Interviewing in phenomenology and grounded theory: is there a difference?
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INTRODUCTION

Questions arose for the two authors of this paper, both PhD students, in understanding the role, process and outcome of interview when used in the two methodologies of phenomenology and grounded theory. The purpose of the paper is not to review the position and value of qualitative research, which from our respective but different methodological positions is accepted as a valuable and essential research approach. However, the paper will discuss the links between the two qualitative methodologies and the shared method of interview. To begin the discussion a brief outline of each methodology and the interview process is undertaken. Subsequently, from these foundations, a discussion of the interview is developed from both theoretical perspectives. The approach to exploration is informed by reference to a number of research articles from the years 1995–1998 identified from the Nursing Collection, a computerized database operated by OVID Technologies Inc. (www.ovid.com/).

PHENOMENOLOGY

According to Koch (1995) it is imperative at the outset to contextualize phenomenological research to the different
philosophical traditions that inform its methods. These traditions are usually identified from its roots with Brentano through to Husserl (1969), Heidegger (1962) and Merleau-Ponty (1962). The phenomenology of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty differed from that of Husserl as they considered that the phenomenological reduction or bracketing, was impossible as we are too much ‘beings-in-the-world’ to achieve such a state (Cooper 1999). Spiegelberg (1984 p. 1) chronicles this philosophical development of phenomenology and contends that ‘The difficulties of stating point-blank what phenomenology is are almost notorious’. This notoriety abounds through much of the nursing literature. For example, Jasper (1994) unusually acknowledges Kant as the first philosopher to describe phenomenology which only adds to the confusion.

Crotty (1996) is more specific when he outlines two phenomenologies, one of which developed from Husserl and the other, a North American development, through writers in sociology and psychology such as Shutz (1972), Giorgi (1985) and Van Kaam (1966). As a research approach in nursing, phenomenology has grown considerably over the last 20 years as it is considered a highly appropriate approach to researching human experience. Phenomenology aims, in Husserlian terms, to get ‘back to the things themselves’ and to reveal the object or phenomenon to which meaning is being attached. However, its use in nursing has resulted in criticism on two fronts.

Firstly, as Crotty (1996) so graphically illustrates, there is a lack of relationship between the philosophical tradition and the ‘new phenomenology’ espoused in nursing research, and secondly, there is the method/methodological slurring discussed by May (1991). The perception here is that lack of congruence equates to lack of rigour and hence lower acceptability to the research community. Wilkes (1991) acknowledges that for some researchers phenomenology is an approach and not a method and so a definitive process cannot be determined. If this is the case then there may be difficulty for nursing researchers as they attempt to justify the steps of the research process. Such a difficulty was noted by Taylor (1995) who describes her search for a methodologically congruent method within the phenomenological tradition and highlights the struggle that occurs to stay with a particular approach.

GROUNDED THEORY

Grounded theory has been described not so much as a specific method or technique but more as a style of doing qualitative analysis (Strauss 1987). Glaser & Strauss (1967) emphasize the discovery of theory from data collected from social research. A consequence of this, they argue, will be the development of theory which is suited to its anticipated uses. It can be seen that the position adopted is not to begin with theory and then set out to test it, but to begin with an area of inquiry and allow whatever is theoretically relevant to emerge (Strauss & Corbin 1990). Consequently, the generation of theory is the principal aim, to be achieved in the absence of an a priori conceptual framework or hypothesis. Glaser & Strauss (1967) sought initially to correct the imbalance, as they described it, created by an over-emphasis on verification of theory in sociology research. They recognized the primacy of the quantitative paradigm in sociology research at that time, and highlighted the need to achieve a more equitable balance for those researchers who wished to focus upon the generation of theory. They contended that the prior step of discovering theory, establishing the concepts and hypotheses which were pertinent to the area of inquiry, was seldom undertaken in practice. Grounded theory, through a process of constant comparison and reduction, aims to establish tight, well-integrated theory built from well-defined concepts arising directly from the empirical research in hand.

