Frontier Rescinding Paper – Dr Jan Green

Abstract

Classic grounded theory produces objections, threatens traditions and voices fears in the academic arena precisely because the outcomes of using the stand-alone methodology, which is a further academic concern, frequently cross recognised bodies of knowledge. Properties and categories from multiple disciplines may emerge as generalized others influence and direct the empirical data.

The nature of these issues has the potential to become problematic for researchers seeking positive reviews and, therefore, investigation is warranted as this is a clearly identified methodological problem. The findings provide a means of shedding new light on ways in which this embedded viewpoint can be addressed. There is value for academics, in particular doctoral supervisors and examiners, and also reviewers of conference papers and journal articles in undertaking this investigation.

 In order to provide a framework for the paper, the bodies of knowledge will be limited to business and management, a subject which struggles, from an academic perspective, to keep abreast of the changes occurring in practice. Increasingly there is an over-lapping of traditional practices as short-termism, reduced life cycles and technological leaps have increasing prominence and impact, specifically the illustrative problem is strategic communication.

The methodological problem is further exacerbated as grounded theory is conceptual, rather than descriptive which leads the researcher into diverse areas in order to provide concern resolving proposals for the identified problem, subsequently supported by relevant literature.

This paper draws on the concept of a basic social process that has a minimum of two distinct, or separate, emergent stages and occurs over time. There is a close operational fit between the basic social process and the pattern of behaviour evident within the social problem that is being researched.

Imagery and movement are integral aspects of a basic social process; however require clarity and may therefore be retrospective; the movement is contingent upon contemporary events and settings. A good basic social process has high impact meaning and should emerge within grounded theory practice to discover what is actually happening. Problems are complex with foundations in interactional context, negotiation and development, and shape human behaviour; they do not always fit neatly under a precise category heading. A clear stance regarding epistemology and the researcher position as the active analyst undertaking practical ways of discovering concern resolving behaviours and the social construction of knowledge also require clarification.

Closure of the identified gap is to utilise the notion of the venatic paradigm which has a close fit with classic grounded theory techniques. The foundations of the venatic emphasise qualitative and inferential thought. Historically this approach can be traced back to Aristotle and has three main strands; metaphor where the meaning of words are applied in a different sense; antithesis or a figure of speech and finally energeia, dwelling to produce effective expression. The outcome will

depict strong interdependencies, or saturation, which is sought after in the generation of a grounded theory.

The result of considering two approaches is to produce a synthesis of ideas drawn from classic grounded theory and the application of venatic practices as a support mechanism to strengthen the view that working across bodies of knowledge should be encouraged and assists in the practice of conceptualization, a further requirement of classic grounded theory.

The findings will demonstrate that, as classic ground theory research is inductive, it is carried out in a sequence which differs from the majority of other methodologies in that data is collected and undergoes initial analysis in advance of searching the literature. This approach enables the generation of new theory as opposed to the verification of previous works and therefore the researcher is unable to anticipate the direction in which the study will take.

The structure of the paper emphasises the methodological problem, with supporting contemporary examples and experiences to place the work into context followed by a review of the literature which explains the nature and make-up of a basic social process, within a classic grounded theory setting. To strengthen the argument a similar exercise will be carried out for the venatic paradigm. The conclusions, using theory generations, add to the knowledge related to conceptualization and the effective application of classic grounded theory.

Key words: basic social process, bodies of knowledge, classic grounded theory, conceptualization, figuration, venatic paradigm

Introduction

> So what was then exactly, this truth telling? They would always want even the explanation explained. …….. and it was about being true to the fact, the one thing only followed from the other, that many things in life – oh so many more than we think – that can never be explained at all" (Graham Swift, Mothering Sunday, 2016 p.203)

The central issue of the paper is to demonstrate the way in which the methodological application of classic grounded theory generates new theory which does not respect long established, traditional and therefore academically recognised bodies of knowledge. This issue has been the subject of previous research as grounded theory "transcends the specific boundaries of established paradigms to accommodate any type of data sourced and expressed through any epistemological lens" (Holton, 2007:268). However it remains a source of potential conflict which has yet to be concluded in a satisfactory manner. To illustrate the methodological points leading to this conclusion the example used is strategic communication, where the concern is the level of effectiveness achieved as a result of issuing a business communication related to strategic matters.

