



Case Study Research in Public Administration and Public Policy: Standards and Strategies

Author(s): G. David Garson

Source: *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Jul., 2002), pp. 209-216

Published by: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40215571>

Accessed: 05-06-2017 22:29 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Public Affairs Education*

Case Study Research in Public Administration and Public Policy: Standards and Strategies

G. David Garson

North Carolina State University

ABSTRACT

Based on an exploratory survey of doctoral programs in public administration, commonly (though not universally) accepted standards and guidelines for case study research are synthesized and articulated. A methodological context and strategy for these guidelines is also presented, focusing on theoretic case selection rather than standardization of meta-analytic instruments alone. The call for theoretic case selection strategies and for standardization of meta-analytic instrumentation in public administration is consistent with the increased recognition of the importance of grounded theory in qualitative social science research.

Within the field of public administration, case study dissertations have the reputation of being "easy to write but hard to defend."¹ Case studies are sometimes seen as merely descriptive, lacking theoretical or policy importance. It is said that because they are based on a sample size of one, or just a few, valid generalization is impossible. The approach invites thick description, threatening the dissertation supervisor with the possibility of wandering, turgid prose which, in the end, proves little. Some doctoral programs in public administration or public policy forbid case study based dissertations, while others discourage them. More commonly, however, public administration and public policy doctoral programs at least acknowledge the possibility that the case study approach might yield work of distinction, as has been evident in classic works such as Jeffrey Pressman's and Aaron Wildavsky's book on implementation (1973) or Graham Allison's study of decision-making during the Cuban Missile Crisis (1971).

Doctoral programs do not dictate methodology but rather leave issues of research design and empirical procedure to dissertation committees. For this reason, few programs articulate formal bars to any particular methodology, case studies included. Although it is true that skepticism toward the case study method is widespread, prompted by fears of low quality, the great majority of doctoral programs in public administration and policy nonetheless allow case studies.² Many, however, do so with guidelines or stipulations.

The purpose of the present essay is to articulate commonly (though not universally) accepted standards and guidelines for case study research, and to provide a methodological context and strategy for these guidelines. It is not the purpose of this essay to provide a comprehensive review of the case study literature, nor is examination undertaken of actual enforcement of these guidelines. The author acknowledges there may well be a large gap between case study dissertation practice and prescription within the public administration community.

COMMON GUIDELINES FOR CASE STUDY BASED DISSERTATIONS

In an exploratory attempt to synthesize existing common guidelines for case study based dissertations in the field of public administration, a call

J-PAE 8 (2002):3:209-217

Journal of Public Affairs Education 209

was issued to the discussion list hosted by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). This list is directed toward NASPAA representatives from public administration programs, but in some cases the respondents were other program faculty. Some 31 U.S. and four international programs responded to the survey, representing a 39 percent response rate for the U.S. sample, considered high for an Internet survey.³ It should be emphasized that the purpose of the survey was not to report on which institutions were implementing which specific guidelines (and that is not reported here) but rather simply to obtain a sizable number of statements of case study policy for purely exploratory purposes. It may be that non-responding institutions include a higher proportion which lack any policy at all, hence perceived nothing to report.

Survey results revealed those responding shared a surprising degree of consensus, with only a few programs either banning case study dissertations altogether or, at the other extreme, having a policy explicitly allowing non-theoretical, purely descriptive case study dissertations. Based on replies to the survey, a composite set of guidelines was synthesized by the author and is reproduced in this section immediately below. It should be noted that most programs do not have an explicit policy on case study dissertations; instead, the synthesis is based primarily on self-reported practices. One purpose of the synthesis articulated below is to provide a formalization of typical guidelines for consideration for formal adoption, hopefully leading to better enforcement of guidelines in practice.⁴ Drawing on wording reported by the respondent institutions, a synthesis of typical policy regarding case study dissertations follows:

Case study dissertations should represent original research, be analytic, well-written, insightful, systematic, explicitly related to the literature of the field, and should cover their focus in depth. This focus must test propositions which are relevant to significant theoretical issues. Theoretical issues may be political-theoretic, decision-theoretic, economic or market-theoretic, or public policy or action-theoretic, to name some of the possible dimensions of theory. In this way the criteria for acceptable case study

dissertations do not differ from those for other types of dissertations.