According to Glaser & Strauss (1967) generation of theory from the data of social research can be realized through the process of comparative analysis. They ascribe to this method an extensive degree of general application to social situations. In this sense their conception spans the comparative analysis of people and their roles to that of large organizations and nations. Glaser (1978) suggests that beyond the confines of sociology, researchers in other fields have adapted grounded theory and found this useful. Such utility supports the use of grounded theory in attempting to understand the complex social world of nurses. Grounded theory as an approach to inquiry grew out of Glaser and Strauss’ study of dying in hospital and consequently the connection between this approach to research and health care settings was established. In addition, Stern et al. (1982) note the influence of the then Dean of the nursing faculty at the University of California in bringing both sociologists together. Adaptation of grounded theory, seemingly not solely reserved for others, has been reflected in the different paths taken by the two co-originators in the late 1980s and early 1990s and the publication of Basics of Qualitative Research (Strauss & Corbin 1990). This both sowed the seeds of, and was the catalyst for, a major disagreement between Glaser and Strauss upon the conceptions of grounded theory, reflected in the publication of Emergence vs. Forcing (Glaser 1992). An exploration of this debate can be found in Melia (1997).

INTERVIEWING

Mischler (1979 p. 10) argues that meaning must be viewed within the social context in which it occurs. This is ideologically opposed to the objectifying approach taken in studies developed from the natural sciences. This raises
the possibility of multiple interpretations of the reality, but as he states: 'The choice among them depends on the purposes of the investigator and the focus of the investigation'. Generally, within the phenomenological tradition, it would appear that this meaning must be a result of co-creation between the researcher and the researched and not just the interpretation of the researcher, who may have different contextual factors or agendas influencing the descriptions. Gordon (1998), in a more recent exploration of the interview process, highlights this need for a more reflexive and joint authored approach between interviewer and interviewee in the creation of knowledge. This is especially consistent with some phenomenological research traditions that require the participants to be viewed as co-authors and not merely repositories of data (Walters 1995).

THE INTERVIEW IN PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDIES

From a phenomenological perspective the interview is described by Marshall & Rossman (1995 p. 82) as, ‘...a specific type of in-depth interviewing grounded in the theoretical tradition of phenomenology’. Again, there is acknowledgement of the relationship between the philosophical tradition and method which distinguishes this interview from other forms. The distinction is clearly seen in the relationship between researcher and participant where this moves from observational in quantitative research, to dialogical in qualitative research, and then to reflective in phenomenological research (Munhall & Oiler Boyd 1993). Such reflectivity appears to acknowledge that the researcher is an important component in the research process.

However, Husserlian phenomenological traditions identify the essential requirement of phenomenological reduction or bracketing which is undertaken to suspend belief so that preconceptions and presuppositions are put aside and the ‘true’ phenomenon or essence is revealed (Crotty 1996). By bracketing these preconceptions and presuppositions about the world as it is experienced by the participants the phenomenon can be revealed in its ‘true’ form to the phenomenologist. Shutz (1972) and Taylor (1995) identify the difficulties of undertaking such a suspension of belief and the attitude taken by the phenomenologist is one of doubt towards the world. Whilst acknowledging the problems of interpreting what bracketing is from the Husserlian position (Paley 1997) it would seem that the intention is to adopt a detached position where prior assumptions can be suspended. This is in contrast to researchers who claim congruence with other phenomenological philosophers such as Heidegger where a close involvement is expected (Walters 1995).

The interview is considered the main method of data collection in phenomenological research as it provides a situation where the participants’ descriptions can be explored, illuminated and gently probed (Kvale 1996). Jasper (1994 p. 311) comments that, ‘...the researcher using a phenomenological approach needs to develop specific research skills to enable him/her to get the “lived experiences” without contaminating the data’. This reference to bracketing by the researcher presupposes that it is the researcher that is ‘contaminating’ the data. Such a view is at odds with Polit & Hungler’s (1991) perspective that the subjective judgement of the researcher is valuable in phenomenologically based research. However, for both Polit and Hungler, and Jasper, the interview requires certain skills which Jasper (1994 p. 311) identifies as, ‘...the use of reflection, clarification, requests for examples and description and the conveyance of interest through listening techniques’.

Seidman (1991) supports this perspective by highlighting that a basic requirement for phenomenological interviews is the interest that the researcher has for the others’ stories. Seidman also highlights the need for the development of some interview technique which may be transferable in skill terms both within and outside of the research environment. The interview in Seidman’s terms is a structured, three-stage process, which begins by establishing the context of the interviewees experience, through to a construction of the experience and finally a reflection on the meaning it holds. Such an interview may be seen as formal. However, the progression of the interview will still be influenced by the nature of the relationship/interaction that occurs.

