GETTING STARTED

How to Know Whether and When to Use the Case Study as a Research Method

BEING READY FOR THE CHALLENGE, AND SETTING HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Doing case study research remains one of the most challenging of all social science endeavors. This book will help you—whether an experienced or emerging social scientist—to deal with the challenge. Your goal is to design good case studies and to collect, present, and analyze data fairly. A further goal is to bring your case study to closure by composing a compelling article, report, book, or oral presentation.

Do not underestimate the extent of the challenge. Although you may be ready to design and do case study research, others may espouse and advocate other modes of social science inquiry. Similarly, prevailing federal or other research funds may favor methods other than case studies. As a result, you may need to have ready responses to some inevitable questions and set high expectations for yourself.

Following a clear methodological path. First and foremost, you should explain how you are devoting yourself to following a clear methodological path. For instance, a conventional starting place would be to review literature and define your case study’s research questions. Alternatively, however, you might want to start with some fieldwork first, prior to defining any theoretical concerns or even examining the relevant research literature. In this latter mode, you might be entertaining a contrary perspective: that
what might be “relevant,” as well as the pertinent research questions, may not be determinable ahead of knowing something about what’s going on in the field. Regardless of your starting place, the path should explicitly show how you will adhere to formal and explicit procedures when doing your research.

Along these lines, this book offers much guidance. It shows how case study research is distinctive but also covers procedures central to all modes of social science research. In shaping your case study, you might like to know whether to design and conduct a single- or a multiple-case study to investigate a research issue. You may only be doing a case study or you may be using it as part of a larger mixed-methods study. Whatever the choices, this book covers the entire range of issues in designing and doing case study research, including how to start and design a case study, collect case study evidence, analyze case study data, and compose a case study report.

Equally important, the book will help you deal with some of the more difficult questions still frequently neglected by available research texts. So often, for instance, the author has been confronted by a student or colleague who has asked (a) how to define the “case” being studied, (b) how to determine the relevant data to be collected, or (c) what to do with the data, once collected. This book addresses these and many other questions. The successful experiences of scholars and students from using this book, for more than 30 years, may attest to the potential payoffs.

Acknowledging strengths and limitations. Second, you should understand and openly acknowledge the strengths and limitations of case study research. Such research, like any other, complements the strengths and limitations of other types of research.

Just as different types of research inquiries prevail in the physical sciences, different types of inquiries serve different needs when investigating social science topics. Note that the physical sciences do not follow a single method, such as the experimental method. Astronomy is a science but does not rely on the experimental method; nor
do engineering and geology (Scriven, 2015). Similarly, many studies in neurophysiology and neuroanatomy do not rely on statistical methods. A diverse array of methods also marks the social sciences, and the next section of this chapter will contrast these methods to help you understand the methodological choices and differences.

Setting high expectations in your chosen field. Case study research is commonly found in many social science disciplines as well as the practicing professions (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, social work, business, education, nursing, and community planning). As one result, your high expectations should not only follow a clear methodological path as just discussed, but also can cater to your own field.

Figure 1.1 lists 15 such fields, along with illustrative works that focus on the use of case study research in each specific field. (Not cited are either of two other kinds of works: general methodological texts that discuss various types of research methods, even if including case study research, and general texts on case study research that are not directed at any specific field.) Checking the work(s) in your chosen field may point to some subtle ways of customizing your case study in relation to that field. For instance, Appendix A describes the case study’s lengthy but peculiar history in one of the disciplines—psychology.

Whatever the field of interest, the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena. Case studies allow you to focus in-depth on a “case” and to retain a holistic and real-world perspective—such as in studying individual life cycles, small group behavior, organizational and managerial processes, neighborhood change, school performance, international relations, and the maturation of industries.

COMPARING CASE STUDIES WITH OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH METHODS

When and why would you want to use a case study to examine some social science topic? Should you consider doing an experiment instead? A survey? A history? An analysis of archival records, such as the statistical modeling of epidemiological trends or of student performance in schools?

These and other choices represent different research methods. Each is a different way of collecting and analyzing empirical evidence. Each follows its own logic and procedures. And each method has its own advantages and disadvantages. To get the most out of doing case study research, you may need to appreciate these distinctions.
FIGURE 1.1 ● Sampler of Works Devoted to Case Study Research in Specific Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Illustrative Work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology and Ethnography</td>
<td>Burawoy, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>George &amp; Bennett, 2005; Gerring, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>Duff, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Bromley, 1986; Campbell, 1975; McLeod, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Feagin, Orum, &amp; Sjoberg, 1991; Hamel, 1992; Mitchell,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983; Platt, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICING PROFESSIONS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Bruns, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and International Business</td>
<td>Dul &amp; Hak, 2008; Farquhar, 2012; Gibbert, Ruigrok, &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wicki, 2008; Johnston, Leach, &amp; Liu, 2000; Meyer, 2001;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piekkaari, Welch, &amp; Paavilainen, 2009; Vissak, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Hamilton &amp; Corbett-Whittier, 2013; Yin, 2006a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>Carolan, Forbat, &amp; Smith, 2015; Walshe, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Beverland &amp; Lindgreen, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Baxter &amp; Jack, 2008; De Chesnay, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Agranoff &amp; Radin, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Gilgun, 1994; Lee, Mishna, &amp; Brennenstuhl, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td>Runeson, Høst, Rainer, &amp; Regnell, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships Among the Methods: Not Hierarchical

A common misconception is that the various research methods should be arrayed hierarchically. Many social scientists still implicitly believe that case studies are only appropriate for the exploratory phase of an investigation, that surveys and histories are appropriate for the descriptive phase, and that experiments are the only way of pursuing explanatory or causal inquiries. The hierarchical view reinforces the idea
that case study research is only a preliminary mode of inquiry and cannot be used to describe phenomena or test propositions.

