; Glaser, 1978, p. 37).

Glaser continued to explain, “the general procedure of theoretical sampling...is to elicit codes from raw data from start of data collection through constant comparative analysis as the data pour in” (1978, p. 36). Thus, as a researcher collects data, he or she conducts coding simultaneously. It means that the codes will indicate the direction of future data collection. This process will continue until “it is saturated, elaborated and integrated into the emerging theory” (Glaser, 1978, p. 36).

### **Analysis**

#### **Analysis of KJ method: Integration of data to KJ method type A**

When conducting field research, the collected data would be unorganized and varied from drawings to transcripts of conversations. Integration of data became more critical than the analysis of data, and this process conducted to establish the KJ method (Kawakita, 1967).

To conduct KJ method analysis, the researcher prepares black pens, colored pens, gem clips, rubber bands, many pieces of business card sized paper, a letter sized paper for drawing, some paper to write sentences and a place to spread out the pieces of paper (Kawakita, 1967). Then the researcher reviews the data, and makes labels by using the business card sized paper. Each label contain a sentence, which the researcher gets from the data. When writing the sentence, researcher should write an opinion, will not only facts from the data (Kawakita, 1986). Labels are

spread out, and the researcher will read them several times. By reading several times, according to Kawakita, the researcher will realize that some labels have similar and/or close opinions (1986). These labels are gathered to make up groups and are wrapped together using gem clips or rubber bands. The researcher will summarize the contents of the groups. The summary of each group will be written down on the business card sized paper, and placed on the top of each group. This is called "HYOSATSU" or nameplate (Kawakita, 1986, p. 126). During this process, some labels won't seem to fit into any of these groups. These labels should be left out as a one-card group and should not be forced into any groups. Groups of labels are spread out again, and the grouping process will be repeated until the number of group becomes less than ten (Kawakita, 1986).

#### Type A diagram

Finalized groups of labels are placed on a piece of paper according to the interrelationship of each group (Kawakita, 1967). The placing of the groups is critical because the position of each group explains the observed phenomena, thus it has to be logically placed. It is recommended that there should be enough space among groups so that lines and/or comments are written to explain the relationship of groups, and the group will be spread out again at the next step (Kawakita, 1986). After placement of all groups, the group which is the highest level in terms of concept, is spread out at the place on the paper according to the interrelationship of other groups (Kawakita, 1986). This process is repeated until all labels are placed on the paper (Kawakita, 1986). In the case that the paper is not big enough to spread out all of the labels, the researcher will write down the diagram of the groups, and the groups will be spread out on different pieces of paper (Kawakita, 1986). The diagram works as an index.

The researcher will draw diagrams of each group, circle the group, and copy the summary of each group above the circle or around the circle (Kawakita, 1986). Lines and comments are written to explain the interrelationship among groups. At this point, various data is integrated, and the researchers get a sense of understanding of the observed phenomena.

### **Analysis of grounded theory: Coding and constant comparative analysis to theoretical sorting**

A third component of grounded theory is constant comparative analysis. This is a unique feature of grounded theory. It is essential to theoretical sampling that, rather than waiting until all data is gathered, the researcher continually analyzes or codes data as it pours in. Glaser (1965) introduced the constant comparative method prior to the birth of grounded theory. Glaser stated "the constant comparative method is designed to aid analysts with these abilities in generating a theory which is integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data" (1966, p. 437). There is a slight difference in the naming of each stage between grounded theory and constant comparative method. "The constant comparative method can be described in four stages: (1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties, (3) delimiting the theory, and (4) writing theory" (Glaser, 1965, p. 439). It is clear that grounded theory was developed with constant comparative analysis as its base.

To begin the analysis, the researcher starts with open coding (Glaser, 1978). Open coding is "coding the data in everyway possible" (Glaser, 1978, p. 56); however, there are several rules.