THE INTERVIEW IN GROUNDED THEORY STUDIES

Chenitz & Swanson (1986) examine two approaches to interviewing in grounded theory: the formal and the informal qualitative interview. In considering the formal interview two types are noted: structured and unstructured. Chenitz and Swanson see the latter as commonly utilized in the collection of qualitative data and they consider this as the formal interview of grounded theory. Although unstructured interviews may frequently in practice have a general guide which seeks to cover the theme which is to be developed in depth, the researcher seeks to follow the major concerns or point of view of the respondent. This approach is considered as the best means of securing the personal and private concerns of respondents. Listening to respondents recounting their stories (Glaser & Strauss 1967 pp. 75–76) is prominent during the early stages of the research, later theoretical sampling based upon the emerging theory brings a sharper focus to subsequent interviews.

The informal interview is likened to an everyday conversation by Chenitz and Swanson for the purpose of both collecting and validating data. May (1991) suggests
that these are unplanned encounters in a field, important to the area of inquiry and usually a part of participant observation. May also makes a general comment upon the difference between interviewing in grounded theory and ethnography, as opposed to phenomenology, by referring to the views of Munhall & Oiler (1986). According to these authors, phenomenological nursing studies appear to rely on formal interviews, usually repeated over time, an important factor according to Mischler (1979) and Seidman (1991); whereas a feature of grounded theory and ethnographic work is the use of informal interviews tied to participant observation and ‘one off’ formal/arranged interviews. This can be little more than a general comment on interviewing with regard to particular research perspectives for, as May (1991) then goes on to indicate, more than one style of interviewing may be employed in a research study. This strategy, coupled with the possible need for flexibility with respect to interviewing as the research progresses, means that it is hard to outline a typical pattern for the interview in qualitative research. Therefore, it is pertinent to ask whether there is indeed a ‘typical’ interview in grounded theory or phenomenological research?

Sorrell & Redmond (1995) undertook a review of interviews in phenomenological and ethnographic research traditions with the purpose of determining the most appropriate methodological approach. The common ground which they identified is that all interviews, by their nature, put the researcher in the role of research instrument; ‘through which data are collected’ (Sorrell & Redmond 1995 p. 118). It is difficult to see major differentiation in the two traditions other than the cultural aspects of ethnography which may subtly change the questioning and therefore, potentially, the analysis. However, it is unconvincing that the cultural aspects will not surface during phenomenological interviews. This highlights the difficulty encountered for the researcher who may have determined a methodology but finds it impossible to determine differences in method from the literature reviewed.

An examination of the work of Chenitz & Swanson (1986) would appear to suggest that there is no typical grounded theory interview. Both the formal and informal interview constitute the approach taken at appropriate stages of theoretical sampling in the research process. In a consideration of the formal qualitative interview Chenitz and Swanson suggest that this type of interview in generating grounded theory may differ from formal interviews in other types of research. Crotty (1996) identifies that different phenomenological studies have employed interviews that may be seen as both formal and informal. The degree of structure may not be identified solely with the questioning approach but also the way in which the interview is conceptualized (Seidman 1991). Despite these differences it appears that a phenomenological interview is intended to be ‘in-depth’. This approach is reflective of the open and accepting style of interviewing technique, which in Hallett’s (1995) terms seeks to elicit the genuine views and feelings of respondents. This may, however, be difficult to achieve if the process has a predetermined structure.

THE INTERVIEW IN CONTEXT

Charmaz (1994 p. 5) discusses the process of developing interview questions in her grounded theory study of chronic illness. Acknowledging that there is criticism of grounded theorists for not showing enough concern for the accuracy of specific data, she continues to press for data gathered to provide complete details of the processes and issues being studied. The impact of the interview process upon the data gathered is emphasized, along with the explicit shaping of this material when gathered by the researcher. In what she refers to as the framing, shaping and managing of the interview questions used there will be effects in respect of the quality and type of material which is gathered. The problem of the over-zealous, too directive or inexperienced interviewer is commented upon, whereby interesting directions and rich data are lost in the encounter. This, coupled with a lack of awareness in the researcher of assumptions being loaded into the questions, can be limiting. However, she notes that there are times when such direction may be helpful, but this follows from the sensitivity of the researcher to both the interviewee and the data. Charmaz outlines how interview questions in a grounded theory study may be framed and ordered. This process includes setting the tone, seeking information in depth, feeling and reflection, searching for the narrative and ending on a positive note.