However, you need not automatically accept this hierarchical view. You would point to the fact that experiments with an exploratory motive have certainly always existed. In addition, the development of causal explanations has long been a serious concern of historians, especially reflected by the subfield known as historiography.

Likewise, you also would point out that case studies are far from being only an exploratory method. Some of the best and most famous case studies have been explanatory case studies (e.g., see BOX 1 for a vignette on Allison and Zelikow’s *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 1999; additional examples of explanatory case studies are found in Applications 8 and 9 in Chapter 5 of this book). Similarly, famous descriptive case studies are found in major disciplines such as sociology and political science (e.g., see BOX 2 for two vignettes; additional examples of descriptive case studies are found in many of the other BOXES in this book). Thus, distinguishing among the various social science methods and their advantages and disadvantages may require going beyond the hierarchical stereotype.

---

**BOX 1**

**A BEST-SELLING, EXPLANATORY, SINGLE-CASE STUDY**

For more than 40 years, Graham Allison’s (1971) original study of a single case, the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, has been a political science best seller. In this crisis, a U.S.–Soviet Union confrontation could have produced nuclear holocaust and doomed the entire world. The book posits three competing but also complementary theories to explain the crisis—that the United States and Soviets performed as (a) rationale actors, (b) complex bureaucracies, or (c) politically motivated groups of persons. Allison compares the ability of each theory to explain the actual course of events in the crisis: why the Soviet Union placed offensive (and not merely defensive) missiles in Cuba in the first place, why the United States responded to the missile deployment with a blockade (and not an air strike or invasion—the missiles already were in Cuba!), and why the Soviet Union eventually withdrew the missiles.

The case study shows the explanatory and not just descriptive or exploratory functions of single-case studies. Furthermore, the authors contrast the lessons from the case study with prevailing alternative explanations in post–Cold War studies of foreign policy and international politics. In this way, the book, even more thoughtfully presented in its second edition (Allison & Zelikow, 1999), forcefully demonstrates how a single case study can be the basis for insightful generalizations.
2A. A Neighborhood Scene

*Street Corner Society* (1943/1993), by William F. Whyte, has for decades been recommended reading in community sociology. The book is a classic example of a descriptive case study. It traces the sequence of interpersonal events over time, describes a subculture that had rarely been the topic of previous study, and discovers key phenomena—such as the career advancement of lower income youths and their ability (or inability) to break neighborhood ties.

The study has been highly regarded despite its taking place in a small urban neighborhood (under the pseudonym of “Cornerville”) and during a time period now nearly 100 years ago. The value of the book is, paradoxically, its generalizability even to contemporary issues of individual performance, group structure, and the social structure of neighborhoods. Later investigators have repeatedly found remnants of Cornerville in their work, even though they have studied different neighborhoods and different time periods (also see BOX 21, Chapter 4).

2B. A National Crisis

Neustadt and Fineberg’s excellent analysis of a mass immunization campaign was issued originally as a government report in 1978, *The Swine Flu Affair: Decision-Making on a Slippery Disease*, and later published independently as *The Epidemic That Never Was* (1983). The case study describes the immunization of 40 million Americans that took place under President Gerald Ford’s administration, when the United States was faced with a threat of epidemic proportions from a new and potentially lethal influenza strain. Because the case study has become known as an exceptionally well-researched case study, contemporary policy makers have continued to consult it for any generalizable lessons for understanding the quandaries of health crises and public actions in light of new threats by flu epidemics, such as the H1N1 strain of 2008–2010 and by viruses such as the Ebola and Zika outbreaks of 2013 to the present.

The more appropriate view may be an inclusive and pluralistic one: Every research method can be used for all three purposes—exploratory, descriptive, and explanatory studies. There may be exploratory case studies, descriptive case studies, or explanatory case studies. Similarly, there may be exploratory experiments, descriptive experiments, and explanatory experiments.

What distinguishes the different methods is not a hierarchy but the three important conditions discussed next. As an important caution, however, the clarification does not imply that the boundaries between the modes—or the occasions when each is to be used—are always sharp. Even though each mode of inquiry has its distinct characteristics, there are large overlaps among them. The goal is to avoid gross misfits—that is, when you are planning to use one mode of inquiry but another is really more advantageous.
When to Use the Different Methods

The three conditions consist of (a) the form of research question posed, (b) the control a researcher has over actual behavioral events, and (c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to entirely historical events. Figure 1.2 displays these three conditions and shows how each is related to five social science research methods: experiments, surveys, archival analyses (e.g., economic modeling, or a statistical analysis in an epidemiological study), histories, and case studies. The importance of each condition, in distinguishing among the five methods, is as follows.