A brief overview of grounded theory is that all research is grounded in data, but few studies actually produce a grounded theory. Grounded Theory is an inductive methodology; it is not a qualitative method, it is a general method that requires the systematic generation of theory from systematic research. It is a set of rigorous research procedures leading to the emergence of conceptual categories. These concepts and categories are related to each other as a theoretical explanation of the action(s) that continually resolves the main concern of the participants in a substantive area. (www.groundedtheory.com). There is an avoidance of repeating the well-trodden ground related to

the individual procedures required to achieve a grounded theory. The format of the paper thus commences with a review of the basic social process, followed by a view of what comprises conceptualization and then progresses to provide a perspective of epistemology in relation to knowing and levels of knowing which have the potential to reduce boundaries. The later sections demonstrate the range which the concept of frontier rescinding straddles followed by a discussion linked to the basic social process, conclusions and areas for further research.

Basic Social Process

Identifying a basic social process is a key aspect of undertaking a classic grounded theory study; it is not evident from the outset of the research and therefore is an unknown in the early stages. The unknown element emerges from the data collection and subsequent coding as it becomes known. As the theory categories become evident they do not necessarily fit into a neat or recognised body of knowledge. This aspect of grounded theory clearly supports the rationale of the methodology not to carry out a detailed literature search and review in advance of data collection. Kelle (2007) comments on this point and suggests a flexible strategy in regard to the variety of theoretical perspectives which can be used that are suitable for the area under study. Hood (2007) adds that the process of grounded theory does more than illustrate; it reveals an underlying mechanism that is applicable to the setting, and potentially wider settings.

In seeking to define and review the notion of a basic social process it is evident that previous works with extensive relevant detail are somewhat limited. However it is emphasised by Glaser and Holton (2005) that a basic social process has two or more clear emergent stages with the action of life clearly evident within the process that indicates both a past and a future. Gustavsson and Age (2014) refer to the basic social processes as centrepieces that relate to other categories of a study. In addition to stages and centrality, the basic social process, in relation to sociology, requires a form of contact, and beyond contact, a form of communication to provide evidence of the social element of the term. The term is subsequently applied to a readily recognisable and particular circumstance; which in academia would be expected to indicate a clear link with the research question or questions. The intention is subsequently the development of answers to socially purposeful questions of what is happening and why (Douglas, 2004). This emerges via the consensus of rational opinion that may be established or reaffirmed through induction and the expectation of future occurrences through replication of research processes. According to Weiner (2007) a basic social process has a relationship with changes in conditions that result in patterns of action and interaction that are also responsive to a phase or stage that is evolving. The final naming of the basic social process develops precision as codes and memos are established, written and sorted, as denoted by the methodology.

A basic social process is located by undertaking what Gustavsson and Age (2014) identify as knocking on the data to ask the question posed by Glaser (1978), what is actually happening? The response being located in a complex interplay of factors (Saldaňa, 2013). This supports the consideration of what social process is present in a study and provides the most important building block in the developing theory. Searching for evidence of a process is summarized as "participant actions that have antecedents, causes, consequences and a sensor of temporality." (Saldaňa, 2013:103). Attention should also be paid to the settings and boundaries of the process as an element of causation. The aim being to "obtain a sense of how events originate and evolve, and their shifting

significance for those involved, process refers to movement and change over time." (Dey, 1993:38) and enables the development of an account with a dynamic origin as opposed to static description.

A further view is that a basic social process contains interactive behaviour consisting of two stages that create a context-action process (Jones and Kriflik, 2006). In order to reveal the centrality of a study, O'Reilly, Paper and Mark (2012) propose that there is a requirement to travel the path of the data's story to begin seeing relationships crystallize, indicating that there is a process of emergence with links which suggest a form of process. This view is reinforced by Locke (2007) who refers to micro level processes where there is evidence of action and interaction which is in the form of a trajectory and highlights changes over a period of time. Movement from one phase to the next is stimulated by structural conditions which lead to consequences; the basic social process is not static, rather the opposite as unfolding actions or sequence of events are captured within context. These aspects are referred to by Saldaňa, (2013) as action-oriented influences that should indicate progression in a linear manner.

Process is somewhat elusive; being difficult to explain and challenging to capture in data. However, developing these aspects the term is defined as "the flow of action/interaction/emotions that occurs in response to events, situations, or problems" (Corbin and Strauss, 2008: 87). The contents of a process may vary from being automatic or thoughtful. In terms of scope the contents of a process may range from being strategic, routine, random or novel. Referring specifically to business, Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2012) note that process theory has become increasingly prevalent since the turn of the century where the emphasis is on the creation and management of organizational knowledge and learning processes to specify what or how managers should do their work.