The first rule is "to ask a set of questions of the data which must be kept in mind from the start" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57). There are three questions to ask (Glaser, 1978). The first question is "what

is this data a study of?" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57), and the second question is "what category does this incident indicate?" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57), and the third question is "what is actually happening in the data?" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57). These questions allow the researcher to stay theoretically sensitive and grounded in the data.

The second rule is "to analyze the data line by line, constantly coding each sentence" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57). The third rule is that the researcher codes by him or herself. Computerized coding software is not used in grounded theory. By coding him or herself, the researcher discovers where to go next for theoretical sampling. Thus, open coding and theoretical sampling are directly linked (Glaser, 1978).

The last rule is that "the analysis should not assume the analytic relevance of any face sheet variables such as age, sex, social class, race, skin color etc., until it emerges as relevant" (Glaser 1978, p. 60). It is fundamental to grounded theory that data must be earned through theoretical sampling.

As coding proceeds, the researcher analyzes the codes by the constant comparative method. Glaser developed this method while he was studying dying patients in hospital wards, and published in 1965 in *Social Problems*. In this section of the analysis, I only deal with the first three stages. However, these stages are interrelated thus they blend together into the overall analysis process.

First, the researcher compares the incident that he/she coded to other incidents he/she coded. The purpose of this process is to establish "the underlining uniformity and its varying conditions" (Glaser, 1978, p. 49). This process will lead the researcher to discover concepts. Then he/she compares the concept and new incidents. New concepts will emerge from this process; then, the researcher will compare a concept to another concept. The purpose of this process is to establish "the best fit of many choices of concepts to a set of indicators, the conceptual levels between concepts that refer to the same set of indicators and the integration into hypotheses between the concepts, which becomes the theory" (Glaser, 1978, p. 50).

The researcher will encounter a concept that emerges several times, or he/she will find a concept that cannot be ignored. Coding should be stopped at this point, and the researcher should "record a memo on ideas" (Glaser, 1965, p. 440). These memos will guide the researcher to the variable that may become the core variable of the study. Looking for a core variable is a constant effort of the researcher. He/she "is constantly looking for the 'main theme'" (Glaser, 1978, p. 94).

The researcher begins selective coding for a core variable when he/she finds a prospective core variable. Glaser explained selective coding as follows:

To selectively code for a core variable, then, means that the analyst delimits his coding to only those variables that relate to the core variable in sufficiently significant ways to be used in a parsimonious theory. The core variable becomes a guide to further data collection and theoretical sampling (Glaser, 1978, p. 61).

Glaser (1978) listed the criteria for a core category as follows:

1. It must be central, that is related to as many other categories and their properties as possible.
2. It must reoccur frequently in the data.
3. By being related to many other categories and reoccurring frequently, it takes more time to saturate the core category than other categories.



4. It relates meaningfully and easily with other categories.
5. A core category in a substantive study, has clear and grabbing implication for formal theory (1978, p. 95).
6. Based on the above criteria, the core category has considerable carry through.
7. It is complete variable.
8. While accounting for variation in the problematic behavior, a core category is also a dimension of the problem.
9. The criteria above generate such a rich core category, that in turn they tend to prevent two other sources of establishing a core which are not grounded, but without grounding could easily occur: (1) sociological interest and (2) deductive, logical elaboration.
10. The above criteria also generate a false criterion yet which indicates it is core.
11. The core category can be any kind of theoretical code: a process, a condition, two dimensions, a consequence and so forth (1978, p. 96).

Glaser explained, “a theory must have fit and relevance, and it must work” (1978, p. 4). These are important criteria for the core category.

The last part of coding is “theoretical coding” (Glaser, 1978, p. 72). Theoretical code supports “the analyst maintain his conceptual level in writing about concepts and their interrelation” (Glaser, 1978, p. 73). When an analyst is coding, “18 coding families” (Glaser, 1978, p. 73) help to maintain the conceptual level. Glaser added several more families in 1998. However, “the additional codes mentioned here overlap that list and give a different slant” (Glaser, 1998, p. 170).