For many phenomenological nurse researchers the account by Charmaz (1994) may resonate in respect of the search for narrative. Walshe’s (1995) study was intended to attempt to answer the question ‘What is it like to live with a venous leg ulcer?’ using methods derived from a phenomenological perspective. This phenomenon would appear to be as accessible using Charmaz’s approach towards interviewing as any other. Therefore, interviewing as a method of data collection may have a similar construction irrespective of the methodological grounding.

The relationship between the method of gathering data and the research methodology has been a focus for attention in nursing research. For example, Baker et al. (1992) identify the problems of method slurring and, in particular, how too often this is found in journal articles and in conference papers. Slurring is viewed across phenomenology and grounded theory research in nursing. As Baker et al. (1992 p. 1355) state, ‘It is not uncommon for an investigator to purport to use one or the other while in fact combining elements of each’.
The distinctions made in their paper are focused on methodological differences with the roots and purposes of each tradition explored in relation to the ensuing research process. The authors in this case are arguing that it is the methodological foundations which make the research strategies different; ‘As a result they have distinct methodological prescriptions guiding data collection and analysis which are based on and are consistent with their intellectual foundation’ (Baker et al. 1992 p. 1359). Consequently this has important implications for the researcher to ensure that the data collection methods adopted are appropriate to the research methodology.

However, the present authors contend that differentiation based on methodological difference appears to diminish in journal articles as the research moves into a description of method, therefore method slurring may not be an appropriate term. What is apparent from this review is the need to differentiate between those papers that mix methodologies without acknowledgement, which we classify as muddling, slurring which equates to an explicit, pragmatic approach to mixing methodologies, and slurring when no clear methodological approach is identified. Therefore, from the journal articles reviewed, congruence between the interview as the means of collecting data and the chosen methodology is not always evident. In this sense the interview is simply a generic data collection tool.

**A QUESTIONING APPROACH**

What may differ is the type of questioning which is influenced by the methodology, for example, is the interview guided by theory development or personal descriptions of the experience? Even here there may be ambiguity. Walters (1995), in comparing the phenomenological traditions of Husserl and Heidegger, highlights how Heideggerian hermeneutics continue in a state of development and refining as new insights emerge. This may assume that development and refining occurs between interviews as the researcher’s exposure to the phenomenon increases. However, the questions that a researcher using grounded theory chooses to ask may have some similarity to this as the researcher attempts to refine emerging theoretical constructs.

Although grounded theory may have been chosen to answer questions about particular social processes of interest to the researcher these may be similar areas of interest to the phenomenologist. Therefore, it may be assumed that the subjective involvement of the researcher is present, irrespective of methodology, although it is acknowledged that this remains a contentious issue, particularly in phenomenology. A phenomenologist often commences an interview with ‘Please describe your experience of...’ with clarification sought to enrich the description and illuminate that experience. Crotty (1996) identifies this as a common starting point that does not accord with a traditional phenomenological point that does not accord with a traditional phenomenological approach as the researcher is going on to explore the person’s subjective interpretation of the phenomenon rather than the manifestation of the experience. In grounded theory this approach to questioning is also apparent in the early stages when a narrative from the person’s perspective is required to allow the field of inquiry to unfold. However, in grounded theory no attempt is made to reduce the personal theorizing, unlike the approach traditionally taken in some phenomenologies (Crotty 1996).

Bush & Barr (1997), in using a phenomenological research approach, asked the questions ‘Can you give me some of your feelings about caring in the critical care setting?’ and ‘What are your rewards for caring?’ It is useful to know these two starting points for the interview although it is difficult to see in the article itself how the interview then developed. The composite description gives some detail and moves beyond the ‘feelings’ focus about caring but doesn’t elicit, in any major way, the phenomenon of ‘rewards’ which might be considered a separate avenue of concern. It may also be considered that from a phenomenological perspective the questions are on the phenomena of feelings and rewards although the outcome is clearly directed towards caring. No further guide is identified and it must be assumed that the researcher developed subsequent questions from these starting points. Not so Ring & Danielson (1997) who also used a phenomenological approach but identified the need for an interview guide which acted as a reminder to ask about certain issues. This highlights the tension between having a frame of reference and the naivety identified as essential by many phenomenological researchers.