**FIGURE 1.2 Relevant Situations for Different Research Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>(a) Form of Research Question</th>
<th>(b) Requires Control Over Behavioral Events?</th>
<th>(c) Focuses on Contemporary Events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Analysis</td>
<td>who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>how, why?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: COSMOS Corporation.*

(a) Form of research question (see Figure 1.2, column (a)). The first condition covers your research question(s) (Hedrick, Bickman, & Rog, 1993). A basic categorization scheme for the form of questions is the familiar series: “who,” “what,” “where,” “how,” and “why” questions.
If research questions focus mainly on “what” questions, either of two possibilities arises. First, some types of “what” questions are exploratory, such as “What can be learned from a study of a startup business?” This type of question is a justifiable rationale for conducting an exploratory study, the goal being to develop pertinent hypotheses and propositions for further inquiry. However, as an exploratory study, any of the five research methods can be used—for example, an exploratory survey (testing, for instance, the ability to survey startups in the first place), an exploratory experiment (testing, for instance, the potential benefits of different kinds of business incentives to determine which type of incentive might be worthy of a more definitive experiment), or an exploratory case study (testing, for instance, the differences between “first-time” startups and startups by entrepreneurs who had previously started other firms, as a prelude to selecting the case(s) for a subsequent case study).

The second type of “what” question is actually a form of a “how many,” “how much,” or “to what extent” line of inquiry—for example, “What have been the ways that communities have assimilated new immigrants?” Identifying such ways is more likely to favor survey or archival methods than others. For example, a survey can be readily designed to enumerate the “what,” whereas a case study would not be an advantageous method in this situation.

Similarly, like this second type of “what” question, “who” and “where” questions (or again their derivatives—“how many,” “how much,” and “to what extent”) are likely to favor survey methods or the analysis of archival data, as in economic studies. These methods are advantageous when the research goal is to describe the incidence or prevalence of a phenomenon or when it is to track certain outcomes. The investigation of prevailing political preferences (in which a survey or a poll might be the favored method) or of the spread of a disease like Ebola or Zika (in which an epidemiologic analysis of health statistics might be the favored method) would be typical examples.

In contrast, “how” and “why” questions are more explanatory and likely to lead to the use of a case study, history, or experiment as the preferred research method. This is because such questions deal with the tracing of operational processes over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence. Thus, if you wanted to know how a community successfully avoided the potentially catastrophic impact of the closing of its largest employer—a military base (see Bradshaw, 1999, also presented in Application 8, Chapter 5 of this book)—you would be less likely to rely on a survey or an examination of archival records and might be better off doing a history or a case study. Similarly, if you wanted to know how research investigators may possibly (but unknowingly) bias their research, you could design and conduct a series of experiments (see Rosenthal, 1966).

Let us take two more examples. If you were studying “who” had suffered as a result of terrorist acts and “how much” damage had been done, you might survey residents, examine government records (an archival analysis), or conduct a “windshield survey” of the affected area. In contrast, if you wanted to know “why” the act had occurred, you would have to draw upon a wider array of documentary information, in addition to
conducting interviews, and you would likely be doing a case study. Moreover, if you focused on the “why” question in more than one terrorist act, you would probably be doing a multiple-case study.

Similarly, if you wanted to know “what” the outcomes associated with a new governmental program had been, you could answer this question by doing a survey or by examining economic data, depending on the type of program involved. Questions—such as “How many clients did the program serve?” “What kinds of benefits were received?” “How often were different benefits produced?”—all could be answered without doing a case study. But if you needed to know “how” or “why” the program had worked (or not), you would lean toward a case study or a field experiment.

To summarize, the first and most important condition for differentiating among the five social science research methods is to classify the form of the research question being asked. In general, “what” questions may either be exploratory (in which case, any of the methods could be used) or about prevalence (in which surveys or the analysis of archival records would be favored). “How” and “why” questions are likely to favor using a case study, experiment, or history.

EXERCISE 1.2 DEFINING A CASE STUDY RESEARCH QUESTION

Develop a “how” or “why” question that would be the rationale for a case study that you might conduct. Instead of doing a case study, now imagine that you only could do a history, a survey, or an experiment (but not a case study) to address this question. What would be the distinctive advantage of doing a case study, compared to these other methods, in order to address the question?

Defining your research question(s) is probably the most important step to be taken in a research study, so you should be patient and allow sufficient time for this task. The key is to understand that your research questions have both substance—for example, What is my study about?—and form—for example, am I asking a “who,” “what,” “where,” “how,” or “why” question?

Other scholars have focused on some of the substantively important issues (see Campbell, Daft, & Hulin, 1982). The point of the preceding discussion is that the form of the question can provide an important clue regarding the appropriate research method to be used. Remember, too, that the methods can overlap. Thus, for some questions, a choice among methods might actually exist. Be aware, finally, that you (or your academic department) may be predisposed to favor a particular method regardless of the study question. If so, be sure to create the form of the study question best matching the method you were predisposed to favor in the first place.
(b) Control over behavioral events [see Figure 1.2, column (b)]—and focus on contemporary as opposed to entirely historical events [see Figure 1.2, column (c)]. Assuming that “how” and “why” questions are to be the focus of study, these two remaining conditions help to distinguish further among a history, a research case study, and an experiment.

