

10-6-2014

Qualitative Case Study Guidelines

Saša Baškarada

Defence Science and Technology Organisation, sasa.baskarada@dsto.defence.gov.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Baškarada, S. (2014). Qualitative Case Study Guidelines. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(40), 1-18. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss40/3>

This How To Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Qualitative Case Study Guidelines

Abstract

Although widely used, the qualitative case study method is not well understood. Due to conflicting epistemological presuppositions and the complexity inherent in qualitative case-based studies, scientific rigor can be difficult to demonstrate, and any resulting findings can be difficult to justify. For that reason, this paper discusses methodological problems associated with qualitative case-based research and offers guidelines for overcoming them. Due to its nearly universal acceptance, Yin's six-stage case study process is adopted and elaborated on. Moreover, additional principles from the wider methodological literature are integrated and explained. Finally, some modifications to the dependencies between the six case study stages are suggested. It is expected that following the guidelines presented in this paper may facilitate the collection of the most relevant data in the most efficient and effective manner, simplify the subsequent analysis, as well as enhance the validity of the resulting findings. The paper should be of interest to students (honour, masters, doctoral), academics, and practitioners involved with conducting and reviewing qualitative case-based studies.

Keywords

Qualitative Research, Case Study, Guidelines, Validity

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank The Qualitative Report Co-Editor, Dan Wulff, for his invaluable assistance with manuscript preparation



Qualitative Case Study Guidelines

Saša Baškarada

Defence Science and Technology Organisation, Melbourne Australia

Although widely used, the qualitative case study method is not well understood. Due to conflicting epistemological presuppositions and the complexity inherent in qualitative case-based studies, scientific rigor can be difficult to demonstrate, and any resulting findings can be difficult to justify. For that reason, this paper discusses methodological problems associated with qualitative case-based research and offers guidelines for overcoming them. Due to its nearly universal acceptance, Yin's six-stage case study process is adopted and elaborated on. Moreover, additional principles from the wider methodological literature are integrated and explained. Finally, some modifications to the dependencies between the six case study stages are suggested. It is expected that following the guidelines presented in this paper may facilitate the collection of the most relevant data in the most efficient and effective manner, simplify the subsequent analysis, as well as enhance the validity of the resulting findings. The paper should be of interest to students (honour, masters, doctoral), academics, and practitioners involved with conducting and reviewing qualitative case-based studies. Keywords: Qualitative Research, Case Study, Guidelines, Validity.

Where quantitative research is mainly concerned with the testing of hypotheses and statistical generalisations (Jackson, 2008), qualitative research does not usually employ statistical procedures or other means of quantification, focusing instead on understanding the nature of the research problem rather than on the quantity of observed characteristics (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Given that qualitative researchers generally assume that social reality is a human creation, they interpret and contextualise meanings from people's beliefs and practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Case study research involves "intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units ... observed at a single point in time or over some delimited period of time" (Gerring, 2004, p. 342). As such, case studies provide an opportunity for the researcher to gain a deep holistic view of the research problem, and may facilitate describing, understanding and explaining a research problem or situation (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Tellis, 1997a, 1997b).

Besides being widely used in academia, the method is also popular with practitioners as a tool for evaluation and organisational learning. However, although widely used, the qualitative case study method is not well understood (Barratt, Choi, & Li, 2011; Dooley, 2002; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Gerring, 2004; Stuart, McCutcheon, Handfield, McLachlin, & Samson, 2002). Given the considerable time and resource requirements associated with conducting such studies (GAO, 1990), any misunderstandings regarding the purpose and implementation of the method as well as the validity of the resulting findings can have significant negative consequences. In the context of academic studies, significant misunderstandings identified during the peer-review process may potentially

invalidate the whole study, thus, leading to wasted time and effort on the part of the researchers and the case study participants. Any misunderstandings in practitioner-oriented case studies may potentially result in dysfunctional (Merton, 1940) or superstitious (Levitt & March, 1988) organisational learning (March, Sproull, & Tamuz, 1991; Yukl, 2009).

Justifying the rigour of qualitative case studies to researchers experienced with the method and the problem domain can be challenging. For any justification to be persuasive, it has to rely on arguments rooted in the methodological literature. Justifying such studies to more quantitatively minded researchers who may not be experienced with the domain under investigation may seem like an almost unsurmountable obstacle. The author has experienced such challenges first-hand as a doctoral student, researcher, and practitioner.

The author has been a predominantly qualitative researcher for almost a decade, and has conducted and published numerous case studies, largely in the information systems domain, including (Baškarada, 2010, 2011; Baškarada & Koronios, 2011; Baškarada, Koronios, & Gao, 2007; Baškarada, McKay, & McKenna, 2013). Most recently, as part of his role as an operations analyst in the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO), the author has been engaged in case studies in the domains of operations management, leadership, and organisational learning. This paper originated from a study aimed at providing methodological foundations to Lessons Learned activities conducted by the Australian Defence Force (ADF).

ADF's adaptability and continuous improvement are underpinned by its ability to learn from experience. Such learning requires the ability to capture and analyse observations, and to take adaptive actions that ensure lessons identified become learned and institutionalised. In order to facilitate the collection of relevant observations, as well as to assure the validity of the subsequent analysis, it is essential that ADF follows a scientifically rigorous process and employs the most appropriate methods. This paper presents qualitative case study guidelines, which may facilitate the collection of the most relevant observations in the most efficient and effective manner. Furthermore, it is expected that following these guidelines will also simplify the subsequent analysis as well as assure the rigour of any identified lessons. In addition to being of potential benefit to the ADF, this paper should also be of interest to other practitioners as well as academics with a stake in qualitative case studies.

In order to assist students, academics, and practitioners with conducting and evaluating qualitative case studies, this paper adopts Yin's (2009) nearly universally accepted six-stage case study process and enriches it by integrating additional guidelines from the wider methodological literature. The paper concludes by elaborating on suggested modifications to the dependencies between some of the case study stages (see


Figure 1); original dependencies are represented in blue, suggested additions in red, and suggested deletions in gray.

Plan

The planning stage focuses on identifying the research questions or other rationale for doing a case study, deciding to use the case study method (compared with other methods), and understanding its strengths and limitations (Yin, 2009). Clearly defining the research problem is probably the most important step in the entire research project. As such, every case study should begin with a comprehensive literature review and a careful

consideration of the research questions and study objectives (Ravitch & Riggan, 2011). A comprehensive literature review, which enhances the face validity of the study (Dooley, 2002), should identify relevant gaps in the literature and relate them to the research questions (Darke, Shanks, & Broadbent, 1998).

Figure 1: The Case Study Process, adapted from (Yin, 2009, p. 1)



Another key point of the planning stage is to ensure that no mismatch exists between the research questions and the case study method (GAO, 1990). The choice of the research method is determined by several factors, including the type of research question, the control an investigator has over actual behavioural events, and the focus on contemporary as opposed to historical phenomena (Yin, 2009). The case study method should also align with the underlying research paradigm; e.g., positivist/postpositivist, interpretive, and critical/postmodern (Gephart, 2004). Critical realism has been advocated as the preferred paradigm for case study research (Easton, 2010).

While the case study method has traditionally been classed as soft research, the properties described above actually make case studies particularly difficult to execute well (Yin, 2009). Nevertheless, they are particularly suitable when research sponsors (rather than investigators) define the research questions (GAO, 1990). Additionally, while experiments usually control the context in an artificial environment and have many more data points than variables of interest, case studies usually have “many more variables of interest than data points,” rely “on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion,” and benefit “from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis” (Yin, 2009, p. 18).

