Exploring the Fakes within Online Communication: A Grounded Theory Approach (Phase Three: Grounded Theory)

FirasTayseerAyasrah, Dr.Hanif Abu-Bakar,   Dr. Amani Ali

School of Human Development and Techno communication, UniMAPKangar, Malaysia

Abstract

This study in its second phase aimed at fundament the study adopted methodology, in the analysis processes of the fake profiling phenomenon among students with different age categories in schools in Jordan. Theory building is conceptualizing; and to begin with, data are divided into actions, events, incidents and ideas by means of asking straightforward questions such as what, where, when and how much. Data are then given a representative name, and this procedure entails word-by-word, line-by-line and phrase-by-phrase analysis. There are two open coding methods involved. First, N-Vivo Coding necessitates exploration of literally documented data. Next, Open Label Coding entails analysis of concepts expressed in gathered data.

Keywords: fake profiling, social networks, Grounded Theory.

1.1 Introduction

Glaser and Strauss (1967) described the grounded theory as a research methodology facilitating to obtain theory from observed data; which predestined hypotheses or a specific theoretical framework is not incorporated thus privileges the data rather than extant theoretical concepts (Cutcliffe, 2000). Prior to investigating the procedures of grounded theory, it is expedient to identify the environment within which it was developed.

Grounded Theory was introduced as a reaction to a distaste against the dominion of a quantitative ideology filling social science research during the 1960s (Seale, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln 2005; Charmaz, 2006). The development of grounded theory was also a response to the criticism that qualitative research was vague, subjective, disorganized and biased (Charmaz, 2006).

In addition, researchers who advocated qualitative inquisition nevertheless recognized a deficiency of methodical procedures, which would defy the disparagement of quantitative champions. Glaser and Strauss' (1967) disappointment with the generation of theories from the former assumptions add up to a catalyst for the improvement of a system that could as a substitute produce theory from data obtained from the factual occurrence. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), by presenting viable strategies that facilitate the meticulous construction of theories from raw data concerning to social processes, it signifies an effort to satiate the disparity between theory and empirical research.

1.2 Preference of Grounded Theory

As being affirmed, the current research questions are open-ended, which are features of grounded theory research questions (Smith &Biley, 1997). In addition, McCann and Clark (2003a) referred particularly to its expediency in researchers that have to do with interaction and new-found phenomenon. McCallin (2003a) suggested that grounded theory aims to produce understanding concerning the behavioral patterns of a group which tally with this research. While Coyne and Cowley (2006) stated that the aim of this methodology is to develop theory that will enlighten the prevailing process in the phenomenon being explored.

1.2.1 Styles of Grounded Theory

Even though at its embryonic phase, Glaser and Strauss (1967) encouraged their advocate to utilize grounded theory strategies adjustably in their own way, in view of the fact that Glaser specifically has become apprehensive with different understanding of the methodology. Glaser and Strauss (cited in Charmaz, 2006), in fact, went in separate ways at some stages in the 1990s due to their discrepancy over the methodology resulting in a split in the theory between Straussian and Glaserian paradigms. Furthermore, the distinctions between grounded theory and qualitative data analysis from their point of view has been outlined, stating that individuals who do not be aware of these dissimilarities would affect grounded theory as it was initially constructed (Glaser & Holton, 2004).

Morse (2006), on the other hand, argued that the initiation of every research methodology leaves it exposed to being tailored and utilized in a different way to how the creators imagined. Strauss and Corbin (1994) themselves made this point, remarking that when a new methodology inaugurated, it is subject to a combination of its derivation and the developing unforeseen event. However, given that grounded theory is a relatively new research methodology; Woods (2003) stated that this dispute is expected. Moreover, Johnson et al. (2001) claimed that integrating different methodologies can in fact enhance rigor. Dey (2004) explained that it is not considered as grounded theory if it is a single, unified, firmly defined and clearly specified methodology. For that reason, researchers who employ grounded theory must classify which version they are utilizing.

Therefore, for this research, the approach proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) has been adopted. Three basic elements this approach should include (Legewie&Schervier-Legewie, 2004) are: theoretical sensitive coding, that is, generating theoretical strong concepts from the data to explain the phenomenon researched; theoretical sampling, that is, deciding whom to interview or what to observe next according to the state of theory generation, and that implies starting data analysis with the first interview, and writing down memos and hypotheses early; and the need to compare between phenomena and contexts to make the theory robust. In addition, structured aspect encourages the novice researcher and provides clear boundaries of what to look for in specific situations, how, where, when, and why.