A history has virtually no such control and deals with the “dead” past—that is, when direct observations of the event(s) being studied are not possible and when no relevant persons are alive to report, even retrospectively, what occurred. The historian must then rely on primary documents, secondary documents, and cultural and physical artifacts as the main sources of evidence. A more contemporary version of historical research can study the recent but not quite “dead” past, as in conducting an oral history (e.g., Janesick, 2010). In this situation, historical research begins to overlap with case study research.

Case studies are preferred when the relevant behaviors still cannot be manipulated and when the desire is to study some contemporary event or set of events (“contemporary” meaning a fluid rendition of the recent past and the present, not just the present). The case study relies on many of the same techniques as in a history, but it also relies heavily on two sources of evidence not usually available as part of the conventional historian’s repertoire: direct observation of the events being studied and interviews of the persons who may still be involved in those events. Again, although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence—documents, artifacts, interviews, and direct observations, as well as participant-observation (see Chapter 4)—beyond what might be available in a conventional historical study.

Finally, experiments call for an investigator to manipulate behavior directly, precisely, and systematically. This can occur in a laboratory setting, in which an experiment may focus on one or two isolated variables (and presumes that the laboratory environment can “control” for all the remaining variables beyond the scope of interest), or it can be done in a field setting, where the term field (or social) experiment has emerged to cover research where investigators “treat” whole groups of people in different ways, such as providing
(or not providing) them with different kinds of vouchers to purchase services (Boruch & Foley, 2000).

The full range of experimental research also includes those situations in which the experimenter cannot manipulate behavior but in which the logic of experimental design still may be applied. These situations have been commonly regarded as quasi-experimental research (e.g., Campbell & Stanley, 1966; Cook & Campbell, 1979) or observational studies (e.g., Rosenbaum, 2002, 2009). They differ from case study research because of their adherence to experimental principles and inferences.

**Summary.** You should be able to identify some situations in which all research methods might be relevant (such as doing an exploratory study) and other situations in which two methods might be considered equally attractive. You also can use multiple methods in any given study (e.g., a survey within a case study or a case study within a survey). To this extent, the various methods are not mutually exclusive. But you also should be able to identify some situations in which a specific method has a distinct advantage. For case studies, this niche is when:

- A “how” or “why” question is being asked about
  - a contemporary set of events,
  - over which a researcher has little or no control.

To determine the questions that are the most pressing on a topic, as well as to gain some precision in formulating these questions, requires much preparation. One way is to review the literature on the topic (Cooper, 1984). Note that such a literature review is therefore a means to an end and not—as many people have been taught to think—an end in itself. Novices may think that the purpose of a literature review is to determine the answers about what is known on a topic; in contrast, experienced investigators review previous research to develop sharper and more insightful questions about the topic.

**VARIATIONS IN CASE STUDIES, BUT A COMMON DEFINITION**

Our discussion has progressed without formally defining case study. In addition to a need for a definition, three commonly asked questions about variations in case studies still have to be addressed. For example, (1) Is it still a case study when more than one case is included in the same study? (2) Does a case study preclude the use of quantitative evidence? (3) Can a case study be used to do evaluations? Let us now attempt first to define the case study as a research method and then to address these three questions.
Definition of the Case Study as a Research Method

Some definitions of case studies have merely repeated the types of topics to which case studies have been applied. For example, in the words of one scholar,

> The essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result. (Schramm, 1971, emphasis added)

This definition thus cites cases of “decisions” as the major focus of case studies. Other common cases can include “individuals,” “organizations,” “processes,” “programs,” “neighborhoods,” “institutions,” and even “events.” However, dwelling on the definition of a case study by interest in an individual case, not by the methods of inquiry used (e.g., Stake, 2005, p. 443), would seem insufficient to establish the complete basis for case studies as a research method. Outside of social science research, notice that the everyday use of case studies in the popular literature and media (popular case studies—see the Preface) further blurs the issue.

In fact, many of the earlier social science textbooks failed to consider case studies as a formal method at all. As discussed previously, one common shortcoming was to consider case studies as the exploratory stage of some other type of research method.

Another definitional shortcoming had been to confuse case studies with doing “fieldwork,” as in participant-observation. Thus, early textbooks limited their discussion of case studies to descriptions of participant-observation or of fieldwork as a data collection process, without elaborating further on a definition of case study research (e.g., Kidder & Judd, 1986; Nachmias & Nachmias, 2014).

In a historical overview of the case study in American methodological thought, Jennifer Platt (1992) explains the reasons for these treatments. She traces the practice of doing case studies back to the conduct of life histories, the work of the Chicago school of sociology, and casework in social work. She then shows how participant-observation emerged as a data collection technique, effectively eliminating any further recognition of case study research. Thus, she found ample references to case study research in methodological textbooks up to 1950 but hardly any references to case studies or to case study research in textbooks from 1950 to 1980 (Platt, 1992, p. 18). Finally, Platt explains how the first edition of this book (1984) definitively dissociated case study research from the limited perspective of only doing some kind of fieldwork. She then also showed how a renewed discussion of case study research began to emerge in textbooks, largely occurring from 1980 to 1989 and continuing thereafter. Case study research, in her words, had now come to be appreciated as having its own “logic of design . . . a strategy to be preferred when circumstances and research problems are appropriate rather than an ideological commitment to be followed whatever the circumstances” (Platt, 1992, p. 46).
A twofold definition of case study as a research method. And just what is this research method? The critical features first appeared in earlier publications (Yin, 1981a, 1981b, and reproduced on the companion website, study.sagepub.com/yin6e), predating the first edition of this book. The resulting definition as it has evolved over the five previous editions of this book reflects a twofold definition. The first part begins with the scope of a case study, when doing case study research:

1. A case study is an empirical inquiry that
   • investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the “case”) in depth and within its real-world context, especially when
   • the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident.

