**CASET - Evaluation Template for Case Study Articles – Extended version**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author(s)** |  | | **Article title** |  | | **Journal** |  | | **Year of publication** |  |
|  | | |  | |  | | | | |  |
| **Number of cases**  Note the number of cases studied in the article  The number of cases follows the definition of case used in the article, so where “embedded cases” are being used, for instance several projects within the same company, the number of cases studied should be apparent from the cross-case analysis. | |  | **Number of data sources**  Note how many sources of data were collected, disregarding the quality of data that were collected.  The number of different data sources is based on the following five sources: | | | | | | |  |
| 1. interviews (face to face, including unstructured/semi-structured/structured interviews and informal conversations) 2. surveys 3. observations (including site visits, workshops, ethnography, data feedback sessions) | | | | | 1. internal documents 2. secondary data | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Evaluation criteria** | **Evaluation question** | **Explanation of Criterion** | **Anchoring Statements** | **Score (0/1)** |
|  | *Theoretical foundation* | Was a clear explanation given of why the case method was the most appropriate method to adopt? | This criterion does not judge the quality of the justification, only its existence. However, to exist, the justification must be explicit. The author(s) must explicitly state that the case method is appropriate and justify why.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, the justification for conducting case study research thus needs to be explicitly mentioned. For example, if the argument of “the study being exploratory” is used as the justification, there needs to be a clear explanation of the gaps in the literature to validate the “exploratory” claim. | 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. |  |
|  | *Pilot study* | Was there a pilot study proceeding the main study? | This criterion does not judge the quality of the pilot study, only its existence. The author(s) must explicitly state that a pilot study was conducted to test and refine data collection instruments.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, there needs to be an explicit mention of the existence of the pilot study and of its general characteristics (e.g., participants in the pilot study, steps being followed, how the results of the pilot study were leveraged to revise instruments later used in the main study). | 0 = “No”: there was no pilot study.  1 = “Yes”: a pilot study was conducted before the main study. |  |
|  | *Theoretical sampling* | Was an explanation provided of which case(s) were chosen and why? | This criterion does not judge the quality of the explanation of choice of cases; it is only concerned with the existence of a theoretical explanation for the choice of cases.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, there needs to be an explicit explanation for the rationale for choosing cases. The rationale also needs to be connected to theory. So clearly articulated convenience sampling is not coded as “yes”. | 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. |  |

**Research Design**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Triangulation* | Was the research based on multiple sources of data? | This criterion does not judge the quality of data triangulation. The assumption is that research that uses more than one source data, has the opportunity to use these multiple sources of data to triangulate their findings. | 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 |  |
|  | *Review and validation of data* | Were case study evidence reviewed and validated by external parties? | This criterion does not judge the quality of how the review and validation was done nor how well the review and validation is explained. The criterion is concerned with whether or not review and validation was done.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, the article needs to explicitly state that external parties, such as interviewees or, external experts or fellow researchers, have reviewed and validated the case study evidence. | 0 = “No”: the data were not reviewed and validated. The article did not explicitly state if the data is reviewed and validated.  1 = “Yes”: the data were 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. |  |
| **Data Collection** | *Transparency of data collection* | Was it made clear how the data collection process was conducted? | This criterion evaluates whether it would be possible to replicate the data collection, given the information presented in the article. The information needed to replicate data collection could be presented in the text or in separate exhibits.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, there needs to be explicit information on what the case data are about (in terms of the areas, constructs, themes, and topics they cover) and how they were collected. | 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. |  |
|  | *Inter-coder agreement* | Were the data coded by multiple investigators? | To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, there needs to be an explanation of how the multiple coding was done and how inter-coder agreement was achieved. It is not necessary to have all the details explained, but the overall logic and process of how the multiple coders worked needs to be described.  Thus, it is not enough to only mention that the data were coded by multiple researchers, without adding more details. | 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. |  |
| **Data Analysis** | *Case presentation* | Were findings and empirical evidence presented in a way that made it clear how the author(s) reach their conclusions? | This criterion concerns whether or not it is possible for the reader to follow the logic of how the case data led the author(s) to their conclusions (the “trail of evidence”). It is a question of whether or not the reader can follow the learning process that led to the conclusions.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, the article needs to provide a clear trail of evidence, that links the data, the interpretation of the data and the conclusions drawn. A common way of achieving this is through the use of visual aids such as tables and figures to illustrate how the authors moved from the raw data, through analysis to conclusions. However, other creative ways may also be used.  Articles where the answer to the evaluation question is “no”, tend to only describe the case and/or the interpretation of the case, without giving the reader any chance of seeing how data are related to the presented case analysis. Only presenting the data in the form of selected quotes that supports the author(s) “story” is not enough. | 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). |  |
|  | *Case interpretation* | Did the case analysis move beyond description and conceptual ordering? | To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, it is necessary for the article to move beyond description and conceptual ordering. The data needs to be interpreted, concepts developed and/or populated with meaning and relationships between (at least some) of the concepts explained.  There are several ways of demonstrating theorizing. It is possible to theorize without creating models and/or frameworks; thus using text only to describe concepts and the relationships between them. However, part of theorizing is being parsimonious. Thus, it is not enough to describe the case study data using new “conceptual” labels, using more or less the same level of abstraction as with the original data. The task of abstraction is an important of this criterion. | 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** | *Reflecting on validity and reliability* | Was there a discussion about the quality of the research? | This criterion concerns whether or not the author(s) are explicitly reflecting on the quality of their research.  To answer “yes” on the evaluation question, there needs to be an explicit discussion on one or more dimensions of validity and reliability. It is the existence of a discussion that is important, not the quality, comprehensiveness or strength of the discussion. The key thing is to show an awareness of the need to ensure research quality.  As this criterion concerns the reflection on research quality, the different practices employed to increase the research quality are not part of the evaluation here. These practices are instead captured by other criteria in the evaluation template. | 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 discussing the research design 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)** | | | |  |