1.2.3 Nature of Grounded Theory
In spite of the differing methodology, there is a consensus regarding certain aspects of the grounded theory, and these aspects have been recognized as the following:

1.3 Constant Comparative Analysis
Conrad (1978) stated that this early phrase in grounded theory research referred to the researcher recognizing incidents, events, and activities and continuously evaluating them to an emerging category to develop and saturate the category (Creswell, 2007). This means in grounded theory, in order to evaluate the data and further expound and assess the emerging ideas, data collection and analysis is conducted in a cyclical fashion (Dey, 2004). Creswell (1998, p. 64) expressed this as "a 'zigzag' process: out to the field to gather information, analyze the data, back to the field to gather more information, analyze the data, and so forth". Consequently, constant comparative analysis stresses that data need to be analyzed as it is accumulated and the researcher should not delay to begin data analysis. Constant comparative analysis remains during the research process and, similar to theoretical sampling, finish when collecting fresh data no longer produces new theoretical insights (Charmaz, 2006). Nonetheless, (Charmaz, 2006) warned not to confound saturation with the recurrence of described events, actions, and statements.

1.4 Data Analysis
According to Corbin and Strauss (1990), there are three steps involved; the preliminary step in the process of a grounded theory methodology is data collection. Data collection and analysis are significantly related with no predetermined notions of what they will find. Through analysis, repetition of the idea is observed throughout the data set; subsequently ideas revealed in the research procedure will become applicable (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Recurring concepts or ideas become an indicator of a potential occurrence.

The second step will involve the categorizing and designation of categories or subject matters under which the concepts fall (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and these classifications are purposefully created to be more abstract than the actual behaviors portrayed in the data, hence the themes can be scrutinized in a more generalizable context. The formation of a theory about the phenomenon is done with the combination of the more general or abstract themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

The third process implicates continuous comparison. It is an ongoing process which takes place throughout the analysis and the researcher will compare each new incident of an idea in the data with already organized groups of similar concepts in order to conclude where the new concept fits in as well as challenge the existing groupings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Eventually, this course of action leads to improved categories and facilitates to guard against researcher preconceived ideas (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

1.4.1 Units of Analysis

A method of analyzing data is termed as coding (Charmaz, 2006). In open coding, it may consist of a sentence, a line from a transcription, a physical action or amalgamation of previous elements (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). It is significant during data analysis to differentiate between terms used by the respondents and the procedural terms that the researcher associates with fake profiling phenomena as Gasson (2003) asserts will minimize the predisposition that could be introduced into the analysis by the researcher's presuppositions.

Jorgensen (1989) established that analysis is the process of breaking up, sorting out, or disassembling research materials into pieces, parts, elements, or units. With facts broken into manageable parts, the researcher sorts and filters them, probing for categories, classes, sequences, processes, patterns or wholes and the target of this process is to renovate the data in a meaningful and comprehensible approach (Jorgensen, 1989).

Charmaz (1983) proposed that the researcher uses codes to pull together and classify series of otherwise discrete events, statements, and observations which they identify in the data. At first the data may appear to be a mass of confusing, unrelated, accounts but by studying and coding the researcher begins to create order (Charmaz, 1983).

1.4.2 Proposed Units of Analysis

Strauss and Corbin (1998) established that grounded theory is a method that merges data analysis with data collection, and is based on three types of coding procedures: open, axial, and selective. The goals of grounded theory, according to Strauss and Corbin (1998), are to build rather than test theory, offer researchers with analytic pieces of equipment for handling masses of raw data, help the analysts to consider alternative meanings of phenomena, be systematic and creative simultaneously, as well as identify, develop, and relate the concepts that are the building blocks of theory.

For precision, each of the three types of coding procedures is discussed separately below.

1.5 Open Coding

Open coding is characterized as the investigative procedure to classify concepts via comparative analysis (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Douglas, 2003; Gasson 2004). The purpose is to find out, name and categorize phenomena according to their properties, dimensions and incidents. The two phases of conceptualizing and discovering categories in the open coding process (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) are conceptualizing and discovering categories.