In other words, you would want to do a case study because you want to understand a real-world case and assume that such an understanding is likely to involve important contextual conditions pertinent to your case (e.g., Yin & Davis, 2007).

This first part of the definition therefore helps you to continue distinguishing case studies from the other modes of inquiry that have been discussed. Experimental research, for instance, deliberately separates a phenomenon from its context, attending only to the phenomenon of interest (usually as represented by a few variables). Typically, experiments ignore the context by “controlling” it in a laboratory environment. Historical research, by comparison, does deal with the entangled situation between phenomenon and context but usually in studying noncontemporary events. Finally, survey research can try to deal with phenomenon and context, but a survey’s ability to investigate the context is extremely limited. The survey designer, for instance, constantly struggles to limit the number of items in a questionnaire (and hence the number of questions that can be analyzed) to fall safely within the allotted degrees of freedom (usually constrained by the number of respondents who are to be surveyed as well as the presumed variability in the likely response sets).

The second part of the definition of case studies arises because phenomenon and context are not always sharply distinguishable in real-world situations. Therefore, other methodological characteristics become relevant as the features of a case study, when doing case study research:

2. A case study
   • copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result
   • benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide design, data collection, and analysis, and as another result
   • relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion.
In essence, the twofold definition—covering the scope and features of a case study—
shows how case study research comprises an all-encompassing mode of inquiry, with its
own logic of design, data collection techniques, and specific approaches to data analysis.
In this sense, case studies are not limited to being a data collection tactic alone or even a
design feature alone (Stoecker, 1991). How case study research is practiced is the topic of
this entire book. See Tutorial 1.1 on the companion website at study.sagepub.com/yin6e
for an elaboration of the definition of “case study.”

**EXERCISE 1.4 FINDING AND ANALYZING AN EXISTING CASE STUDY FROM THE RESEARCH LITERATURE**

Retrieve an example of case study research from the research literature. The case study can be on any
topic, but it must have some empirical method and present some empirical (qualitative or quantitative)
data. Why is this a research case study? What, if anything, is distinctive about the findings that could not
be learned by using some other social science method focusing on the same topic?

*Applicability of different epistemological orientations.* This all-encompassing mode
of inquiry also can embrace different epistemological orientations—for example, embrac-
ing a *relativist* or *interpretivist* orientation, compared to a *realist* orientation.²

Much of case study research as it is described in this book appears to be oriented
toward a *realist* perspective, which assumes the existence of a single reality that is inde-
pendent of any observer. However, case study research also can excel in accommodating
a *relativist* perspective (e.g., Boblin, Ireland, Kirkpatrick, & Robertson, 2013; Leppääho,
Plakoyiannaki, & Dimitratos, 2015)—acknowledging multiple realities and having mul-
tiple meanings, with findings that are observer dependent.

By pursuing a *relativist* perspective, you might pursue a *constructivist* approach in
designing and conducting your case study—attempting to capture the perspectives of
different participants and focusing on how their different meanings illuminate your topic
of study. Although this book may not offer comprehensive guidance on pursuing a rela-
tivist or constructivist approach, many of the book’s topics still offer helpful and relevant
ideas for doing such case studies. For instance, Chapter 2 will later discuss the impor-
tance of “theory” in designing case studies and alert you to the optional choices.

**Variations in Case Studies as a Research Method**

Certain other characteristics of case studies are not critical for defining the method. They
may be considered variations in case studies, which now also provide the opportunity to
address the three questions posed at the outset of this subsection.
Yes, case studies include both single- and multiple-case studies (e.g., Stake, 2006). Although some fields, such as political science and public administration, have tried to distinguish between these two situations (and have used such terms as the *comparative case method* as a distinctive form of multiple-case studies; see Agranoff & Radin, 1991; Dion, 1998; Lijphart, 1975), single- and multiple-case studies are in reality but two variations of case study designs (see Chapter 2 for more). BOX 3 contains two examples of multiple-case studies.

**BOX 3**

**MULTIPLE-CASE STUDIES: CASE STUDY RESEARCH BASED ON MULTIPLE “CASES”**

The same case study can cover multiple cases and then draw a single set of “cross-case” conclusions. The following two examples both focused on a topic of continuing public interest: identifying successful programs to improve U.S. social conditions.

3A. A Cross-Case Analysis Following the Presentation of Separate, Single-Case Studies

Jonathan Crane (1998) edited a book that has nine social programs as separate case studies. Each case study had a different author and was presented in its own chapter. The programs had in common strong evidence of their effectiveness, but they varied widely in their focus—from education to nutrition to drug prevention to preschool programs to drug treatment for delinquent youths. The editor then presented a cross-program analysis in a final chapter, attempting to draw generalizable conclusions that could apply to many other programs.