The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) extensively uses case studies in their evaluations. GAO defines case study as “a method for learning about a complex instance, based on a comprehensive understanding of that instance obtained by extensive description and analysis of that instance taken as a whole and in its context” (GAO, 1990, p. 15). Case studies allow for confirmatory (deductive) as well as explanatory (inductive) findings (Hyde, 2000; Yin, 2009), can be based on *single* or *multiple cases*, and can include *qualitative* and/or *quantitative* data (Gerring, 2004). They can be *exploratory*, *descriptive*, or *explanatory*, and they have been described as the preferred research method when *how* and *why* questions are posed, the investigator has little control over events, and the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context (Yin, 2009). Conversely, case study research method may not be the best choice in situations where the phenomenon of interest is mature and well-understood, where there is little interest

regarding *how* or *why* a phenomenon occurs, and where real-life context is irrelevant (Darke et al., 1998).

According to Yin, *how* and *why* questions are better answered through case studies as such questions “deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence” (p. 9). On the other hand, surveys, for example, are more appropriate when answering questions like *who*, *what*, *where*, *how many*, and *how much* (Dane, 2010). However, as surveys are usually analysed using statistical techniques, the unit of analysis also needs to be taken into consideration. For instance, when studying groups/organisations, it may be difficult (or even impossible) to obtain a sufficiently large sample; in such instances case studies may be more appropriate.

While case studies do not aim to generalise to populations (*statistical generalisation*), similar to experiments, they aim to generalise to theories (*analytical generalisation*; Yin, 2009). Thus, according to Yin, replication may be claimed “if two or more cases are shown to support the same theory” (p. 38). Stake (1978), on the other hand, argues that case studies are particularly well-suited for *naturalistic generalisations* that are based on experiential transformation of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. In any case, case studies are particularly well-suited for extensive and in-depth descriptions of complex social phenomena. In fact, the depth of analysis is one of the primary virtues of the case study method (Gerring, 2004). As a research method, case studies are commonly used in psychology, sociology, political science (Gerring, 2004), business (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007), information systems (Darke et al., 1998), education (Stake, 1978), operations management (McCutcheon & Meredith, 1993), marketing (Easton, 2010), and the like.

However, “given the time required, the rich, in-depth, nature of the information sought, and the need to achieve credibility,” case studies can also be costly to conduct (GAO, 1990, p. 11). Other challenges identified by GAO include choosing the method for selecting cases, reporting the basis for selecting cases, and integrating findings across several cases when the findings in one were inconsistent with those in another.

Exploratory case studies may be undertaken prior to the definition of the research questions and hypotheses. Accordingly, they are mainly used for theory building. *Descriptive* case studies try to completely describe different characteristics of a phenomenon in its context and so they are also mainly used for theory building. Such studies may also identify differences between individual cases with a view of potentially generating a classificatory framework (Gerring, 2004). *Explanatory* case studies may be undertaken to investigate causal relationships; hence, they are mainly used for theory testing. They are characterised by *how* and *why* research questions because they investigate the relationships that are proposed between different theory components (Yin, 2009). Any inconsistencies between a preliminary theory and the evidence may lead to theory modification and enhancement (Aneshensel, 2012). A notable example of an explanatory case study is the Allison and Zelikow (1999) study of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, which according to Yin (2009) demonstrates how a “single case study can be the basis for significant explanations and generalisations” (p. 6).

As surveys are usually considered as the preferred method for theory testing, providing clear justification for the use of deductive (explanatory) case studies is imperative (Barratt et al., 2011). Since purely descriptive studies are frequently criticised

due to a lack of theoretical contribution, it has been suggested that exploratory case studies may be “the safest option” (Pan & Tan, 2011, p. 163).

Stake (1995) differentiates between *intrinsic*, *instrumental*, and *collective* case studies. *Intrinsic* case studies only aim at acquiring better understanding of the particular case of interest. Thus, such case studies are not used for theory building. *Instrumental* case studies provide insights into an issue or are used to refine a theory, and *collective* case studies comprise several instrumental case studies. However, Stake also argues that studies seldom fit neatly into such categories, and that researchers have to make a strategic choice in deciding on the scope of the case study, since everything cannot and need not be understood.

GAO (1990) provides a more detailed classification, differentiating between six types of case studies:

- *illustrative*—this case study is descriptive in character and intended to add realism and in-depth examples to other information about a program or policy;
- *exploratory*—this is also a descriptive case study but is aimed at generating hypotheses for later investigation rather than for illustrating;
- *critical instance*—this examines a single instance of unique interest or serves as a critical test of an assertion about a program, problem, or strategy;
- *program implementation*—this case study investigates operations, often at several sites, and often normatively;
- *program effects*—this application uses the case study to examine causality and usually involves multi-site, multi-method assessments; and
- *cumulative*—this brings together findings from many case studies to answer an evaluation question, whether descriptive, normative, or cause-and-effect.

Design

The design stage focuses on defining the unit of analysis and the likely cases to be studied, developing theory/propositions and identifying issues underlying the anticipated study, identifying the case study design (*single*, *multiple*, *holistic*, *embedded*), and developing procedures to maintain case study quality (Yin, 2009). Research design logically links the research questions to the research conclusions through the steps undertaken during data collection and data analysis. Thus, research design, which can be seen as a “blueprint” for the research project, should address the research questions, relevant propositions/hypotheses, the unit of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions, and the criteria for interpreting the findings. The logic linking the data to the propositions should also ensure the correct type and amount of relevant information is collected. The criteria for interpreting the findings should include any relevant rival theories/explanations so that relevant data can be collected during the data collection stage. Common design-related issues include choosing an inappropriate unit of analysis, inappropriate case selection, insufficient attention to alternative theories/hypotheses, and more/fewer cases selected than necessary (GAO, 1990). Countering some of these issues requires a careful balance between “knowing more about less and knowing less about more” (Gerring, 2004, p. 348).

The unit of analysis defines what the case is—for example, an event, a process, an individual, a group, or an organisation (GAO, 1990; Yin, 2009). As the literature is not

consistent with respect to the terminology—for example, Gerring (2004) advocates a taxonomy in which units comprise cases—clearly defining relevant terms is critical. In the case of an event or a process, defining the time boundaries (i.e., the beginning and the end of the case) is imperative. While it may sound obvious and simple, identifying the appropriate unit of analysis requires careful consideration, as any confusion over it may invalidate the whole study (Gerring, 2004). Nevertheless, a review of qualitative case studies in operations management recently found that 83% of articles did not clearly state their unit of analysis (Barratt et al., 2011). Similarly, most case studies published in the information systems literature fail to identify the unit of analysis (Dubé & Paré, 2003).