The first phase of theory building is conceptualizing (Haig, 1995; Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Douglas, 2003). To begin with, data are divided into actions, events, incidents and ideas by means of asking straightforward questions such as what, where, when and how much, and data are then given a representative name (Pandit, 1996; Creswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This procedure entails word-by-word, line-by-line and phrase-by-phrase analysis (Douglas, 2003). There are two open coding methods involved. First, In Vivo Coding necessitates exploration of literally documented data (Creswell, 1998; Douglas, 2003). Next, Open Label Coding entails analysis of concepts expressed in gathered data (Creswell, 1998; Douglas, 2003). Phenomenon are the essential key ideas surfaced from the data and represented as concepts to illustrate the subject, issues, predicaments and concerns (Haig, 1995; Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to illustrate what is occurring in the circumstances penetrated (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). By means of relatively examining the data by categorizing phenomena, concepts materialize as the fundamental elements of the theory (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002).

The next step of open coding is a deduction procedure to categorize concepts into categories. Categories are concepts resulting from the process of grouping concepts at a higher and further abstract level (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Creswell, 1998; Goulding, 2002). Properties describe the meaning of a category, and elucidate the common or exact attributes and characteristics of a category. Dimensions describe the diverging scope of common properties of a category, provide the specification to a category, and recognize the location of a property. Categories are uncovered by means of comparative analysis of properties and dimensions (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002, Goede&Villers, 2003). Occurrences represent the connection between properties and dimensions, and assist the researcher to pinpoint categories through comparative analysis of occurrences (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goede&Villers, 2003).

1.6 Axial Coding

Axial coding is the method of discovering associations among categories and subcategories (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Douglas, 2003; Goede&Villers, 2003). The objective of the axial coding methodology is determining how categories correlate to subcategories in terms of their properties, dimensions and incidents (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

1.6.1 Subcategory

Subcategories are categories which have properties, dimensions and incidents, and which stand for a phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). As for categories, subcategories have answers concerning the phenomenon such as what, when, where, who, why and how (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

1.6.2 Paradigm

A paradigm in Strauss and Corbin's terms is an analytical instrument, which assists researchers to incorporate structure and process. The fundamental elements of the paradigm are conditions, actions or interactions and consequences. In view of the fact that categories are coded from phenomena, they are able to describe by paradigms that consist of conditions, actions or interactions and consequences (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Goede&Villers, 2003).

1.6.3 Conditions

Conditions elucidate the circumstances wherein a phenomenon takes place (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Conditions are part of occurrences that put in order the predicaments, settings, issues concerning to a phenomenon, and elucidating why and how groups or persons react in particular conducts. Conditions can be causal, intervening and contextual (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Causal circumstances typically elucidate elements of occurrences or occasions that influence phenomena. Intervening conditions transfer the outcome of causal conditions on phenomena. Contextual conditions are the precise elements among causal and intervening conditions that put in order some problems or circumstances to which groups or persons react through actions and interactions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

1.6.4 Actions or Interactions

They are observed by the queries how and by whom, are strategic or habitual responses which are made by groups or persons to happenings, events, problems or issues which take place under those circumstances (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goede&Villers, 2003). In Strauss and Corbin's terms, strategic actions represent intentional actions to resolve problems, while habitual actions represent everyday activities to respond to happenings in daily life (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

1.6.5 Consequences

Consequences are characterized as results of events or communications which have properties of duration, scope, predictability and visibility, and require to be recognized to comprehend phenomena (Pandit, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goede&Villers, 2003).

1.7 Selective Coding

Selective coding is the procedure of combination and modification of the emerged theories. The purpose of the selective coding procedure is combination of categories at the dimensional level with the intention of
   a. Ascertain a theory,
   b. Authenticate the connection between concepts,
   c. Distinguish any categories which require additional improvement (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
In view of the fact that categories recognized in the open and axial coding procedure are representations of data and not the theoretical framework, diverse categories have to be integrated to build up the theoretical framework (Pandit, 1996; Creswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Goede&Villers, 2003). Selective coding has three steps: a) detection of fundamental categories, b) integration of fundamental categories, and c) refinement of a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
 The preliminary phase of the selective coding procedure is determining on a fundamental category, which signifies the significant topic of the research (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goede&Villers, 2003) as associations linking all important categories need to be discovered (Pandit, 1996; Creswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Goede&Villers, 2003). The fundamental categories: a) permit assortment of other categories to explain a whole, and b) represent considerable array of all categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Several techniques, which are a) writing storylines, b) drawing diagrams,

and c) sorting memos manually or computerized, exist to determine the fundamental category (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Goulding, 2002; Goede&Villers, 2003).