3B. A Book Whose Entire Text Is Devoted to the Multiple-Case (“Cross-Case”) Analysis

Lisbeth Schorr’s (1997) book is about major strategies for improving social conditions, illustrated by four policy topics: welfare reform, strengthening the child protection system, education reform, and transforming neighborhoods. The book continually refers to specific cases of successful programs, but these programs do not appear as separate, individual chapters or case studies. Also citing data from the literature, the author develops numerous generalizations based on the cases, including the need for successful programs to be “results oriented.” Similarly, she identifies six other attributes of highly effective programs (also see BOX 44A and 44B, Chapter 6).

And yes, case studies can include, and even be limited to, quantitative evidence. In fact, any contrast between quantitative and qualitative evidence does not set apart the various research methods. Note that, as analogous examples, some experiments (such as studies of perceptions) and some survey questions (such as those seeking categorical rather than numerical responses) rely on qualitative and not quantitative evidence. At the opposite end of the spectrum, some historical studies can include enormous amounts of quantitative evidence.
As an important caveat to the preceding paragraph, the relationship between case study research and qualitative research still has not been fully explored. Some have recognized case studies as being among the viable choices in doing qualitative research (e.g., Creswell & Poth, 2017). Nevertheless, and in contrast, the features and core characteristics of case studies—for example, the necessity for defining a “case,” the triangulation among multiple sources of evidence, and the ability to rely on quantitative data—seem to push case study research beyond being a type of qualitative research. As a further example, case study research need not always engage in the *thick description* (Geertz, 1973) or detailed observational evidence that marks many forms of qualitative research. And as yet another challenge, qualitative research (almost by definition) may not be limited to quantitative evidence. Not surprisingly, some disciplines such as psychology have tended to allow case study research and qualitative research to stand apart from each other (see Appendix A of this book).

And yes (and as discussed in greater detail in Appendix B of this book), case study research has its own place in doing evaluations (see Cronbach & Associates, 1980; Patton, 2015; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, pp. 309–324; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 1990; Yin, 2013). There are at least four different applications (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 1990). The most important is to explain the presumed causal links in real-world interventions that are too complex for survey or experimental methods. A second application is to describe an intervention and the real-world context in which it occurred. Third, a case study can illustrate certain topics within an evaluation, again in a descriptive mode. Fourth, case study research may be used to enlighten those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear, single set of outcomes. Whatever the application, one constant theme is that program sponsors—rather than researchers alone—may have a prominent role in defining the evaluation questions and relevant data categories.

**ADDRESSING TRADITIONAL CONCERNS ABOUT CASE STUDY RESEARCH**

Although case study research is a distinctive mode of social science inquiry, many researchers nevertheless disdain case studies. As an illustration, case studies have been viewed as a less desirable research method than either an experiment or a survey. Why is this?

**Rigorous enough?** Perhaps the greatest concern has arisen over a presumed need for greater rigor in doing case study research. Too many times, a case study researcher has been sloppy, has not followed systematic procedures, or has allowed equivocal evidence to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions. In doing case study research, you need to avoid such practices.

**Confusion with “nonresearch” case studies.** As discussed in the preface to this book, case studies have played a prominent role outside of the research realm. These include case
studies that (a) serve teaching or professional development functions ("teaching-practice" case studies), (b) appear in the popular literature and media ("popular" case studies), or (c) appear as an integral part of various administrative archives ("case records").

Although all three types of case studies have great value, they nevertheless may be considered nonresearch case studies. They do not claim to follow a research method, and they may not be concerned with conventional social science procedures—as in formally describing their methodologies. Thus, in each of the three nonresearch situations, the producer of the case study was not necessarily conducting the case study as a research endeavor but was serving some other purpose. The ensuing case study might have been carefully crafted, well written, and led to informative conclusions—but the producer may not have been trying to follow any explicit research method.

For instance, the use of case studies as a teaching tool, originally popularized as “teaching cases” in the fields of law, business, medicine, or public administration (e.g., Ellet, 2007; Garvin, 2003; Llewellyn, 1948; Stein, 1952; Towl, 1969; Windsor & Greanias, 1983) now embraces virtually every professional field and subspecialty, including those in the physical and life sciences. The teaching-practice case study may dominate a professional course curriculum (e.g., in business schools or law schools) or may appear as a supplement in a pedagogical setting (e.g., continuing education courses in medicine or other fields). Either way, for teaching purposes, this kind of case study need not contain a complete rendition of all the critically relevant events or perspectives. Rather, the purpose of the teaching-practice case study is to establish a framework for student discussion and debate around some critical professional issue. The criteria for developing good teaching and training case studies—usually of the single- and not multiple-case variety—are therefore different from those for doing case study research (e.g., Caulley & Dowdy, 1987).

The same confusion also may extend to the unknown quality of case studies when they appear in the popular literature or media (popular case studies). The presented case study may span an entire magazine article or appear as a brief vignette or video. Under any of these circumstances, the writers still readily refer to their work as a “case study.” As one result, many people, including scholars in non–social science fields, may then inappropriately derive their impression of case study research from these popular works that in fact do not claim to have followed any research method.