Since all research is based on theory, the theoretical foundations of the study should be clearly articulated (Flynn, Sakakibara, Schroeder, Bates, & Flynn, 1990). This includes differentiating between theory building (Eisenhardt, 1989) and theory testing approaches. As previously discussed, case studies are appropriate for answering *how* and *why* questions. The specific questions can be identified and developed by closely examining any previous studies and identifying any suggestions/opportunities for future research (Yin, 2009). However, as the *how* and *why* questions are usually quite broad, they may not provide enough guidance on what data needs to be collected. In such cases, deriving more specific propositions/hypotheses may be of benefit. Deciding on which propositions apply to the case(s) under study and which are intended to be generalised to a broader population is critical (Gerring, 2004). Stating all relevant propositions also has the benefit of illustrating the study scope (Baxter & Jack, 2008). As the choice of the theoretical lens is entirely subjective, there are no explicit guidelines for how exactly this should be done (Walsham, 2006). Nevertheless, from a pragmatic standpoint, theoretical foundations should not be dated, immature, overused, or overly practitioner-oriented (Pan & Tan, 2011). When the case study data uncovers constructs that do not neatly fit within the foundational theoretical schema, the researchers may have the opportunity to extend it by including additional constructs and/or propositions. The alternative and reasonably controversial view (Walsham, 1995) argues against any theoretical preconception prior to data collection with a view that any theory should purely emerge from the raw data (Eisenhardt, 1989; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

As studies may have multiple stakeholders (e.g., researchers and the organisation under study), it is also important to either clearly differentiate between, or align, expected practical and theoretical contributions (Darke et al., 1998). Potential practical benefits to the case study organisation include benchmarking against best-practices and other organisations, and rich descriptions of the phenomenon under investigation. Interviewees may also benefit by gaining a better understanding of the research problem (Onwuegbuzie, Leech, & Collins, 2012).

It has been shown that many published case studies fail to identify the rationale for case selection (Dubé & Paré, 2003). Individual cases may be selected based on *convenience*, *purpose*, and *probability* (see Table 1). Table 2 shows another non-mutually-exclusive taxonomy for the selection of cases. According to Yin, reasons for justifying *single-case* studies include studying a *critical case*, an *extreme case*, a *representative* or *typical case*, a *revelatory case* (involving a novel situation), and a *longitudinal case*. *Purposive* case selection provides an ability to collect the most relevant data (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2012), and *longitudinal* cases provide an ability to identify trends over time (GAO, 1990).

According to Yin, in *multi-case studies*, each case should be selected so that it either predicts similar results (*literal replication*), or predicts contrasting results but for anticipatable reasons (*theoretical replication*). If multiple cases lead to contradictory results, the preliminary theory should be revised and tested with another set of cases (Yin, 2009). Both single and multiple designs can be either holistic (one unit of analysis per case) or embedded (multiple units of analysis per case).

Table 1: Instance Selection in Case Studies (GAO, 1990, p. 25)

Selection Basis	When to use and what questions it can answer
Convenience	Case selected because it was expedient for data collection purposes.
Purpose	
<i>Bracketing</i>	What is happening at extremes? What explains such differences?
<i>Best Cases</i>	What accounts for an effective program?
<i>Worst Cases</i>	Why isn't the program working?
<i>Cluster</i>	How do different types of programs compare with each other?
<i>Representative</i>	Instances chosen to represent important variations.
<i>Typical</i>	Instance chosen to represent a typical case.
<i>Special Interest</i>	Instances chosen based on an unusual/special attribute.
Probability	What is happening in the program as a whole, and why?

Table 2: Strategies for the Selection of Cases (Flyvbjerg, 2001)

Selection Basis	Description
Extreme/deviant case	Extreme or unusual case.
Maximum variation cases	Cases which are very different on one dimension.
Critical case	A case with strategic importance to the general problem.
Paradigmatic case	A prototypical case.

While there is no ideal number of cases, depending on the nature of the research question, the available resources, the study timeframe, and case availability, either breadth (across multiple cases) or depth (within case) may take precedence (Darke et al., 1998; Perry, 1998). Nevertheless, multiple cases typically lead to more robust outcomes than single-case research, especially in the context of inductive theory building (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). As gaining access to suitable case study organisations is perhaps the most challenging step in the entire process (Walsham, 2006), some argue that it may be more pragmatic to tailor any theoretical contribution based on case study accessibility (Pan & Tan, 2011). In other words, that searching for, and gaining access to, relevant cases should come prior to the identification of research questions. This advice especially makes sense if one agrees with the claim that unsolicited contact should be avoided.

The quality of any empirical studies, including case studies, depends on *construct validity*, *internal validity*, *external validity*, and *reliability* (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2012).

Construct validity, which is especially challenging in case study research, deals with concept operationalisation. *Operationalisation* is the process of defining a concept through a set of attributes/variables in order to make it measurable through empirical observations (Loseke, 2012). Numerous threats to *construct validity* have been identified, including inadequate explication of constructs, construct confounding, mono-operation bias, mono-method bias, confounding constructs with levels of constructs, treatment sensitive factorial structure, reactive self-report changes, reactivity to the experimental situation, experimenter expectancies, novelty and disruption effects, compensatory equalisation, compensatory rivalry, resentful demoralisation, and treatment diffusion. Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002) discuss each of these threats in great detail and provide recommendations on how to mitigate against them. According to Yin (2009), three strategies for improving construct validity include using multiple sources of evidence, having key informants review the case study report, and maintaining a chain of evidence. Employing multiple sources of evidence can contribute to construct validity by providing multiple measures of the same phenomenon. Designing the case study so that the chain of evidence is maintained should allow reviewers to trace from conclusions back to the initial research questions, or from questions to the conclusions (Sarker & Lee, 1998). The corrections made through reviews by key informants may enhance the accuracy of the case study as well as identify a range of competing perspectives.

Internal validity, which is concerned with justifying causal relationships, only applies to explanatory and not to descriptive or exploratory case studies (GAO, 1990). Threats to internal validity include ambiguous temporal precedence, selection, history, maturation, regression, attrition, testing, instrumentation, and additive and interactive effects. Again, Shadish et al. (2002) provide detailed explanations and recommendations. The use of methodological and data source triangulation (including cross-case comparisons) can lead to increased internal validity (GAO, 1990). Other types of *triangulation* include investigator triangulation and theory triangulation (Denzin, 1978). For instance, a number of individual investigators or teams may separately engage in data collection and preliminary analysis activities, prior to converging and comparing their initial findings (Gerring, 2004). Separate investigators could then actively attempt to invalidate each other's preliminary findings (Campbell, 1975). In addition, a theory should be enhanced and validated by continually and iteratively evaluating cases against it (Sykes, 1990). It has also been argued that *pattern matching* may be used to enhance the internal validity, whereby, involving qualitative but logical deduction (Lee, 1989), an empirically based pattern is logically compared against a predicted pattern (Yin, 2009).

External validity deals with the problem of knowing whether the findings are generalisable to other cases. Threats to external validity include interaction of the causal relationship with units, interaction of the causal relationship over treatment variations, interaction of the causal relationship with outcomes, interaction of the causal relationship with settings, and context dependent mediation (Shadish et al., 2002). However, it has been argued that the use of one case is similar to the use of one experiment, in the sense that neither one is sufficient to reject or disprove propositions, and that several are necessary to demonstrate accuracy of a theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Lee, 1989; Yin, 2009). In other words, "case studies, like experiments, are generalisable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, the case study, like the experiment, does not represent a 'sample', and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalise theories

[*analytical generalisation*] and not to enumerate frequencies [*statistical generalisation*]" (Yin, 2009, p. 10). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the methodological literature provides little consensus regarding how exactly analytical generalisation may be achieved (Halkier, 2011).