#### Theoretical memos

A fourth component of grounded theory is theoretical memoing. The writing of theoretical memos is an essential and vital process for grounded theory. The analyst writes down ideas about the incidents or categories. Memos are separate from the surface of the data; they capture the concept or the categories. Glaser defined memos as “the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding” (1978, p. 83). The goals of memoing are “to theoretically develop ideas (codes), with complete freedom into a memo fund, that is highly sortable” (Glaser, 1978, p. 83). In the process of open coding, the source of memos is the constant comparison of incidents. Then, comparing categories produces more memos. Memos are not a full description of data but rather conceptual word tanks. “Without memos, there are no theoretical ideas to sort, and density with integrative richness and to write up” (Glaser, 1978, p. 89).

As constant comparison proceeds, the numbers of memos increase. Glaser suggested “each memo should be introduced by a title or caption which is the category or property that the memo is about” (1978, p. 87).

#### Theoretical outline and sorting

The next stage of grounded theory is constructing a theoretical outline and sorting of memos. Theoretical outlining and sorting are conducted simultaneously in a back-and-forth process of continual modification.

At this point, the researcher has a pile of memos to be sorted. Sorting may indicate a need for more data to be collected and analyzed and more memos to be written.

Theoretical sampling, coding, memoing, sorting, and theoretical outlining may be conducted simultaneously, until the point of theoretical saturation. It is important to remember that this is conceptual sorting process, not data sorting. There is no ready-made outlining process. However,

the theoretical coding families support conceptual level sorting.

“While ideational memos are the fund of grounded theory, the theoretical sorting of memos is the key to formulating the theory for presentation to others whether in words or writing” (Glaser, 1978, p. 116). After the memos are all sorted out, the researcher starts writing up the study.

## **Writing**

### **Writing of KJ method: KJ method type B**

KJ method type B is writing or composing to explain the Type A diagram. If it makes sense, according to Kawakita (1967), the researcher can start writing explanations of any of groups that he/she made while analyzing the data. The fundamental rule is to distinguish between the description and the explanation of the researcher (Kawakita, 1967). By doing so, the paper will be useful and meaningful. Kawakita also suggested that if the researcher cannot explain by the collected data, but still needs to explain, additional data should be collected (1967). Subjective explanation is useful if the explanation is coming from a fair description (Kawakita, 1967).

### **Writing of grounded theory**

The last stage of grounded theory is writing. The last stage of constant comparative method is also “writing the theory” (Glaser 1965, p. 439). “In this final stage of grounded theory methodology, writing is a ‘write up’ of piles of ideas from theoretical sorting” (Glaser, 1978, p. 128). Glaser mentioned that English properness is not a concern at this point (1998). This supports researchers in non-English speaking places when empirical data is not in English; the researcher translates while analyzing.

Like other sociological monographs, grounded theory monographs include an introductory chapter with the general problem, methodology, and the outline of the coming substantive theory. Then each chapter or section will discuss the core valuables and categories related to the core valuable. The end of the monograph is the general conclusion. However, grounded theorists “handle this shaping in somewhat different ways than standard, because of the aim of putting the substantive theory into relief” (Glaser, 1978, p. 131). Glaser (1978) suggested as follows:

Our approach to the ending is to take the core variable, and perhaps a few of those sub-core variables that worked best, and generate their use and contribution for formal theory in sociology and for other substantive realms in sociology (p. 133).

Grounded theory is a rigorous research method. When the purpose of the study is to explain the latent patterns of the subject, this method allows the researcher to write a monograph.

## **Discussions**

Kawakita and Glaser did not attempt to verify pre-established hypothesis but attempted to discover a new explanation of the respective field. It was an unknown community for Kawakita, and it was a dying phenomenon in hospitals for Glaser. Researchers are not sure where the relevant information is, thus KJ method suggests collecting data from multidimensional perspectives. Grounded theory also suggests that a “slice of data”(Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 65), a “different kind of data gives the analyst different views or vantage points” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 65).