Finally, case studies may appear as case records. Medical records, social work files, and other case records can be used to facilitate some administrative practice, such as a case-based procedure involving child custody evaluation (e.g., Vertue, 2011). Although the creation of a case record or case evaluation may follow a similar procedure as if doing a research case study, in fact the criteria for developing case studies for practice differ from those for doing case study research. In particular, Bromley (1986) suggests that the content of case records may be undesirably influenced by “expectations regarding accountability rather than factual data” (p. 69)—also see Appendix A of this book.
You need to be alert to the possibility that some people’s only prior exposure to case studies may have been to these three types of non-research case studies. Such an exposure may taint a person’s view of the case study as a research method. For instance, because the teaching-practice case studies exist in great number and are used nowadays so routinely in professional training (preservice and inservice), the experience can have a disparaging effect on one’s impressions of case studies as a research method.

When doing a research case study, you need to overcome this confusion by highlighting your methodic procedures, especially the reporting of all evidence fairly. You also need to be transparent and explicit about limiting or eliminating any biases, similar to efforts in the other modes of social science inquiry, such as in avoiding the “experimenter effect” (see Rosenthal, 1966), in designing unbiased survey questions (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982), or in searching for evidence when doing historical research (Gottschalk, 1968). The challenges are not different, but in case study research, they may occur more frequently and demand greater attention. In essence, your procedures and documentation need to distinguish your research case study from the other kinds of non-research case studies.

### EXERCISE 1.5 EXAMINING TEACHING-PRACTICE CASE STUDIES

Obtain a copy of a case study designed for teaching purposes (e.g., a case study in a textbook used in a business school course). Identify the specific ways in which this type of “teaching case” is different from research case studies. Does the teaching case fully cite its primary sources, contain all the relevant evidence, or display data so you can arrive at your own interpretation of the conclusions? Does the teaching case discuss how the evidence resulted in substantive findings and conclusions and compare them with rival interpretations? What appears to be the main objective of the teaching case?

**Generalizing from case studies?** A third common concern about case study research is an apparent inability to generalize from case studies. “How can you generalize from a single case study?” is a frequently heard question. The answer is not simple.

However, consider for the moment that the same question had been asked about an experiment: “How can you generalize from a single experiment?” In fact, generalizations in physical science are rarely based on single experiments. They are usually based on a multiple set of experiments that have replicated the same phenomenon under different conditions. Even then, the generalizations from experimental research can vacillate enormously over time (think of the many reversals regarding the presumed nutritional consequences from consuming caffeine or other foods).

The same approach can be used with case studies, as discussed in detail in Chapter 2. The short answer is that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, neither the “case” nor the
case study, like the experiment, represent “samples.” Rather, in doing case study research, your goal will be to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalizations) and not to extrapolate probabilities (statistical generalizations). Or, as three notable social scientists describe in their single case study done years ago, the goal is to do a “generalizing” and not a “particularizing” analysis (Lipset, Trow, & Coleman, 1956, pp. 419–420).

**Unmanageable level of effort?** A fourth frequent concern about case study research is that case studies can potentially take too long and result in massive, unreadable documents. This concern may be appropriate, given the way case studies have been done in the past (e.g., Feagin et al., 1991), but this is not necessarily the way case studies must be done in the future. Chapter 6 discusses alternative ways of composing a case study (whether presenting the case study in writing or orally)—including an option in which the traditional, flowing (and potentially lengthy) narrative even can be avoided, if desired.

Nor need case studies take a long time. This incorrectly confuses case study research with a specific method of data collection, such as ethnography (e.g., O’Reilly, 2012) or participant-observation (e.g., DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011). Ethnographies usually require long periods in the field and emphasize detailed observational and interview evidence. Participant-observation may similarly assume a hefty investment of field effort. In contrast, case study research is a form of inquiry that does not depend solely on ethnographic or participant-observer data.

**Comparative advantage?** A fifth possible concern with case study research has to do with its unclear comparative advantage, in contrast to other research methods. This issue especially emerged during the first decade of the 21st century, which favored randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or “true experiments,” especially in education and related topics. These kinds of experiments were esteemed because they aimed to establish the effectiveness of various treatments or interventions (e.g., Jadad & Enkin, 2007). In the eyes of many, the emphasis led to a downgrading of case study research because case studies (and other types of nonexperimental methods) cannot directly address the effectiveness issue.

Overlooked has been the possibility that case studies can nevertheless offer important insights not provided by RCTs. Noted quantitative scholars suggest, for instance, that RCTs, though addressing the effectiveness question, are limited in their ability to explain “how” or “why” a given treatment or intervention necessarily worked (or not), and that case studies can investigate such issues (e.g., Shavelson & Towne, 2002, pp. 99–106)—or, as succinctly captured by the subtitle of an excellent article on evaluating public programs, “not whether programs work, but how they work” (Rogers, 2000). In this sense, case study research does indeed offer its own advantage. At a minimum, case studies may be valued “as adjuncts to experiments rather than as alternatives to them” (Cook & Payne, 2002). In clinical psychology, a “large series of single case studies,” confirming
predicted behavioral changes after the initiation of treatment, may augment the evidence of efficaciousness from a field trial (e.g., Veerman & van Yperen, 2007). Finally, in a similar manner, case study research can readily complement the use of other quantitative and statistical methods (see BOX 4).