Reliability is concerned with demonstrating that same results can be obtained by repeating the data collection procedure. In other words, other investigators should in principle be able to follow the same procedures and arrive at the same results. Two strategies for ensuring reliability of case studies include creation of the case study protocol, and development of a case study database (Yin, 2009). The case study protocol contributes to the reliability by standardising the investigation. Relevant documents may include an overview of the project, field procedures, guiding questions, and a report outline.

In addition to construct/internal/external validity and reliability, *data quality* is also a key validity criterion. Research has identified a range of relevant data quality dimensions, including accuracy, objectivity, believability, reputation, interpretability, ease of understanding, concise and consistent representation, relevancy, value-added, timeliness, completeness, amount of information, accessibility, and access security (Wang & Strong, 1996). In relation to these dimensions, data may become corrupted during collection, transmission, storage, integration, retrieval, and analysis (Baškarada, 2010, 2011).

Prepare

The prepare stage focuses on developing skills as a case study investigator, training for a specific case study, developing a case study protocol, conducting a pilot case, and gaining any relevant approvals (Yin, 2009). Preparation should also aim to identify any relevant issues in the case study design and/or the team composition, and endeavour to address any such issues before starting the data collection stage. Even though critical, it has been observed that this step is frequently omitted in published accounts of case studies (Dubé & Paré, 2003).

According to Yin, the researchers should be sufficiently familiar with the study domain as to understand the main concepts and theoretical/methodological issues relevant to the study. They should know why the study is being done, what evidence is being sought, what empirical variations can be anticipated (including what should be done if such variations occur), and what constitutes supportive or contrary evidence. Specific preparations for data collection activities may include reviewing the original case study proposal, case study protocol, sample reports, and the like. In addition to being sufficiently familiar with the study domain, case study investigators should also be able to interpret the information in real-time and adjust their data collection activities accordingly to suit the case study (Yin, 2009).

As previously discussed, the use of a case study protocol positively contributes toward reliability of the study, and should ideally include introduction to the case study and the purpose of the protocol, the data collection procedures, an outline of the case study report, high-level case study questions, and any references. Pilot case studies may also be used to refine the "data collection plans with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed" (Yin, 2009, p. 92). Any pilot reports should reflect on the lessons identified and, as appropriate, provide avenues for the implementation of lessons into the next iteration. Nevertheless, it has been shown that most case studies published in the information systems literature fail to mention any pilots (Dubé & Paré, 2003). Any

subsequent changes to, or deviations from, the case study protocol should be completely and accurately documented (Dooley, 2002).

Before proceeding further, the investigators should also reach an agreement with the case study organisation/participants regarding any limitations on the disclosure of data, identities, and findings (Darke et al., 1998). Potential participants should also be informed about the research timeframe, the proposed nature of their involvement, and the expected practical outcomes.

Collect

The collect stage involves following the case study protocol, using multiple sources of evidence, creating a case study database, and maintaining a chain of evidence (Yin, 2009). GAO (1990) similarly recommends that multiple sources of evidence should be used, that a case study database should be used to store relevant evidence, and that an auditable chain of evidence (also referred to as an “audit trail”) should explain how any conclusions have been drawn (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

According to Yin, one major difference between survey based studies and case studies is that surveys capture perceptions and attitudes about events and behaviours, whereas case studies collect direct evidence. Furthermore, in case studies, data are analysed as they become available, and the emerging results are used to shape the next set of observations (GAO, 1990), or the next data collection activity (Dooley, 2002).

Theoretical sampling, which differs from *statistical sampling*, originated with the development of *grounded theory* (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In contrast to statistical sampling, the goal of theoretical sampling is not to undertake representative capture of all possible variations, but to gain a deeper understanding of the cases in order to facilitate the development of theories. Theoretical sampling implies that the researchers guide their data collection activities on the basis of provisional theoretical ideas (Boeije, 2002). Thus, it enables answering of questions that have arisen from the analysis of and reflection on previous data, since each piece of analysed data provides indications about where to look next. Theoretical reasons for sampling cases include revelation of something unusual/unexpected, seeking replication/falsification, elimination of alternative explanations, and elaboration of emerging theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Selecting extreme case-pairs (e.g., good vs. bad) is a common theoretical sampling approach. As such, the theory is continually modified as a consequence of further research. Such comprehensive data collection approach helps ensure that key aspects have not been missed, the associated flexibility provides an ability to collect the most relevant data, and multiple sources of evidence lead to enhanced validity and reduced bias (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; GAO, 1990). In addition, the ability to search for disproving evidence may lead to a reduction in confirmation bias, and maintaining a chain of evidence allows for stronger justifications of any conclusions.

In addition to investigator bias that may result from personal values and assumptions, and which can unduly influence data collection and analysis, potential effects of the investigators on the behaviour of the case study participants also need to be taken into consideration (Darke et al., 1998). For instance, “double hermeneutics” refers to the situation where researchers influence the interpretations of the study participants (Giddens, 1984). Arguments that such type of bias may be minimised by building rapport between the investigators and the participants (Miles & Huberman, 1994) are questionable. In any

case, researchers should explicitly acknowledge any such aspects and critically reflect on how meanings may have been socially constructed (Klein & Myers, 1999).

Relevant data may be collected through *documents, archival records, interviews, direct observations, and physical artefacts* (Yin, 2009). According to Yin, when reviewing documents, researchers should bear in mind that they may not always accurately reflect reality (e.g., policy and process documents may be out-of-date). Archival records are arguably more reliable, as they are usually used for record keeping purposes.

A case study database allows investigators to develop an audit trail from data collection, through analysis, to final conclusions. According to Yin, any interested reader should be able to link the conclusions presented in the case study report to the underlying analyses, the supporting evidence, the case study protocol, and the original research questions. A case study database may include interview transcripts, investigator notes, documentary evidence, preliminary analyses, and the like. As such, the use of a case study database enhances the reliability of the study. All items in the database should be categorised, indexed, and cross-referenced in order to facilitate easy retrieval.

Before data collection is completed, researchers should ensure they have collected enough confirmatory evidence for most of the main study topics, and that the evidence included attempts to investigate major rival hypotheses or explanations. According to Yin, any case study findings are “likely to be more convincing and accurate if [they] are based on several different sources of information” (p. 116), because multiple sources of evidence allow for data triangulation and the development of converging lines of inquiry. In other words, “examining consistency of evidence across different types of data sources is akin to verification” (GAO, 1990, p. 21). Construct validity is also supported as multiple sources of evidence provide multiple measures of the same construct (Yin, 2009). According to GAO (1990) selection of appropriate instances/cases, triangulation, and the search for disproving evidence are the key features of case studies.

Interviews (see Table 3) are guided conversations that are usually one of the most important sources of case study evidence (Yin, 2009). However, “they should only be used to obtain information that cannot be obtained in any other way” (Darke et al., 1998, p. 283). For instance, information about organisational functional areas, reporting structures, and roles and responsibilities can be obtained from a range of internal documents (e.g., policies and procedures), public documents (e.g., annual reports), and websites. Even though the interview conversation has been described as a “pipeline for transmitting knowledge” (Silverman, 1997, p. 113), effective interviewing remains a very difficult undertaking (Fontana & Frey, 1994). Interviews can be *structured, semi-structured, or unstructured*.

Structured interviews involve asking pre-defined questions, with a limited set of response categories. The responses are coded by the interviewer based on an already established coding scheme (Miles & Huberman, 1994), thus being somewhat similar to written surveys.