1.7.1 Data Analysis Procedures

Hair, Wolfinbarger, Bush, and Ortinau (2007) established that subsequent to data gathering, there are three phases in scrutinizing qualitative data and that researchers move backward and forward between these steps iteratively to a certain extent than going through them one step at a time. These steps, according to Hair et al. (2007), are data reduction or deduction or abstraction that consists of a number of interrelated processes particularly categorization and coding, theory development and iteration and negative case analysis. Categorization is the method of coding and labeling segments of the transcripts or images into themes (Abu Bakar, 2015).

Consequently, the categories can be incorporated into a theory through iterative analysis of the data; constructing data depict findings so that the data can be more effortlessly grasped and communicated. After a thorough iterative procedure, the researcher obtains conclusions, authenticates the findings and verifies the conclusions to determine the trustworthiness of the data analysis (Hair et al., 2007).

Based on the guiding principles and techniques (Hair et al., 2007), the researcher adopted the following steps that are crucial towards accomplishing an effective, systematic and result oriented data analysis. The researcher accumulated all the field notes taken whilst conducting the series of in-depth and focus group interviews into a logically coherent write-up or format, with distinctive indication of their sources, individual designations or group identification. To achieve clarity, easy retrieval and reference or access, the researcher typed out all the field notes using NVivo version 11.

1.8 Memoing

The theory which surfaces is facilitated by the process of memoing, a method in which ideas concerning the developing theory during the process of open, axial, and selective coding is being written down by the researchers (Creswell, 2007). According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), memoing could be in the manner of preliminary propositions (hypotheses), concepts regarding emerging categories, or various aspects of the connection of categories as in axial coding. Generally, these are informal written documentation of investigation that assists with the formulation of theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In memoing, the researcher should stop and analyze ideas concerning the codes at any moment when there is an internal dialogue occurs in researcher's mind (McCann & Clark, 2003). In other words, it is a good initiative to get in the habit of jotting down memos immediately after the thoughts emerge.

Strauss and Corbin (1998) differentiate three kinds of memos: code notes, theoretical notes, and operational notes. Code notes pinpoint the code labels and their meanings (Babbie, 2010). According to Babbie (2010), code notes are predominantly significant since most of terms utilized with technical meanings in all social science research also have meanings in daily language. Consequently, it is fundamental to note down a lucid account of meaning by the codes used in the analysis. Theoretical notes in the meantime cover a diversity of subjects: sign of dimensions and profound meanings of concepts, association between concepts, and theoretical propositions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In the current study, the researcher found that it is vital to write down thoughts, and ponders albeit they will be disposed of later. Finally, operational notes deal with methodological concerns. Some will attract consideration to data collection situations that might be significant to understand the data afterwards. Others will consist of notes directing forthcoming data compilation.

Ideas appeared as the researcher rereads notes or transcripts, code chunks of text, or discuss the project with others. Therefore, jotting down memos has taken place the whole time during the data compilation and analysis process.

1.8 Theoretical Development

Dey (1993) characterized a theory as an idea concerning how additional ideas can be associated. It can take diverse types in term of the descriptions or explanations, and presentations.

McCann and Clark (2003a) pointed out that grounded theory studies characteristically produce 'a firm basis in reality' or substantive rather than formal theories. A substantive theory unearths collective structural practices that are utilized in reaction to certain predicament, whereas a formal theory is wide-ranging universal procedure happen in diverse social contexts (Kearney, 1998). Given that this research

focused on fake profiling phenomenon experienced by adolescents, therefore it can be categorized as substantive.

Interpretive theories main concern is to gain an insight on a phenomenon rather than forecasting potential outcomes. Miles and Huberman (1994) added that qualitative investigation is to be a prevailing technique for assessing causality seeing that with its rigorous analysis; it can classify instrument, going ahead of absolute association. This was supported by Jeon (2004), saying that it presents clarifications as to causes, conditions, contexts and consequences of the phenomenon taking place. On the whole insinuation, grounded theories are substantive theories which could both illustrate a phenomenon and elucidate processes supporting it.

finally, according to Smith and Biley (1997), the final result of a grounded theory analysis typically bear the form of a set of entirely saturated elemental underlying groups, in addition to a list of definitions, huge amount of theoretical memos, potential relation of suggestions and a model or models that explain and elucidate the data. To boot, Creswell (1998) affirmed that a grounded theory is enunciated near the conclusion of a research and can take up the form of a narrative statement (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), an illustration (Morrow & Smith, 1995), or a sequence of assumptions or propositions (Creswell & Brown, 1992). McCann and Clark (2003b) acclaimed the ability of diagrams and illustrations to exemplify the conceptual link that develops between categories visually. Therefore, diagrams have been utilized in the current research findings.