BOX 4
COMPLEMENTARITY OF CASE STUDY AND STATISTICAL RESEARCH

In the field of international politics, a major proposition has been that “democracies seldom if ever make war upon one another” (George & Bennett, 2005, p. 37). The proposition has been the subject of an extensive body of research, involving statistical research as well as case study research. An excellent chapter by George and Bennett (2005, pp. 37–58) shows how statistical studies may have tested the correlation between regime types and war, but how case studies have been needed to examine the underlying processes that might explain such a correlation. For instance, one of the more prominent explanations has been that democracies are able to make formal commitments with each other that make the use of military force unnecessary for resolving disputes (p. 57). The review shows how the relevant research has taken place over many decades, involving many different scholars. The entire body of research, based on both the statistical and case studies, illustrates the complementarity of these methods.

Summary. Despite the fact that these five common concerns can be allayed, as above, one major lesson is that good case study research is still difficult to do. The inability to screen for a researcher’s ability to do a good case study further compounds the problem. People know when they cannot play music; they also know when they cannot do mathematics beyond a certain level, and they can be tested for other skills, such as the bar examination in law. Somehow, the skills for doing good case study research have not yet been formally defined. As a result, “most people feel that they can prepare a case study, and nearly all of us believe we can understand one. Because neither view is well founded, the case study receives a good deal of approbation it does not deserve” (Hoaglin, Light, McPeek, Mosteller, & Stoto, 1982, p. 134). This quotation is from a book by five prominent statisticians. Surprisingly, from another field, even they recognize the challenge of doing a good case study.

Summary

This chapter has introduced the relevance and importance of case study research. Like other social science research methods, case studies investigate an empirical topic by following a set of desired procedures. Articulating these procedures dominates the remainder of this book.
The chapter has provided an operational definition of case studies and has identified some of the known variations. The chapter also has distinguished the case study from other social science methods, suggesting the situations in which doing a case study may be preferred, for instance, to doing a survey. Some situations may have no clearly preferred method, as the strengths and weaknesses of the various methods may overlap. The basic goal, however, is to consider all the methods in an inclusive and pluralistic fashion—before settling on your method of choice in conducting a new social science study.

Finally, the chapter has addressed some of the major concerns about case study research, offering possible responses to these concerns. However, we must all work hard to overcome the problems of doing case study research, including the recognition that some of us were not meant, by skill or disposition, to do such research in the first place. Case study research is remarkably hard, even though case studies have traditionally been considered to be “soft” research, possibly because researchers have not followed systematic procedures. By offering an array of such procedures, this book tries to make case study research easier to follow and your own case study better.

### Notes to Chapter 1

1. Appendix A has a full discussion of the reasons for the large number of variables in a case study.

2. These terms were deliberately chosen even though they oversimplify two contrasting perspectives. Ignored are the many more subtle orientations that investigators may bring to their research. For brief definitions, see Schwandt’s (2015a) dictionary of qualitative inquiry, which characterizes **realism** as “the doctrine that there are real objects that exist independently of our knowledge of their existence,” **relativism** as “the doctrine that denies that there are universal truths,” and **interpretivism** as a term that has occasionally been used as a synonym for all qualitative inquiry. For a fuller discussion of the worldviews more generally, see Creswell (2014).

3. For instance, see the case studies made available by the National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science, at the University of Buffalo, SUNY, a resource supported by the National Science Foundation.

4. There nevertheless may be exceptional circumstances when a single case study is so unique or important that a case study investigator has no desire to generalize to any other case studies. See Stake’s (2005) “intrinsic” case studies, Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis’s (1997) “portraits,” and Abma and Stake’s (2014) “naturalistic” case studies.

5. Scholars also point out that the classic experiments only can test simple causal relationships—that is, when a single treatment such as a new drug is hypothesized to produce an effect. However, for many social and behavioral topics, the relevant causes may be complex and involve multiple interactions, and investigating these may well be beyond the capability of any single experiment (George & Bennett, 2005, p. 12).
**Chapter 2: Design**

- Define the case(s) to be studied
- Develop theory, propositions, and related issues, to guide the anticipated case study and to generalize its findings
- Identify the case study design (single or multiple, holistic or embedded cases)
- Test the design against four criteria for maintaining the quality of a case study

**ABSTRACT**

A research design links the data to be collected (and the conclusions to be drawn) to the initial questions of study. Every empirical study has an implicit, if not explicit, research design. You can strengthen case study designs by articulating a “theory” about what is to be learned. The theoretical propositions also lay the groundwork for making analytic rather than statistical generalizations from your case study.

Critical to the design will be to define the “case” to be studied and to set some limits or bounds to the case. You can then examine the quality of your emerging design in relation to four tests commonly used in social science research: (a) construct validity, (b) internal validity, (c) external validity, and (d) reliability.

Among the specific case study designs, four major types follow a $2 \times 2$ matrix. The first pair consists of single-case study and multiple-case study designs. The second pair, occurring in combination with either of the first pair, distinguishes between holistic and embedded designs. Whether holistic or embedded, single-case studies can be invaluable when the single case has any of five characteristics—being a critical, extreme or unusual, common, revelatory, or longitudinal case. Again whether holistic or embedded, the selection of the cases in a multiple-case study should follow a replication rather than sampling logic. Although single-case studies can yield invaluable insights, most multiple-case studies are likely to be stronger than single-case studies. Compared to doing a single-case study, trying even a “two-case” design is therefore a worthy objective. Case studies also can be used in combination with other methods, as part of a larger mixed-methods study.