Looking back at the early developments of classic grounded theory the stand-alone methodology was no respecter of artificial boundaries prevailing in the academic arena. As the aim of grounded theory is to identify concern resolving behaviour, it is rarely possible to predict where a research project would lead; resulting in the potential for multiple cross-overs to arise in terms of academic bodies of knowledge. This outcome has frequently been the origin of academic disputes as grounded theory emerges as a "meta-theory of inductive research design, most powerful to help discovering theories in rupture with existing literature." (Walsh, Holton, Bailyn, Fernandez, Levina and Glaser 2015:584). This outcome is satisfactory when it is evident that "propositions hold together because of their explanatory relations."(Haig, 1995:8) and there are limited assumptions within the developing theory. A useful further contribution to this point is made by Age (2014) that a previously established process should be followed unless change is supported by suggestions for improvement that do not involve suffocation by procedure and mirror situation-specific trends and priorities.

As the methodology evolves and matures the notion of the basic social process is gaining prominence and recognition. The concept has such a widespread application to cut across the traditional boundaries by which sociology has been sub-divided (Glaser and Holton, 2005). Reed and Runquist (2007) refer to the basic social process, originally being conceived by Glaser (1978), as being able to transcend boundaries within and across disciplines and comment that this is an important assumption for disciplines valuing coherence between theories inquiry methods.

These views provide initial support for the idea of frontier rescinding and indicate agreement of the view that being "actively intellectual means to resist circling one's own wagons, to instead work toward new ideas all of the time." (Wasserman, Clair and Wilson, 2009:357). However, despite developments Goulding (2003) indicates that most grounded theory studies come to a conclusion that is context specific or substantive rather than being developed further to a general level. Whilst a rationale for this approach is suggested as being the need to utilise research teams together with time pressures and publication deadlines, given extensive coverage by Green and Binsardi, (2014). Attending to these particular resource issues when embarking on a research study whilst employed in higher education, and conceptualizing the findings as systematic avocating, many basic social processes are so readily recognized by the broader research community that generalization is almost self-eliminating. In searching for examples to further oppose the view presented by Goulding, Vander-Linden (2008) identified mapping as a basic social process that transcends a substantive area as it explains three integrated and cyclical stages of behaviour when routinely entering new experiences. The process encompasses locating, embarking and reflecting and requires elements of navigating as factors and conditions arise and emerge during the experience. Whilst this study is based on adults considering re-entry into the education system, the findings have widespread transferability into other sectors, contexts and situations. A further study using high stakes situations as data sources undertaken by Martin (2015) refers to the greater explanatory power than current theories allow becoming evident during the conceptual interpretation of a process. The conclusions refer to several processes which including addressing awareness in a number of ways such as abridging, discounting and escaping. It is timely to note that awareness of dying (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) is the founding core of grounded theory and remains relevant in 2016 when the headline of the Daily Telegraph newspaper on 02 May 2016 was 'Families kept in the dark as doctors let patients die' based on an audit of 9,000 dying patients.

A basic social process is viewed by Clarke and Friese,(2007) as centring on action and they propose the use of situational maps to elucidate the key elements and conditions that characterize the situation of concern taken up by the research project and draw on a wider range of data sources. However, it should be noted that Glaser long since termed the phrase 'all is data' and therefore the point of oversimplification through the identifications of a singular basic social process being argued by Clarke and Friese (2007) is somewhat weakened and they also comment on the open and porous nature of boundaries, together with the difficulties in assuming the directionalities of influence.

Concepts

Grounded theory is conceptual and the depth of researcher knowing may assist in this process, it is evident that the literature to explain the notion of a concept and provide guidance in how to reveal a concept is somewhat scant. Gill and Jonhson (2010) refer to the establishment of concepts and conceptual properties where the identification of patterns in the data are sought and subsequently grouped together, but omit any specific commentary as what a concept actually is. Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) explain that individual components of the data should indicate links that provide a framework that is created in order to explain or predict the phenomenon under study, however concepts go beyond explanation. Conceptualization is abstract but requires a close relationship with the data during this procedure that, given sufficient attention, should highlight a pattern or catalyst that connects to the issue being studied.

A more precise view of concepts is provided by Kumar (2014) when referring to certain words that are difficult to measure and may be understood in ways which vary from person to person and can be mental images or perceptions. Concepts are subjective impressions which would potentially cause problems in comparing responses obtained from different respondents. The examples provided by way of illustration include words like satisfaction and impact.

Saldaña (2013) proposes the "touch test" as a strategy for progressing from topic to concept, from the real to the abstract, and from the particular to the general. An example used is an old house in a poor state of repair, but poverty, which may be the cause of the lack of repairs, cannot be touched. What cannot be touched is conceptual and processual, representing forms of abstraction that most often suggest higher-level thinking.

Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) identify a range of optional approaches that are not mutually exclusive, when undertaking a conceptualization exercise. These include a search for the central story of the data to gain a broader perspective whilst generating a big picture. This requires an understanding of the data components and connectivity, which is established through comparisons and diversities in behaviours and circumstances. From this perspective summarizing without diminishing, through synthesis and nuance is the proposed course of action. The opposite approach is labelled as telescoping by Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) to gain distance from the data to obtain a broad view and then changing to focus on detail. Writing and presenting data are beneficial during the analysis stages and are also helpful ways of conceptualizing as they requires making sense of the data for an audience and concisely capturing issues, outcomes and implications.

Whilst not referring to a basic social process Hemmink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) outline a strategy for conceptualizing data through considering whether the data describes a particular process or pathway. This is established by querying to what extent the data identifies stages, steps or a process which may be utilized to formulate a conceptual understanding of the data. The process of seeking out a path and subsequent outcome, distinguished by a range of circumstances or characteristics is often referred to as a career approach. By adopting a career stance and the background context to the research, subtle underlying processes may be uncovered and subsequently result in a greater understanding of the issue. Nayak (2008) portrays an interesting view of a path, that may be commonplace, customary and conventional, or the opposite and be out of place, strange or paradoxical when drawing on the understanding of a method. This view provides additional support for the unknown direction as a path may be straight or winding and level or undulating when searching for answers to research questions.

A situation which is a struggle is noted by Douglas (2003) who refers to the inferential emergence of a concept from the coding process which cannot be preconceived and does create difficulties for novice researchers when suggesting that they know, somewhat prematurely what they want to find out!

In seeking to provide an alternative view of concept the term figure of speech is beneficial. Mouton, Just and Gabrielsen (2012) suggest that a figure of speech may amplify or diminish by means of re-description. Grisham (2006) refers to transference by use of, or, as if, so that meanings are relative and one term, name or label stands for another. Using the idea of a frontier, which is central to this study, it could take the form of a fence, a wall, a hedge, a river, a cliff, a river, a country border or a line on a map. Several of these examples are objects but a figure of speech of relevance is 'don't

fence me in' a phrase which depicts restriction. To resolve the concerns of effective strategic communication, fences need to be removed to eliminate obstruction, in a conceptual manner.

Epistemology

According to Gill and Johnson (2010) epistemology is the basis of warranted knowledge about our chosen domains; it is about how we know whether any claim, including our own, is warranted. It is the theory of truth.   Epistemology refers to the "relationship between the inquirer and the known" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013a:26). St. Pierre (2013) adds that epistemology is concerned with what counts as knowledge and how knowledge claims are subsequently justified as being true. There is an implication of an ethical-moral stance emanating from the researcher towards the world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013c)

Denzin and Lincoln (2013a) provide a useful contrast between approaching grounded theory from a positivist approach or one informed by pragmatism and constructivist grounded theory proposed by Charmaz. The essence of the differences is the separation of values from facts, which requires that "data gathering does not raise questions about researchers' tacit assumptions, privileged statuses, or the particular locations from which they view studied life." (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013b:305).   The role of the researcher is one of authoritative expert and active analyst which represent the position of foundational epistemology and does not require a special set of evaluative criteria.

The opposing view has gained popularity from a stance presented by Bryant and Charmaz (2007) that the viewer has a part within what is being viewed and therefore realities are multiple leading to an element of co-creation of data which includes situational locations together with historical and social experiences, leading to an interpretive understanding.

In order to retain professional impartiality Green and Binsardi (2015) propose an abstract concept of mental boxing. To achieve mental boxing the researcher undertakes a metaphoric but firm lid closing on preconceptions and accumulated knowledge during the data collection phases. Engaging in the practice of mental boxing assists in the grounding of data and where appropriate the emergent theory has the potential to challenge established ideas in the field (Loy, 2011) and support the notions linked to epistemology.

According to Green (2012) the crucial aspect is an interpretation of social action where there is an element of sourcing cause and effect issues with a view to arriving at a causal explanation, therefore adopting the hermeneutic circle goes some way to resolving any potential difficulties from an epistemological perspective. Grassie (2008) refers to a fusion of horizons using the data, comprehension of the data and an explanation through understanding of the data. The result is appropriation where the back and forth nature of grounded theory procedures enabling parts to be understood, in advance of understanding the whole.

There are similarities and clarity when incorporating the venatic which "concerns the individual case, probability rather than certainty, qualitative rather than cumulative or quantifiable information and inferential rather than deductive thought, since it depends on the reading of signs." (Gross and Walzer, 2008:138). Using grounded theory techniques requires contemplation of each data set with no certainty where it will lead until there is evidence of some signage or direction as a way of

accumulating information to make theoretical inferences. This is a further illustration of a sense of movement in the development of the theory.