Semi-structured interviews, or focused interviews (Dane, 2010), can be more flexible and allow the researcher to better understand the perspective of the interviewees (Daymon & Holloway, 2002). In semi-structured interviews, a researcher is able to refocus the questions, or prompt for more information, if something interesting or novel emerges.

Unstructured interviews, on the other hand, do not impose any predefined answer categories (Fontana & Frey, 1994). They utilise open-ended questions, thus allowing for even more flexibility. While such interviews are least efficient, they may generate rich data

and uncover surprising/unexpected evidence (Daymon & Holloway, 2002). The experience of an interviewer with regard to technique and subject matter expertise is a key factor in identifying and maximising the collection of relevant information. It is recommended interviewers mainly use probe questions, which start with “How...?” and cannot be answered with a “yes” or a “no,” in unstructured interviews (Perry, 1998).

Table 3: Interview Process, adapted from (Kasunic, 2010, p. 77)

Orientation	Introductions and exchange of contact details. Description of the study and the interview process. Clarification of any expectations regarding non-attribution, sharing of data, and any other issues.
Information Gathering	The interviewer uses a questionnaire to guide the interview and to record responses.
Closing	The interviewer reviews the key points, any issues, and/or action items, and confirms accuracy with the respondent. The interviewee is invited to provide feedback on the interview process. The interviewer thanks the interviewee and seeks permission for any future contact.

The appropriate number of interviews depends on the size of the unit of analysis (e.g., organisation or department), the phenomenon under investigation, the scope of the study, and the timeframe available (Pan & Tan, 2011). Nevertheless, anything less than 15 interviews per case study organisation is generally not considered sufficient.

Ideally, at least two researchers should participate in each interview, so that one can fully focus on the interview while the other records interviewee responses (Kasunic, 2010). As is the case with any case study researcher, interviewers require relevant subject matter expertise as well as information collection (i.e., interviewing) skills. They also need to have a flexible approach, be objective, and critical.

Some common pitfalls that can threaten an effective interview include: misinterpretation/misunderstanding of questions and answers (perhaps due to personal prejudices or convictions), leading/loading questions and interjecting comments that can bias the response, listening only to what is easy to understand, and making assumptions about what the interviewee may answer based on prior responses (Barker, 1971). Furthermore, it has been observed that posing of *why* questions may create defensiveness on the part of the interviewees, and that *how* questions are usually a better choice (Yin, 2009).

Additionally, as interviewees may be biased, have poor recall, or poor articulation, it is usually necessary to corroborate such data with information from other sources. For instance, Yin argues that interviewing people with different perspectives can be a valuable approach. If possible, views of individuals from all relevant sections of the organisation should be obtained, and the views of more senior officials should not be given greater weight than views of less highly placed persons (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; GAO, 1990). Interviewees themselves may also suggest other persons to interview, or other sources of evidence that may be of interest (Yin, 2009).

Any interview questionnaire used should include topic areas that address important issues; however, interviewers should preferably not read the questions but memorise the first few and refer to the instrument only occasionally (Kasunic, 2010). Interviewers should

use eye contact and a confident manner to set the tone for the interview and help establish rapport with the respondent. When tempted to omit a question because they think they already know the answer, interviewers should confirm their assumptions with the interviewee. Also, when an answer is too brief or vague, the interviewer should try to elicit more detail. This can be done by employing the silent probe (i.e., pause and wait), using overt encouragement (e.g., saying “uh-huh” or “okay”), asking for elaboration, asking for clarification, repetition (verify understanding by paraphrasing interviewee responses), and so on (Kasunic, 2010).

Using recording devices is a matter of personal preference. However, most interview methodologists do not think that mechanised recording is a good idea as recording may make interviewees uncomfortable as well as introduce additional transcription and analysis related complications (Yin, 2009). For instance, in the case where the recording device malfunctions and the interviewers haven’t been taking notes, the whole interview (or series of interviews) may be lost. Additionally, respondents may struggle to say things only in a socially acceptable way (Kasunic, 2010). As complete transcription and analysis of recorded interviews can be expensive and very time consuming, it may be argued that conducting more non-recorded interviews instead could be a more productive approach (Walsham, 2006). Thus, it is recommended interviewers mainly rely on pen and paper (Trochim, 2001). The scribe should record responses as they are being stated as this conveys the idea that they are interested in what the respondent is saying. While the scribe does not have to write down everything, certain key phrases or quotes may need to be recorded verbatim (Kasunic, 2010). However, if the case study is being undertaken as part of a higher education project (honours, masters, or doctoral), full interview transcripts may be expected (Darke et al., 1998). In any case, interviewers should ensure that interviewees understand how the data will be used as well as that statements can be made off-the-record.

In order to bring the interview to closure, the interviewer should review any actions and issues that were identified during the meeting. Upon the completion of the interview, researchers should discuss it as soon as possible in order to compare impressions and identify any potential misunderstandings. The interviewer should also review the interview transcript and annotate it as needed (e.g., abbreviations, incomplete thoughts, etc.) (Kasunic, 2010). Any clarifications should be followed up with the interviewees as soon as possible.

Table 4 details additional recommendations for the interviewer.

Table 4: Do’s and Don’ts for the Interviewer (Kasunic, 2010, p. 83)

Do’s	Focus on the primary objective of the meeting. Ask every question. Manage time so that all questions are covered during the interview. Record responses on the interview form. Do not rely on an audio recording device.
Don’ts	Allow personal stories to take up valuable time. Diverge too far from the questionnaire. Allow your personal interests to become part of the discussion.

In addition to individual interviews, focus group discussions can be used to capture data on the attitudes of small groups of participants to the research problem (Basch, 1987).

The ideal number of participants ranges from eight to 12 (Sim, 1998), and in contrast with individual interviews, the interviewer also needs to facilitate interaction among focus group members. While focus groups are usually more time and cost effective than individual interviews, they may discourage creativity or individual responsibility (e.g., through uneven participation and groupthink).

Any observation data collection instruments should be developed as part of the case study protocol (Yin, 2009). Observations may be targeted at artefacts (e.g., physical audits), or any events/activities of interest (e.g., meetings). Such observational evidence (e.g., photographs) may provide additional information about the study domain or a particular event. For instance, if the case study is about a new technology, observations of the technology in the field setting can be highly valuable. Similar to interviews, having multiple investigators making the same observation may increase the reliability of the resulting evidence. Participant-observation refers to a special kind of observation where the investigator is not purely a passive observer, but an active participant in the events being studied (e.g., when the investigator is a staff member in the organisation being studied) (Yin, 2009). However, participant-observations can be biased as the investigator is not an independent party. Also, such observers may find it difficult to think “outside of the box” and, as such, adopting a novel perspective may be challenging.

Analyse

The analyse stage relies on theoretical propositions and other strategies, considers and employs analytic techniques, explores rival explanations, and displays data (facts) apart from interpretations (Yin, 2009). Qualitative analysis has been described as both the most difficult and the least codified part of the case study process (Eisenhardt, 1989). Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) even suggest avoiding the use of term “qualitative research,” recommending instead to contrast the qualitative approach employed with alternative qualitative approaches (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2012).

As already discussed, qualitative research aims towards analytical generalisation, as opposed to statistical generalisation usually aimed at in quantitative studies. Analytical generalisation involves the extraction of abstract concepts from each unit of analysis (Yin, 2013). These abstract concepts should link to the theoretical foundations and be potentially applicable to other cases. It is important to note that even purely quantitative studies presuppose some qualitative knowledge; otherwise, the numbers would be meaningless (Meredith, 1998). Where statistical generalisation aims to make an inference about a population on the basis of empirical data collected from a sample, analytical generalisation uses previously developed theory with which empirical case study results are compared. As such, analytical generalisation is made to theory and not to population; the theory can be further strengthened by performing cross-case comparisons (Yin, 1981, 2009).