From a grounded theory perspective the ongoing analysis will influence the questions that are asked, with the direction of the interview becoming driven by the emerging theory (theoretical sampling). As Glaser (1978 p. 36) states:

Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyses his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them in order to develop his theory as it emerges.

From a phenomenological perspective it may be considered that the openness remains irrespective of the number of interviews; the emphasis is on ‘The experience of...’ and is driven from the individual account as opposed to the emerging theory although this is by no means easy to determine from research articles. This may provide an explanation of ‘method/methodological muddling’, where the researcher, in carrying out successive interviews, finds the influence of preceding interviews impacting on subsequent ones. If this is the case, and the researcher sets out with a phenomenological approach, it may be
pertinent to ask to what extent their approach is reflective of grounded theory? Darbyshire (1994) describes a move in the opposite direction and reflects the potential linkage that exists between the methodologies. However, if the researcher has a particular question that is centred on the experience of others and finds prior influence from other interviews it may be possible, as already identified, to remain within particular phenomenological guidelines which identify the essential involvement of the researcher in the process.

Again from a grounded theory perspective, Strauss & Corbin (1990) indicate that it is the openness of the interview rather than specificity which drives the initial sampling choices. Then as theory emerges the researcher directs questions which have a focus upon the salient categories within it. Here the specific topic drives the interview, although new categories may emerge which force the researcher into a more open-ended conversation. Therefore, interviewing can be viewed as a process which begins in an open, broad manner seeking the overall perspective of the respondent, that is their point of view on the phenomena. The on-going data analysis leads to the emergence of a tentative theory, the categories of which provide a focus for subsequent interviews. Subsequent interviews are then guided by analytical questions and initial hypotheses about these categories and relationships between them (Strauss 1987).

**STRUCTURING**

The interview in grounded theory may thus be less open and more structured than the interview in phenomenology. However, some phenomenological researchers identify the use of semi-structured interviews which seems opposed to the required unstructured depth interviews described by Koch (1996). It is also apparent that many research questions must arise from the researcher and therefore a conceptual map of the phenomenon already exists and it is this map that may limit the interview and reduce the potential depth rather than the methodology. Taylor (1995) notes that using Heideggarian phenomenology requires the researcher to acknowledge their own ‘being-in-the-world’ and therefore the researcher is part of the research and not ‘bracketed’ from it as the Husserlian interpretation might suggest. Glaser (1992), from his grounded theory perspective, states that researchers set out to study what is to be studied with no preconceptions, although as the study progresses the overlay of ‘theoretical sensitivity’ from theory in general and sociological theory in particular is applied. For Glaser (1978), ‘no preconceptions’ is identified as having as few previous ideas and *a priori* conditions as possible. Therefore, no preconceptions suggests a style of research in which the researcher adopts an approach to studying ‘what is there to be studied’ putting one’s trust in the emergence of the problem. This approach seems just as applicable to phenomenological research.

Baillie (1996) uses a phenomenological approach to explore the nature of empathy, an approach she equates to open, unstructured interviewing. She identifies the difficulty of her own bracketing and the impact this may have on the research. The interview commenced with ‘Tell me, how do you see empathy?’ which is intended to open up the phenomenon. However, it suggests that empathy is being explored as a phenomenon external to the individuals’ experiences. From a grounded theory perspective, to begin with this question may be viewed as inappropriate as it restricts the potential for opening up the field of empathy, therefore forcing rather than enabling the emergence of data. A grounded theorist may begin the same interview by asking about relationships with patients/clients. Glaser (1992 p. 25) notes that in the context of asking questions the grounded theory researcher ‘…never, never asks the question directly in interviews as this would preconceive the emergence of data’.

Other research using a phenomenological approach, such as that by Fareed (1996), highlights the conflicts and tensions that exist in attempting to match methodology and method. The interview process is described as unstructured but this doesn’t accord with the aims of the study and the use of a semi-structured guide to keep the phenomenon of reassurance in focus. Such tensions may exist for researchers like Fareed in that the interview process is probably the best way of collecting data in an area of nursing that is as yet ill defined. If Fareed had undertaken the interviews from a grounded theory perspective, would they have been any different? It might be argued that grounded theory may have offered a more appropriate methodology as the aims of the research imply that reassurance is being viewed in the social context of a local general hospital unit and structure is being placed on the researcher by this context. Therefore, the data are being generated from within this social context and may have provided a more ‘grounded’ study than attempting to comply with the requirements of a phenomenological approach.