In summary, epistemology is sufficiently fluid, as a concept, to allow for previous experiences and acknowledge that the very nature of data collection is a potential source of influence and skewing. However, classic grounded theory is focused on seeking to reveal concern resolving behaviours from the perspective of the respondent. There is no right or wrong answer and the process is not a test, and certainly encapsulates an absence of artificial boundaries erected by the academic community; that a business respondent is unlikely to have any detailed knowledge of. Researchers should ensure these issues are clear in advance of data collection commencing to limit any potential for excess influence and bias stemming from the research question, which subsequently has the potential to introduce an element of doubt whether the research outcomes are actually true.

Levels of Knowing

Grounded theory is a stand-alone methodology and therefore does not require a specific epistemological stance, despite the best efforts of supervisors and external examiners.

However in seeking to resolve a concern some insight into knowing and levels of knowing, which are captured within grounded theory through the practice of theoretical sensitivity, referred to as the ability to have a theoretical insight into the area being researched (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) and existing knowledge, may prove helpful. This is particularly evident when building categories as a pre-curser to identifying the core category, in this case frontier rescinding. In absorbing this view the basic social process should include categories that depict a sequential action. During this procedure the need for good interpretation and creativity, when undertaking theoretical analysis of experiences, where metaphors often articulate complex meanings occurring within a process is emphasised by Rennie (2000).

At repeated stages within the data collection phase of this study an emergent issue was one of looking further ahead, the terms far-sighted, longer term, horizons and perimeters were used, all of which suggest a view that boundaries or frontiers currently in place reflect what Green and Binsardi (2014) refer to as corralling, which is selective and requires vigilant guarding whilst Eikeland and Nicolin (2011) use the phrase iron cages for divisions. This situation was the starting point of the basic social process, there were conceptual frontiers that in effect served as barriers when designing and issuing strategic communications. To resolve this circumstance the data was illustrated with terms which referred to cancelling, abolishing, removing and quashing when narrating current practice.

The sense of movement within the basic social process of this study is one of from the current situation, and a sense of immediacy, to a changed scenario where existing demarcations, timescales and scope are revised to provide elongated preparation time and extended reach in order to resolve the concerns linked to the effectiveness of strategic communication.

Introducing the venatic paradigm contributes an additional view of movement. Fowler (2005) suggests that there is no stopping-place, it is a point chosen by the researcher which may already have involved endless alleys and a number of cul-de-sacs during the collection of a series of small

clues in the hunt for the truth. The clues may contribute to causal chains which Meissner and Wulf (2015) link to hindsight perspective when undertaking strategic planning. They propose a change of language and perspective to increase the number of possible alternatives and develop scenario planning further. Hindsight perspective requires asking the question: "what did go wrong?" as if it were the past tense, when those involved in the planning are, in reality looking ahead and predicting; as would be the case in a hunt. Skordoulis and Dawson (2007) refer to being aided by collective evidence and the reaching of a consensus rather than arriving at an explicit answer to an initial problem, which may oppose what was previously thought to be known and should result in finding out. This view links with the point of saturation which is similarity and frequently occurring in the data when conducting a grounded theory study and would contribute to the generation of the basic social process.

In developing the theoretical notion of a basic social process, the much strived for research impact may originate from "understanding knowers' own practice" (Eikeland and Nicolini, 2011:169) through the expressions and organisations of linguistic practice as patterns that are more or less stable. The stability is evident from repetition in certain ways as a foundation for competence, patterns and practical experiences that form structures used by the knower or practitioner which is realised activity or energeia.

Matheus (2009) illustrates the levels of knowing into four stages which encompass:

1. Know-how which represents an understanding of procedures and is valuable knowledge that enables processes to operate in a logical manner.

2. Know-why builds on know-how to develop an appreciation of the principles of components and the interactions between them which leads to insights into the overall purpose of a procedure within a contextual setting.

3. Know-what relates to specific configurations, uses and applications which require a broader level of knowing and is supported by experience.

4. Know-who is also supported by experience in the areas of who does what specific task or process and who knows the requirements of supportive integration and has the potential to explore in terms of improvements.

These elements demonstrate the relevance and importance of organizational knowledge which are often given the label professional intellect with a slight difference in sequence, the foundation being cognitive knowledge, which is know what through the advanced skills which equates to know how. Systems understanding is know why and care why is self-motivated creativity, (Quinn, Anderson and Finkelstein, 1996).