Case studies that use both within and cross-case analysis have been found to be more effective at generating theoretical frameworks and formal propositions than studies only employing within case or only cross-case analysis (Barratt et al., 2011). Analysing case study data in parallel with data collection activities allows the researchers to make quick adjustments to study design as required (GAO, 1990). However, failing to explore rival explanations, inconsistently applying analytic techniques, only using a subset of data, and inadequately relating findings across cases can lead to unjustified conclusions.

In the context of case studies, “data analysis consists of examining, categorising, tabulating, testing, or otherwise recombining evidence to draw empirically based conclusions” (Yin, 2009, p. 126). This process should be guided by prior theory (Perry, 1998). In other words, idiographic details should be related to general theoretical concepts (Klein & Myers, 1999). Nevertheless, researchers should remain open to revising their theoretical preconceptions based on actual findings.

The *constant comparative method* (CCM) and theoretical sampling form the core of qualitative analysis (Boeije, 2002). CCM, which was developed for the creation of theories that are grounded in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), works inductively to “discover the latent pattern in the multiple participant's words” (Glaser, 2002, p. 2). Possible differences in interpretation among the case study participants should be identified and highlighted (Klein & Myers, 1999). Comparison, the main tool in qualitative analysis, is used to identify constructs, group them into themes, find negative evidence, and so on (Tesch, 1990). As such, the key objective of qualitative analysis is to identify conceptual similarities/differences and to discover types, classes, sequences, processes, patterns or wholes (Jorgensen, 1989). Any inductively developed theories should aim to address a number of criteria for “good theory development” as much as possible, including: uniqueness, conservatism, generalisability, fecundity, parsimony, internal consistency, empirical riskiness, and abstraction (Wacker, 1998).

Hermeneutic interpretations may be derived by iteratively changing focus between the whole and its parts (Darke et al., 1998; Klein & Myers, 1999). Such interpretations are rooted in *semiotics*, a field of study that deals with the relationships between representations, intended meanings, and interpretations of signs and symbols (Baškarada & Koronios, 2013). Modern semiotics, which studies the construction of meanings with respect to communication as well as to the construction and maintenance of reality (Beynon-Davies, 2009; Chandler, 2007), is based on the supposition that the whole of human experience is an interpretive activity mediated and sustained by signs (Deely, 1990). As such, social activities are seen as being underpinned by sign-systems (organised collections of signs); e.g. spoken and body language (Beynon-Davies, 2007).

Computer-based tools may aid with the coding and categorising of large amounts of narrative text that may have been collected through interviews or obtained as documentary evidence (Yin, 2009). An important point to make is that these tools can only assist an investigator with data analysis, and that much of their functionality is not automated, but analyst-driven, and does not negate the need for subject matter expertise (Walsham, 2006). This is especially the case with the qualitative (as opposed to quantitative) data analysis tools. Any meaningful patterns and categories in qualitative data as well as any explanatory/descriptive theories need to be identified and interpreted by the analyst. With that in mind, “nearly all scholars express strong caveats about any use of computer-assisted tools” (Yin, 2009, p. 129).

According to Yin, the most important strategy is to follow the theoretical propositions or hypotheses that led to the case study. In other words, such propositions can help the analyst plan and focus on the most relevant data, organise the entire case study, and define alternative explanations. In the absence of any propositions/hypotheses, an alternative is to develop a descriptive framework (e.g., a draft table of contents) for organising the case study, while not pre-empting outcomes before the data has been fully

analysed. Such a framework can help the analyst with organising the data as well as with developing a story line (Yin, 2009).

As researchers usually start the case study with some preconceived ideas, as already noted, in order to minimise any potential bias it is important to identify and test any rival explanations. In other words, researchers should try to anticipate potential counter arguments critical readers of the case study report may have. The process of identifying any such rival views may involve presenting preliminary analyses/findings to critical stakeholders and incorporating any feedback in the ongoing analysis. Rival views, which can often be identified via validity and reliability threats, may include the null hypothesis (the effect is the result of chance), direct rival (other interventions that account for the effect), commingled rival (other interventions contributed to the effect), rival theory (another theory explains the effect better), and so on (Yin, 2009).

In addition to the general strategies described above, any of the following techniques can also be used to analyse the case study evidence: *pattern matching*, *explanation building*, *time-series analysis*, *logic models*, and *cross-case analysis* (Yin, 2009).

Pattern matching is one of the most desirable techniques as it involves the comparison of predicted patterns and/or effects with the ones that have been empirically observed, and the identification of any variances or gaps (GAO, 1990). Detailed records of such predictions and relevant results are essential. Of course, the greater the difference in rival patterns/effects, the easier it is to perform the matching, and the more convincing any resulting findings/conclusions will be. Additionally, confirmations of counterintuitive predictions will be more convincing than confirmations of commonsensical predictions (Campbell, 1975).

Explanation building is a special type of pattern matching which aims to analyse the case study data by building an explanation about the case (Yin, 2009). In this context, explaining refers to the process of building a set of causal links about *how* or *why* something happened (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The process is usually iterative and involves making initial predictions, and comparing them against the case study evidence. Then, based on any variances, the initial predictions are revised and compared against additional evidence and/or cases. This process is repeated until a satisfactory match is obtained. According to Yin, compared to surveys, “the ability to trace changes over time is a major strength of case studies” (p. 145).

Time-series analysis, which can also be considered a type of pattern matching, involves temporal patterns, and may involve statistical analysis techniques (e.g., regression analysis). Chronological analysis of events may involve any of the following rules: event X must always occur before event Y, event X must always be followed by event Y on a contingency basis, event X can only follow event Y after a prescribed interval of time, and certain time periods in a case study may be marked by classes of events that differ substantially from those of other time periods (Yin, 2009).

Logic models are a cross between pattern matching and time-series analysis, where a predicted cause-effect chain of events is compared with the empirically observed evidence. Such logic models, which may be represented as *influence diagrams* (*causal maps*), can be used to causally model competing explanations.

Cross-case analysis/synthesis applies to multiple cases and can involve any of the techniques described above.

According to GAO (1990), the concept *observe, think, test, and revise* (OTTR) is central to case study data collection and analysis. It suggests that during and after *observations*, the researchers *think* about the meanings of information collected in terms of what it may imply. This *thinking* leads to ideas about new types of information required in order to confirm existing interpretations, or rule out alternative explanations (this is equivalent to theoretical sampling). During the *test* phase the researchers collect additional information which, when examined, may lead to *revisions* of initial interpretations. Such *revisions* may in turn lead to another *test* phase. This process can be stopped when a plausible explanation has been developed, there are no outlier or unexplained data, no further interpretations are possible, or it is obvious that any additional data will not lead to new information/insights (GAO, 1990). Thus, according to GAO “in case study methods, causality is established through the internal consistency and plausibility of explanation, derived additively through the OTTR sequence” (p. 70).