Both methods favor diversity of data.

When preparing research, two methods create a chasm. To enter the field, KJ method suggests raising a problem by exploring one's own mind, but grounded theory suggests that having a general sociological topic is enough, or the researcher just needs to know the area of where he/she would study. From the grounded theory perspective, problems are preconceived, and it leads the researcher by forcing data into the preconceived arena. By forcing data, the study is no longer a data driven method, thus it is an epistemological difference.

Looking at the types of data, because both methods mostly deal with qualitative data, they are alike. Field notes and transcripts of conversation are popular data for the methods. Grounded theory employs theoretical sampling and constant comparative method of data analysis, which spirally interrelate while conducting the analysis. This process of collecting and analyzing data makes grounded theory very unique and different from other methods. Analysis starts as soon as the researcher collects data.

Under the KJ method, however, data collections are done in fields, and analysis would be taken place from a different place. Kawakita suggested to prepare black pens, colored pens, gem clips, rubber bands, many pieces of business card sized paper, letter sized paper for drawing, some paper to write sentences and a place to spread pieces of paper (Kawakita, 1967). Thus analysis comes after collecting data, not while collecting; however, even when the researcher started to analyze data, he/she should collect more data if necessary. This is because both methods aim to produce a new idea and theory and not to verify hypothesis. To verify hypothesis, the concern is if data supports the hypothesis or rejects it.

The writing parts of the methods differ from each other. KJ method heavily relies on the diagram that was created while analyzing. Writing of KJ method is basically the explanation of the diagram of the analysis. Grounded theory requires theoretical memos and theoretical outlining. For grounded theory, both processes are necessary in order to complete the process. Based on the outline, the researcher writes the theory grounded on the data.

As discussed in the background section of this essay, many Japanese scholars think KJ method and grounded theory are much alike; however, chasms exist around the essentials of each theory. Qualitative data analysis for research, it may seem similar for many introductory researchers. However researchers should follow the process of each research method according to what the method requires for honoring the scholarship of originators of methods. It will support promoting the use of qualitative analysis for social research, and it also produce results that quantitative analysis of data cannot reach.

## References

- Chenitz, W.C., & Swanson, J.M. (1986). *From practice to grounded theory*. Reading, MA: Wesley.
- Funashima, N. (1999). *Shitsutekikenkyuenchosen*. Tokyo: Igakushoin.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, 12, 436-445.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1965). *Awareness of dying*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kawakita, J. (1967). *Hassohou*. Tokyo: Chukoshinsho.

- Kawakita, J. (1970). *Zoku Hassohou*. Tokyo: Chukoshinsho.
- Kawakita, J. (1974). *The hill magars and their neighbours: Hill people surrounding the Ganges Plain*. Tokyo: Tokai University Press.
- Kawakita, J. (1986). *KJ hou*. Tokyo: Chuokoronsha.
- Kinoshita, Y. (1999). *Grounded theory approach*. Tokyo: Koubundou.
- Minami, H. (1999). Introductory chapter of Japanese basics of qualitative research. In Minami, H. (trans. & ed.), *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. (pp. 3-5). Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin Ltd.
- Mizuno, S. (1996). Possibilities of grounded theory as a research program. In Gotoh, T., Ohe, H. & Mizuno, S. (trans). *Discovery of grounded theory*. (pp. 368-376). Tokyo: Shinyousha.
- Morioka, T. (1999). Issues about grounded theory. In Minami, H. (trans. & ed.), *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. (pp.275-289). Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin.
- Murayama, K. (2001, July 3). proc-glm [Msg 33]. Message posted to <http://groups.yahoo.co.jp/group/proc-glm/message/33>
- Schatzman & Strauss (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Strauss, A.L. (1984). *Chronic illness and the quality of life, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.* St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics for qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics for qualitative research, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.): Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.