Eikeland (2007) argues that practical wisdom, or phrónésis, is insufficient and there are several strands involved in developing a close connection to practical competence and related concerns. Knowing requires both practical competence and the expertise of the practitioner, which has greater relevance as "modern work life becomes increasingly inhabited by highly educated workers doing increasingly knowledge intensive work" (Eikeland 2007:346). In table 1, the ways of knowing which Eikeland refers to as 'a kind of gnoseology' , a term which is explained as a wider category of knowledge. This view encompasses forms of knowledge which potentially lack the infusion of

modern versions of science, largely restricted to quantitative research, such as traditional, practical, experiential, tacit, habitual and emotional.

Table 1: The Aristotelian Ways of Knowing

Basis	Way of Knowing	Associated Rationality	Format
Perception	Theoresis	Deduction, demonstration	Spectator Speculation
	Pathos		Being affected passively from the outside
Empirical Practically Acquired Experience	Khresis	Calculation	Using Making, manipulating Doing: virtuous performance
	Praxis Theoria	Deliberation Dialectics/dialogue The way from novice to expert, tacit to articulate	Doing Practice: training for competence development and insight

Source: Eikeland, 2007:348

Greenwood (2014), in reviewing the work of Toulmin (1933-2009) comments on the need to do more than merely tell stories and proposes that researchers should strive for middle ground between research issues and abstract theory. In so doing this requires the development of nuanced understandings based on theoria.

Whilst levels of knowing prove useful, the outcome of the study relies on the theory of persuasion (Bonet, 2014) which, in academic research, may involve opinion and proven knowledge. In the absence of persuasion, knowing new theory requires the researcher to legitimize knowledge on secure foundations (Nayak, 2008) by way of introduction to a body or bodies of knowledge.

Frontier Rescinding

This section is not intended to be a literature search and review, it is limited to an example of where the two words occur in the literature, together with an indication of the body of knowledge from which it originates.

Frontier Rescinding is a concept which encapsulates the notion of having a broader perspective on the research problem that may require the crossing or overcoming of divisions, barriers and frontiers both within and outside an organization.

The purpose of frontier models is to "calculate levels of efficiency with regard to the best observed performances in a given sample." (de Jorge-Morena and Garcia-Cebrian, 1999:335). A stochastic frontier takes into account the fact that the firm's performance can be influenced by factors outside its control. This reference from the literature is based on production efficiencies. However from a theoretical sensitizing perspective, of relevance to the grounded theorist researching strategic communications, it has fit to frontier rescinding as the best result, however measured, following a communication, indicates an efficient performance in terms of return on investment into the measured task. This is supportive of concern resolving behaviour linked to strategic communication

where an outcome would be performance in terms of numbers of acknowledgements following a communication initiative, in various measurable formats.

A reference to rescinding in the literature refers to the transfer of personal authority, supported by trust in others to make the correct decision that managers undertake in delegating, or rescinding, authority to others. (Thwaites and Williams, 2006). This example is drawn from a study into front line, customer facing staff and reflects an expanding trend where relatively junior staff are able to make immediate decisions that may link to price reductions, product returns, issuing of vouchers, complaint logging and checking stock and availability. These routine transactions expand traditional roles and therefore reflect the notion of rescinding.

Discussion

"All is data" according to Barney Glaser, one of the founders of classic grounded theory. The example used by way of illustration in this paper is based on contemporary sources of data to illustrate one aspect of the flow of social life, within a business setting – that of strategic communication and the use of a basic social process to conceptualise the concern resolving behaviours. In so doing the theory becomes abstract and devoid of time, place and people; all conditions requiring observation during the generation of a grounded theory.

A basic social process may be considered a theoretical tool or framework (Hennink, et al., 2011) for the resulting theory but the knowing element has several sources and levels, which are clearly not restricted to historically constructed academic bodies of knowledge, as argued previously. Whilst a business of any size and complexity, beyond the micro level, may include a number of departments with specialist functions, the need for information and knowledge to flow both within and out of the organization is critical to ensure that systems and processes operate in an efficient manner and result in outcomes. Knowing in a business clearly does encompass levels (Eikeland, 2007), from the new starter through to the validated and experienced practitioner where the requirement to interact and contribute is a critical factor to provide a broader meaning which goes beyond the confines of a specific role. An individual acquires experience through demonstration and subsequently through actually doing to gain insight and experience; this should initiate questions beyond what needs to be done and incorporate why and how to gain a wider appreciation, insight and additional knowing. The notion of isolated specialisms appears rather quaint when viewed alongside the multifaceted interactions in a contemporary organizational setting.