As previously discussed, coding is a key step in qualitative data analysis. During qualitative analysis, the data is broken up into manageable pieces, which the researcher/analyst then reconstructs to reflect back a view of reality (Beekhuyzen, Nielsen, & von Hellens, 2010). The initial step usually involves reading the interview transcripts, observational notes, and/or any other relevant documents, which may lead to the development of preliminary notes or memos that can then be used to formulate initial categories, themes and relationships. Memos are research notes that may contain interpretations of patterns found in the data, or general comments on issues revealed during the analysis, which can be coded in a similar way to interview transcripts. Coding is an iterative and incremental process that may be performed at differing levels of abstraction. *Descriptive coding* pertains to the broad topics that the researcher may wish to develop prior to conducting interviews and observations (Morse & Richards, 2002). *Topic coding* pertains to issues that generally only become apparent during data analysis, (Beekhuyzen et al., 2010). *Analytical coding* involves arranging the coded data into a more abstract framework with categories that are generally more abstract than words in interview transcripts.

Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2011) discuss several additional qualitative data analysis techniques. *Key Word In Context (KWIC) analysis* may be used to identify how words are used in context with other words (e.g., Google search). *Word count analysis* assumes that more frequently used words may be more important. Such quantitative analysis of qualitative data is difficult to classify; some consider it qualitative, others quantitative (Gephart, 2004). *Classical content analysis*, which is similar to constant comparison analysis, counts themes or codes, and can help identify the most common concepts. *Domain analysis* (a domain is a category of categories) involves identification of cover terms (i.e., domains), included terms, and semantic relationships—for example, strict inclusion (X is a kind of Y), spatial (X is a place in Y or X is a part of Y), cause-effect (X is a result of Y or X is a cause of Y), rationale (X is a reason for doing Y), location for action (X is a place for doing Y), function (X is used for Y), means-end (X is a way to do Y), sequence (X is a step or stage in Y), and attribution (X is an attribute or characteristic of Y) (Spradley, 1979). Case studies can be particularly useful in elucidating causal mechanisms; i.e., the intermediate causes lying between X and Y (Gerring, 2004). *Taxonomic analysis*, which may follow domain analysis, adds another level of complexity by assuming that words can have different meanings and distinct connotations for different people. *Componential*

analysis may also follow domain analysis in order to investigate if certain domains were used in different data sets.

Share

The share stage focuses on defining the audience, composing textual and visual materials, displaying enough evidence for a reader to reach his/her own conclusions, and reviewing and re-writing until done well (Yin, 2009). GAO (1990) provides a detailed checklist for reviewing case study reports, and argues that presenting actual cases may persuade potential readers by providing an assurance of authenticity. Similarly, Klein and Myers (1999) discuss seven principles for evaluating interpretive field studies.

Common case study drawbacks include potential overgeneralisation, inadequate interpretation, unintegrated narrative, results not adequately related to research questions, and not enough evidence (i.e., raw data) being presented. To counter some of these concerns, authors are encouraged to report all potentially relevant facts and hypotheses (Gerring, 2004). In other words, authors are encouraged to over- rather than under-report. Direct quotations from key informants should be used to support the main points (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). In order to contextualise the findings and demonstrate novel contribution, the findings should be related back to the literature (Dooley, 2002; Eisenhardt, 1989) as well as to the social and historical background of the research setting (Klein & Myers, 1999).

A critical step involves defining/identifying the audience for the case study report (e.g., industry, academia, or government). As different audiences have different needs, “no single report will serve all audiences simultaneously” (Yin, 2009, p. 167). For instance, while some audiences may prefer the analytic/academic writing style, others may prefer reflective reporting that incorporates a range of literarily devices (Dooley, 2002). Successful communication with more than one audience may require multiple versions of the case study report. Examining previous reports that were well-received by the intended audience can provide the author with useful ideas about the expected structure, type of content, report length, etc. (Yin, 2009). In any case, the report should clearly articulate how the intended audience may be able to use the findings (Walsham, 2006).

The importance of presenting the case study as an interesting and convincing story should not be underestimated (Darke et al., 1998). However, conceptual frameworks, matrices and network displays should be used when appropriate, since long narrative sections can make the identification and comparison of variables of interest difficult (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013). The inability to simplify from descriptive information into patterns and abstract concepts is a common analysis-related weakness frequently found in case-based research papers (Stuart et al., 2002).

Academic case studies are expected to be published in peer-reviewed literature (Gephart, 2004). Generally, they should comprise an introduction section that contextualises/justifies the study and identifies the research questions, a literature review section that links the research questions to a gap in the literature, a methodology section that justifies the use of the case study method, an analysis section that logically/analytically links data to findings, a discussion section that discusses implications, and a conclusion

section that recapitulates the main points and discusses limitations and future research (Pan & Tan, 2011; Perry, 1998; Walsham, 2006).

The authors should not assume that the readers (or reviewers) are experienced with, or accepting of, case-based research (Stuart et al., 2002). As such, brief relevant justifications should initially be provided in the introduction, and later elaborated on in the methodology section. When reporting on multi-case studies, it is recommended to structure the analysis section around the theory, and support each part of the theory with evidence from at least some of the cases (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). In any case, it is important that the theory (the conceptual argument) is convincing and plausible, even without explicit evidentiary support (Siggelkow, 2007). The persuasiveness of the theory can be strengthened by discussing any alternative explanations in detail. Acceptance and eventual publication of peer-reviewed academic papers is contingent upon being able to effectively respond to reviewers' criticisms (Stuart et al., 2002). It is worth noting that some journals are more receptive to case-based research than others.

Another important point is to start writing as early as possible. For instance, it should be possible to draft certain sections of the report (e.g., background and methodology) before data collection and analysis have been completed (Yin, 2009). Most importantly, the draft report should be reviewed by peers with relevant subject matter expertise as well as by the case study participants. The review by the case study participants provides the investigator with an opportunity to corroborate key facts as the participants may disagree with the findings and recommendations. It may even be worth considering including such review responses in the final report, perhaps as an appendix.

Conclusion


Qualitative case study has been rapidly gaining acceptance as a valid and valuable research method in a large number of diverse scientific domains. However, while it has often been viewed as a soft (easy and not particularly rigorous) research method, it is actually remarkably difficult to execute well in practice. As a result, having a set of clear and succinct guidelines that can be referenced and followed in practice is imperative.

This paper adopted Yin's (2009) six-stage case study process and integrated additional relevant guidelines from the wider methodological literature. Based on the arguments presented in previous sections, we now propose modifications to the dependencies between some of the stages in the process (see

Figure 2). Original dependencies are represented in blue, suggested additions in red, and suggested deletions in gray.

Figure 2: The Case Study Process, adapted from (Yin, 2009, p. 1)

[This is a reprise of Figure 1]



Since the prepare stage aims to identify any issues in the case study design, the red arrow back to the design stage provides an opportunity to update the design based on any issues identified during preparation.

Even though preparation includes considerations of the potential audience and the report structure, this point is not unique to preparation, but applies to all other stages as well. Thus, the link between the prepare stage and the share stages is deemphasised (coloured in gray).

While any design modifications requiring changes to data collection should first be recorded in the case study protocol (hence, the original blue arrow from design to prepare), any design-related changes to the theoretical framework (e.g. propositions) may directly impact data analysis stage (hence, the new red arrow from design to analyse).

Finally, reviews of draft findings by peers and case study participants may uncover issues with the original study design. This may necessitate additional data collection/analysis, and/or identify additional theoretical questions to be addresses in future related studies. Thus, we propose a new red arrow from share back to design.