1.9 Summary of Grounded Theory

Using a grounded theory methodology has primary implication for readiness, organization and execution of the whole research. In particular, the parallel character of information gathering and investigation means that this methodology devours a ton of time. All in all, then again, this strategy can create affluent, earth shattering exploration discoveries which may not be delivered from the inconvenience of a foreordained hypothetical structure.

References

Abu Bakar, H. S. (2015). The emergence themes of cyberbullying among adolescences. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, (ahead-of-print), 1-14.

Al-Abdallah, G. M., Al-Khawaldeh, K. H., & Al-Hadid, A. Y. (2014). Internet Usage and Traditional Distribution Channels: The Moderating Effect of the Firm's Size in Jordan. *International Business Research, 7*(3), p81.

Al-Jubayer, S. (2013). Use of Social Networking Sites Among Teenagers: A Study of Facebook Use in Dhaka City. *Journal of International Social Issues (March 2013), 2*(1), 35-44.

Becker, J. L., & Chen, H. (2009). Measuring privacy risk in online social networks (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis).

Benevenuto, F., Rodrigues, T., Cha, M., & Almeida, V. (2009). *Characterizing user behavior in online social networks.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement conference.

Cao, Q., Sirivianos, M., Yang, X., &Pregueiro, T. (2012, April).Aiding the Detection of Fake Accounts in Large Scale Social Online Services.In *NSDI* (pp. 197-210).

Facebook. (February 4, 2004). About Facebook. Retrieved, August 15, 2014 from https://www.facebook.com/facebook/info.

Gao, H., Hu, J., Wilson, C., Li, Z., Chen, Y., & Zhao, B. Y. (2010, November). Detecting and characterizing social spam campaigns. In Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement (pp. 35-47).ACM.

Halder, D., &Jaishankar, K. (2008).Cyber crimes against women in India: Problems, perspectives and solutions. *TMC Academic Journal*, *3*(1), 48-62.

King, J., Lampinen, A., &Smolen, A. (2011, July). Privacy: Is there an app for that?.In Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (p. 12).ACM.

Kumar, N. S., KarthikChandran, U., ArunKumar, N., &Karnavel, K.(2013). Social Networking Site For Self Portfolio. arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.3399.

Larsen, M. C. (2007). Understanding social networking: On young people's construction and co-construction of identity online. Internet Research, 8.

Lennon, A. (2009). A conversation with Twitter co-founder Jack Dorsey. The Daily Anchor. Retrieved, June 9,2014. From http://www. thedailyanchor. com/2009/02/12/a-conversation-with-twitter-co-founder-jack-dorsey/.

Malik, O. (2009). Odeo RIP, Hello Obvious Corp. GigaOM. http://gigaom. com/2006/10/25/odeo-rip-hello-obvious-corp/. Retrieved, July 3,2104 .

Nazir, A., Raza, S., Chuah, C.-N., Schipper, B., & Davis, C. (2010). *Ghostbusting facebook: detecting and characterizing phantom profiles in online social gaming applications.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 3rd conference on Online social networks.

Olivarez-Giles, N. (2011). Facebook F8: Redesigning and hitting 800 million users. Los Angeles Times. http://latimesblogs. latimes. com/technology/2011/09/facebook-f8-media-features. html.

Sengupta, S. (2012).Risk and riches in user data for Facebook. The New York Times. http://www. nytimes. com/2012/02/27/technology/for-facebook-risk-and-riches-in-user-data. html.

Smith, A., & Brenner, J. (2012). Twitter use 2012. Pew Internet & American Life Project, 4.

Thelwall, M. (2009).MySpace comments. Online Information Review, 33(1), 58-76.

Valarmathi, V. (2014).CONSUMER BEHAVIOR TOWARDS SOCIAL NETWORKING SITE. International Journal of Logistics & Supply Chain Management Perspectives, 2(4), 478-482.