Incorporating venatic insight (Gross and Walzer, 2006), which is a rare occurrence in modern research does open up the epistemological pathways and it is proposed that clues appears to be an interchangeable term for data and has clear relevance to the question: "what is the data telling the researcher?" during the analytical processes. This is an unknown at the outset of the research study and has the potential for practitioner ridicule when confining a study to one specialism, particularly when the research question has a strategic element. The more recent ideas of strategy as practice and emergent strategy indicate flexibility and attending to what is actually occurring within a business rather than a grand theory, which grounded theory was never intended to endorse, the opposite is the case. An inductive approach builds and generates rather than repeats and reinforces.

Revealing a basic social process within a research study provides an opportunity for originality and the generation of new knowledge; it is precisely the type of exercise that should be undertaken in

order to answer research questions. The basic social process has sufficient breadth and fluidity to provide a framework for a synthesis of ideas; so often sought after in academic work and so infrequently evident. The confidence to cross boundaries, to practice frontier rescinding, requires assurance and insight. These characteristics are readily sourced when applying established and validated grounded theory techniques, together with an appreciation of the how knowing may be established, in order to support the grounded theory where it is quickly evident that theoretical boundaries are being crossed, and maybe even be broken down to create a new paradoxical pathway.

Conclusion

The basic social process, irrespective of the research question, has no theoretical boundaries; it has free rein and should be recognised as such by practitioners and academics. From this perspective there is an enhanced opportunity to encourage a greater synthesis of ideas and themes amongst researchers, leading to the generation of an increased insight into new theories of relevance to practitioners who are working in an environment which is increasingly complex and subject to disruptive change. With an ever greater focus on producing research with impact the need to ensure outcomes reflect the actuality of a situation is a greater priority and as the academic community, along with all other sectors of society, are surrounded by basic social processes awaiting identification. The conclusion is that academia should adopt a more fluid approach by practising frontier rescinding with their own domain to encourage research students to seek creative solutions that do not require corralling within an outdated body of knowledge.

Area for further research

This paper illustrates one example of a basic social process, the concept of frontier rescinding as a solution to a metaphoric organizational barrier which was erected as repetition was practised with strategic communications. Applying the concept to emergent strategy and strategy as practice would expand the application and potentially lead to a theory with greater formality.

References

Age, L-J (2014) Goal-oriented Balancing: a new model of contemporary sales management, *Grounded Theory Review,* Vol. 13, Iss 2, pp. 61-69.

Bonet, E. (2014) Exploring the boundaries of rhetoric, *Journal of Organizational Change*, Vol. 27, Iss 5, pp: 793-806.

Bryant, A. and Charmaz, K. (2010) The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory, Sage Publications, London.

Clarke, A.E. and Friese, C. (2007) The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory Edited by Anthony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, Sage Publications, London   pp.363-397.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2008) Basics of Qualitative Research, 3rd. Edition, Sage Publications, London.

de Jorge-Moreno, J. and Garcia-Cebrian, I L.J. (1999),"Measuring of production efficiency in the European railways", European Business Review, Vol. 99 Iss 5 pp. 332 – 344.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2013a) Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, 4th Edn. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2013b) Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry, 4th Edn. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2013c) The Landscape of Qualitative Resarch, 4th Edn. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Dey, I. (1993). Qualitative Data Analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists. Routledge, London.

Douglas, D. (2004) Grounded Theory and the 'And' in Entrepreneurship Research, *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods,* Vol. 2, Iss. 2, pp. 59-68.

Douglas, D. (2003),"Grounded theories of management: a methodological review", *Management Research News*, Vol. 26, Iss, 5, pp. 44 - 52 P

Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. and Jackson, P. (2012) Management Research, Sage Publications, London.

Eikeland, O. (2007),"From epistemology to gnoseology – understanding the knowledge claims of action research", *Management Research News*, Vol. 30 Iss 5 pp. 344 - 358

Eikeland, O and Nicolini, D. (2011) Turning practically: broadening the horizon. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* Vol. 24, Iss. 2, pp. 164-174.

Gill, J and Johnson, P. (2010) Research Methods for Managers, 4th Edn. Sage Publications, London.

Glaser, B.G. and Holton, J. (2005) Basic Social Process, *Grounded Theory Review*. Iss. 3, Vol. 4.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). Awareness of dying. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.

Glaser, B.G. (1978) Theoretical Sensitivity, Sociology Press, Mill Valley, CA.

Goulding, C. (2003) "Issues in representing the postmodern consumer", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 6 Iss: 3, pp.152 – 159.

Grassie, G. (2008) Entangled Narratives: Competing Visions of the Good Life. *The Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* XXXIV (1 & 2).

Green, J. (2012) Stratified Circling; a Grounded Theory of Accomplished Performance in private sector businesses. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Glyndŵr University.

Green, J. and Binsardi, B. (2015) Entrepreneurial Intentions: a grounded theory of green-fielding. *Italian Journal of Management.* No.97, pp.17-54.

