

Table 2. CASET Evaluation Template for Scoring Case Study Articles (Rating Quality on a 0–10 Scale)

CASET - Evaluation Template for Case Study Articles

Author(s) Article title Journal Year of publication

Number of cases studied in the article Number of data sources

Note how many sources of data were collected, based on the following five sources:

- i. interviews (face to face, including unstructured/semi-structure/structured interviews and informal conversations)
- ii. surveys
- iii. observations (including site visits, workshops, ethnography, data feedback sessions)
- iv. internal documents
- v. secondary data

	Evaluation criteria	Explanation of measure	Anchoring Statements	Score (0/1)
Research Design	<i>Theoretical foundation</i>	Was a clear explanation given of why the case method was the most appropriate method to adopt?	0 = "No": no explicit argument was given for why the case method was adopted in the research. 1 = "Yes": there was an explicit argument for why the case method was adopted in the research.	
	<i>Pilot study</i>	Was there a pilot study preceding the main study?	0 = "No": there was no pilot study. 1 = "Yes": a pilot study was conducted before the main study.	
	<i>Theoretical sampling</i>	Was an explanation provided of which case(s) were chosen and why?	0 = "No": no explicit argument was given about how the case(s) was / were selected. 1 = "Yes": case(s) were selected for theoretical purposes, example ranges from a discussion on why case(s) were chosen to a discussion on the selection of polar extremes where cases exhibited extremely high or extremely low value on the constructs of interest.	
Data Collection	<i>Triangulation</i>	Was the research based on multiple sources of data?	0 = "No": the research was based on only one source of data 1 = "Yes": the research was based on more than one source of data	
	<i>Review and validation of evidence</i>	Was the evidence reviewed and validated by external parties?	0 = "No": the evidence was not reviewed and validated. The article did not explicitly state if the evidence is reviewed and validated. 1 = "Yes": the evidence was reviewed and validated by the interviewee and/or the company (e.g. through data feedback-sessions); or by fellow researchers not part of the primary data collection.	
	<i>Transparency of data collection</i>	Was it made clear how the data collection process was conducted?	0 = "No": the data collection process was not clear and transparent because there was not sufficient information about the origin and the contents of the data collected (in terms of areas, topics, themes or constructs), which would allow replication. 1 = "Yes": the data collection process was clear and transparent because interview themes, questions and/or research instruments such as research protocols specifying data collection circumstances were reported, which would allow replication.	
Data Analysis	<i>Inter-coder agreement</i>	Were the data coded by multiple investigators?	0 = "No": the data were not coded by multiple investigators working independently, or there was no information about how inter-coder agreement was achieved. 1 = "Yes": the data were coded by multiple investigators working independently, and there was an explanation about how an acceptable inter-coder agreement was achieved.	
	<i>Case presentation</i>	Were findings and empirical evidence presented in a way that made it clear how the author(s) reach their conclusions?	0 = "No" - The way in which the author(s) reached their conclusions based on the case data was neither clear nor documented. Their focus was on "telling the story" and not "showing the evidence", and any quotes used were selected to support the authors' conclusions. 1 = "Yes" - The article was explicit and clear in demonstrating how the empirical data were used to arrive at the conclusions, providing a clear "trail of evidence" (through the use of approaches such as tables, data displays, coding schemes and other visual aids).	
	<i>Case interpretation</i>	Did the case analysis move beyond description and conceptual ordering?	0 = "No" - The results from the case analysis were mostly descriptive and/or simply consisted of condensing data into patterns and concepts. 1 = "Yes" - The interpretation moved beyond description and conceptual ordering, to the generation of meaning and of the conceptual significance of the case facts. This was achieved by, for example, developing a conceptual framework or model from the case(s), formulating propositions to be tested by future research, and/or systematically discussing results in relation to existing literature.	
Post-hoc	<i>Reflecting on validity and reliability</i>	Was there a discussion about the quality of the research?	0 = "No": there was no explicit discussion about the quality of the research. 1 = "Yes": there was an explicit discussion reflecting on the quality of the research (either in the section on research design stage or in the consideration of limitations), which covered one or more dimensions of validity and reliability, showing that authors were aware of the need to ensure rigor.	
Overall quality score (out of 10)				