**RIGOUR**

Burns (1989) identifies the difficulties that qualitative researchers have had in ensuring that standards are addressed in respect of methodological rigour. Burns, in her paper, accepts a broad view of qualitative research and so it is difficult to elicit specific reference to the interview in the context of different methodologies. The section on data gathering predominantly covers the structural components of any research strategy, although Burns (1989) does highlight that the researcher should clarify the level of volunteering or researcher direction with respect to the data collected. Burns echoes the views of
Becker (1958) who, in the context of participant observation and informal interviewing, is concerned with the extent to which an informant’s statement would be the same if given spontaneously rather than directed by a question from the researcher. This again raises the difficulty of determining the level of volunteering from the subject as opposed to that elicited by the direction of the researcher, a central factor in any qualitative interview process.

Koch (1994) describes how a decision trail may assist the reader to see the interview in the wider context of the research and the researcher. Such a trail may provide a clearer view of the relationship between the interview and the methodology which was not readily apparent in many of the research articles reviewed. The emphasis in such a trail is on the connections between all aspects of the research process, although there is also a need to establish rigour within the interview itself. Burns’s (1989) article outlines the requirements for procedural rigour which could be applied to any qualitative data collection method. She does, however, describe, as one of the five standards for critique, Glaser and Strauss’ view that the researcher should describe the social world with such vividness that you could imagine yourself there and that ‘... you can almost literally see and hear its people’ (Burns 1989 p. 48). Although this would demand good interview techniques, the description occurs after the data are collected and so the importance of the interview cannot be underestimated, irrespective of methodology.

So, establishing rigour in interviewing, from the review so far, requires rigour in both methodological congruence and in the interview process. Kvale (1996) provides criteria for quality in interviews which we argue could be applied equally to interview rigour in phenomenology and grounded theory. The criteria he proposes range from evidence of spontaneity from the interviewee, through to the balance of interviewer/interviewee time and the clarity achieved by the story provided.

CONCLUSIONS

Researchers often refer to phenomenology as the method (Gravelle 1997), whereas to refer to grounded theory as the method could hide the multiple approach to data collection. It would appear that the predominant method of data collection in phenomenology is the (in-depth) interview. This can be contrasted with data collection in grounded theory studies for which the interview may only be one of multiple methods used. Here, the need to elicit and illuminate the social situation often requires diversity in data collection methods, ensuring that the theory is grounded in the data.

The data collection strategies are described as concrete differences (Baker et al. 1992 p. 1357) Therefore, from this perspective it is imperative that the means of collecting data should be consistent with the underlying prescriptions of the specific research approach selected, for as they suggest ‘... credibility for existing qualitative methods will only be established if nurse researchers explicitly describe their data collection and analysis procedures’ (Baker et al. 1992 p. 1359). However, as we have discussed these may not be congruent with the methodology and the result in many research articles is the muddling, slurring and blurring previously outlined.

Baker et al. (1992) also conclude that it is imperative that the chosen method is congruent with the research question. Although it may be considered that the research question itself should be congruent with the methodology, it is sometimes difficult to see such congruence with regard to the method of data collection. What appears to be happening is that the interview is used as a generic method without consideration of how it is to be used in the particular methodology. The result is that the interview process is often discussed inappropriately within the methodological paradigm from which it should originate. On the other hand Melia (1997) comments that such philosophical discussion about data collection methods may be more relevant to research method texts than actual research practice. Therefore, in the context of Melia’s views it may be irrelevant to dwell on the relationship of methodology and method if the story that is produced from the research is plausible.

Finally there is, it would appear, a core of work on interviewing that is common to the method irrespective of methodology (Fontana & Frey 1998). There is also a point however, at which interviewing in grounded theory and interviewing in phenomenology appear to diverge. The phenomenologist remains centred on eliciting the experience of respondents so that the phenomenon can be revealed. The grounded theorist, after an initial phenomenological approach, is then seeking to develop the emerging theory and may move on to other data collection methods, or structured interviews, to saturate emerging categories.
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