Green, J. and Binsardi, B. (2014) Systematic Avocating, *Grounded Theory Review,* Vol. 13, Iss 2, pp.70-79.

Greenwood, J.D. (2014) Toulmin, Stephen *The Sage Encyclopaedia of Action Research* Edited by David Coghlan & Mary Brydon-Millers, Sage Publications, London.

Grisham T., (2006),"Metaphor, poetry, storytelling and cross-cultural leadership", *Management Decision*, Vol. 44 Iss 4 pp. 486 – 503.

Gross, A.G. and Walzer, A.E. (2008) Re-reading Aristotle's Rhetoric, SIU Press, Illinois.

Gustavsson, B. and Age, L-J (2014) Conceptualizing for managerial relevance in B2B research: a grounded theory approach, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 29/7/8 pp. 626-632.

Haig, B.D. (1995) Grounded Theory as Scientific Method, *Philosophy of Education* http://www.ed.unic.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook95_docs/haig.html

Hennink, M/. Hutter, I. and Bailey, A. (2011) Qualitative Research Methods, Sage Publications, London.

Holton, J. (2007) The Coding Process and Its Challenges. *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory* edited by Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz pp. 265-290.   Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Hood, J.C. (2007) The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory Edited by Anthony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, Sage Publications, London, pp.151-164.

Jones, R. and Kriflik, G. (2006) Subordinate expectations of leadership within a cleaned-up bureaucracy: A grounded theory study, *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 154-172.

Kelle, U. (2007) The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory Edited by Anthony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, Sage Publications, London

Kumar, R. (2014) Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners, Sage Publications, London.

Locke, K. (2007) Grounded Theory in Management Research, Sage Publications, London.

Loy, J. T-L. (2011). Dynasting Theory: Lessons in Learning grounded theory. *The Grounded Theory Review,* Vol. 10, No. 2: 45-62.

Martin, V.B. (2015) The system was blinking red: Awareness Contexts and Disaster, *Grounded Theory Review,* Iss 2.

Matheus, T. (2009)A conceptual model and illustrative research framework for inter-organizational innovation, *Management Research News*, Vol. 32 Iss 3 pp. 254 – 271.

Meissner, P and Wulf, T. , (2015) "The development of strategy scenarios based on prospective hindsight: An approach to strategic decision making", *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol. 8 Iss: 2, pp.176 – 190.

Mouton, N., Just, S.N. and Gabrielsen J, (2012),"Creating organizational cultures*", Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 25 Iss 2 pp. 315 – 331.

Nayak, A. (2008) Method, the SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Management Research, Edited by Richard Thorpe and Robin Holt, Sage Publications, London.

O'Reilly, K, Paper, D. and Marx, S. (2012) Demysifying Grounded Theory for Business Research, *Organiztional Research Methods,* 15(2), pp. 247-262.

Quinn, J.B., Anderson, P. and Finkelstein, S. (1996) Making the Most of the Best https://hbr.org/1996/03.

Reed, P. G., and Runquist, J. J. (2007). Reformulation of a methodological concept in grounded theory. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 20(2), 118-122.

Rennie, D.L. (2000) Grounded Theory Methodology as Methodical Hermeneutics, *Theory & Psychology,* Vol. 10(4): pp. 481-502.

Saldaňa, J. (2013) The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers, Sage Publications, London.

Skordoulis, R. and Dawson, P. (2007),"Reflective decisions: the use of Socratic dialogue in managing organizational change", *Management Decision*, Vol. 45 Iss 6 pp. 991 – 1007.

St. Pierre, E.A. (2013) Post Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds) Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, 4th. Edn. (pp.447-479). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Thwaites, E. and Williams, C. (2006) Service Recovery: a naturalistic decision-making process. *Managing Service Quality,* Vol. 16, No. 6: pp. 641-653.

Vander Linden, K.L. (2008) Navigating New Experiences: A basic social process, *Grounded Theory Review*, Issue 3, Vol. 7.

Walsh, I, Holton, J.A., Bailyn, L, Fernandez, W., Levina, N. and Glaser, B.G. (2015) What Grounded Theory Is …. A critically Reflective Conversation Among Scholar, *Organizational Research Methods.* Vol. 18(4), pp. 581-599.

Wasserman, J.A., Clair, J.M. and Wilson, K.L. (2009) Problematics of grounded theory: innovations for developing an increasingly rigorous qualitative method. *Qualitative Research* Vol. 9(3) pp. 355-381.

Weiner, C. (2007). The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory Edited by Anthony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, Sage Publications, London pp. 293-310.