References

- Allison, G. T., & Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Aneshensel, C. S. (2012). *Theory-based data analysis for the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barker, L. (1971). *Listening behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barratt, M., Choi, T. Y., & Li, M. (2011). Qualitative case studies in operations management: Trends, research outcomes, and future research implications. *Journal of Operations Management*, 29(4), 329-342.
- Basch, C. E. (1987). Focus group interview: An underutilized research technique for improving theory and practice in health education. *Health Education & Behavior*, 14(4), 411-448. doi: 10.1177/109019818701400404
- Başkarada, S. (2010). *Information quality management capability maturity model*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Vieweg+Teubner.
- Başkarada, S. (2011). How spreadsheet applications affect information quality. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 51(3), 77-84.
- Başkarada, S., & Koronios, A. (2011). Exploring the effects of enterprise instant messaging presence information on employee attendance in a distributed workforce: An

- ethnographic study of a large professional services organization. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 8(3), 1-18.
- Baškarada, S., & Koronios, A. (2013). Data, information, knowledge, wisdom (DIKW): A semiotic theoretical and empirical exploration of the hierarchy and its quality dimension. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 18(1), 5-24.
- Baškarada, S., Koronios, A., & Gao, J. (2007). Assuring enterprise-wide information quality management capability maturity. In W. Abramowicz & H. Mayr (Eds.), *Technologies for business information systems* (pp. 353-365). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Baškarada, S., McKay, T., & McKenna, T. (2013). Technology deployment process model. *Operations Management Research*, 6(3-4), 105-118.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved from www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf
- Beekhuizen, J., Nielsen, S., & von Hellens, L. (2010). *The Nvivo looking glass: Seeing the data through the analysis*. Paper presented at the 5th Conference on Qualitative Research in IT, Brisbane, Australia.
- Beynon-Davies, P. (2007). Informatics and the Inca. *International Journal of Information Management*, 27(5), 306-318. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2007.05.003
- Beynon-Davies, P. (2009). Neolithic informatics: The nature of information. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29(1), 3-14. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2008.11.001
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality & Quantity*, 36, 391-409.
- Campbell, D. T. (1975). "Degrees of freedom" and the case study. *Comparative Political Studies*, 8(2), 178-193.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The basics* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Dane, F. C. (2010). *Evaluating research: Methodology for people who need to read research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darke, P., Shanks, G., & Broadbent, M. (1998). Successfully completing case study research: Combining rigour, relevance and pragmatism. *Information Systems Journal*, 8(4), 273-289.
- Daymon, C., & Holloway, I. (2002). *Qualitative research methods in public relations and marketing communications*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Deely, J. (1990). *Basics of semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dooley, L. M. (2002). Case study research and theory building. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3), 335-354.
- Dubé, L., & Paré, G. (2003). Rigor in information systems positivist case research: Current practices, trends, and recommendations. *MIS Quarterly*, 597-636.
- Easton, G. (2010). Critical realism in case study research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(1), 118-128.

- Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2012). *An applied reference guide to research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.
- Flynn, B. B., Sakakibara, S., Schroeder, R. G., Bates, K. A., & Flynn, E. J. (1990). Empirical research methods in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 9(2), 250-284.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- General Accounting Office (GAO). (1990). *Case study evaluations*. Washington, DC.
- Gephart, R. P. (2004). Qualitative research and the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 454-462.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341-354.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, UK Polity.
- Glaser, B. G. (2002). Constructivist grounded theory? *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(3).
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. London, UK: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Halkier, B. (2011). Methodological practicalities in analytical generalization. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(9), 787-797.
- Hyde, K. (2000). Recognising deductive processes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(2), 82-89.
- Jackson, S. L. (2008). *Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kasunic, M. (2010). *Measurement and analysis infrastructure diagnostic, version 1.0: Method definition document*. Retrieved from www.sei.cmu.edu/reports/10tr035.pdf
- Klein, H. K., & Myers, M. D. (1999). A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(1), 67-94.
- Lee, A. S. (1989). A scientific methodology for MIS case studies. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(1), 33-50.
- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2011). Beyond constant comparison qualitative data analysis: Using NVivo. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 26(1), 70-84.
- Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 319-340.
- Loseke, D. R. (2012). *Methodological thinking: Basic principles of social research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- March, J. G., Sproull, L. S., & Tamuz, M. (1991). Learning from samples of one or fewer. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 1-13. doi: 10.1287/orsc.2.1.1
- McCutcheon, D. M., & Meredith, J. R. (1993). Conducting case study research in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 11(3), 239-256.
- Meredith, J. (1998). Building operations management theory through case and field research. *Journal of Operations Management*, 16(4), 441-454.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, 18(4), 560-568.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J., & Richards, L. (2002). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. London, UK: Sage.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. (2012). Qualitative analysis techniques for the review of the literature. *Qualitative Report*, 17(56), 1-28. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/onwuegbuzie.pdf>
- Pan, S. L., & Tan, B. (2011). Demystifying case research: A structured–pragmatic–situational (SPS) approach to conducting case studies. *Information and Organization*, 21(3), 161-176.
- Perry, C. (1998). Process of a case study methodology for postgraduate research in marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(9/10), 785-802.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Riggan, M. (2011). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual frameworks guide research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sarker, S., & Lee, A. S. (1998). *Using a positivist case research methodology to test a theory about IT-enabled business process redesign*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Information Systems, Helsinki, Finland.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 20-24.
- Silverman, D. (1997). *Qualitative research: Theory, method, practice*. New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Sim, J. (1998). Collecting and analysing qualitative data: Issues raised by the focus group. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28(2), 345-352.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 5-8.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-286). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Stuart, I., McCutcheon, D., Handfield, R., McLachlin, R., & Samson, D. (2002). Effective case research in operations management: a process perspective. *Journal of Operations Management*, 20(5), 419-433.
- Sykes, W. (1990). Validity and reliability in qualitative market research: A review of the literature. *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 32(3), 289-328.
- Tellis, W. (1997a). Application of a case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(3), 1-17. Retrieved from www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html
- Tellis, W. (1997b). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2). Retrieved from www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/tellis1.html
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research analysis types and software*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Trochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The research methods knowledge base* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.
- Wacker, J. G. (1998). A definition of theory: Research guidelines for different theory-building research methods in operations management. *Journal of Operations Management*, 16(4), 361-385.
- Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive case studies in IS research: Nature and method. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 4(2), 74-81.
- Walsham, G. (2006). Doing interpretive research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3), 320-330.
- Wang, R. Y., & Strong, D. (1996). Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 12(4), 5-34.
- Yin, R. K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 58-65.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4 ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*, 19(3), 321-332.
- Yukl, G. (2009). Leading organizational learning: Reflections on theory and research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(1), 49-53.

Author Note

Dr. Saša Baškarada is a Social Scientist at the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO), and an Adjunct Research Fellow in the School of Information Technology and Mathematical Sciences at the University of South Australia. He is an experienced researcher and information systems professional who has published widely on a range of topics. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed to Dr. Saša Baškarada, Email: sasa.baskarada@dsto.defence.gov.au

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank *The Qualitative Report* Co-Editor, Dan Wulff, for his invaluable assistance with manuscript preparation.

Copyright 2014: Saša Baškarada and Nova Southeastern University

Article Citation

Baškarada, S. (2014). Qualitative case studies guidelines. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(How
To Article 24), 1-25. Retrieved from
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/baskarada24.pdf>