To test propositions derived from theory, one must have some variance in the dependent variable(s) under study, which in turn requires there be some type of comparison such as might be provided by before-after studies of a policy intervention or by examining a phenomenon in a public compared to a private setting. That is, case study dissertations must have a longitudinal, cross-sectional, or other comparative perspective. In some, but not all dissertations, it may be necessary to study multiple cases to achieve the requisite variance in the object of study. Non-longitudinal, single shot case studies of a given organization or policy event do not provide a basis for comparison and testing of propositions and are not acceptable no matter how detailed the description. In fact, description not directly germane to the theoretical concerns of the thesis should be relegated to appendices or dropped from the dissertation altogether.

Because case study dissertations seek to provide theoretical or policy insight based on a small number of cases or even on a single case, a triangulation approach to validation is strongly recommended. Such a rigorous approach involves a multi-method design in which key constructs and processes are traced using more than a single methodology. Multiple methods may include structured and unstructured interviews, sample surveys, focus groups, narrative analysis, phenomenological research, ethnography, symbolic action research, network analysis, content analysis, participant observation, examination of archival records, secondary data analysis, experiments, quasi-experiments, and other methods. Testing the same propositions through data gathered by multiple methods helps address some of the validation problems in case study designs.

The standard reference for public administration and public policy graduate students doing case study research, formally recommended by many programs, is Robert Yin's *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Revised Edition (1994). Other references which were cited by survey respondents as the basis for standards for certain types of case study research

included Goetz and LeCompte (1984), Ragin (1987), Strauss and Corbin (1990), Sabatier (1993), and Morgan (2001).

Not cited by survey respondents were a number of seminal works pertinent to case study research emanating from other disciplines. A brief chronological review of highlights would include classic sociological and anthropological studies of small groups, such as William F. Whyte's *Street Corner Society* (Whyte, 1955), and in international affairs, Graham Allison's study of group decision-making in *Essence of Decision* (1971). However, in terms of a seminal work explicitly defending social science case studies, many would cite Donald Campbell's classic explanation of case study research a quarter century ago, in which he described pattern-matching, discussed later in this essay (Campbell, 1975). In the same period the U. S. General Accounting Office was formulating standards for case study research, commissioning case studies such as that by Evans (1976), and later publishing a manual on case study methodology (U. S. General Accounting Office, 1990). Case study methodology was the focus of classic essays by Lijphart (1971), Eckstein (1975), and others in comparative political studies in the 1970s, down to the present day (Odell, 2000). In the 1980s, case study methodology was popularized in a variety of other fields, including clinical research (Kazdin, 1982), marketing (Bonoma, 1985), education (Merriam, 1988), management (Eisenhardt, 1989), and information systems (Lee, 1989). By the 1990s, various works advocated case study research as a way to get at holistic truths about cultural phenomena not tapped by purely behavioral and empirical methods (e.g., Feagin, Orum, and Sjober, eds., 1991). In the early- to mid-1990s, partly as the result of Sage Publications' interest in developing titles in qualitative research, new texts appeared codifying case study methods (Abramson, 1992; Hamel et al., 1993, as well as Yin, 1994, and Stake, 1995, cited earlier).

THE META-ANALYTIC STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING CASE STUDY DISSERTATION RESEARCH

In their article "Cumulating the Intellectual Gold of Case Study Research," Jason L. Jensen and Robert Rodgers (2001) took note of criticisms of the quality

of research in public administration in general and of case study research in particular (McCurdy and Cleary, 1984; Adams and White, 1994). Defending the case study approach's capacity to handle threats to validity, to cumulate knowledge, and to provide a scientific basis for sound generalization, Jensen and Rodgers conclude "meta-analysis is the logical solution" to public administration research's traditional shortcomings in the dual areas of knowledge cumulation and theoretical generalization (242). Specifically, their most important recommendation is to revive the Inter-University Case Program with a new emphasis on developing standards for meta-analysis (241).

Jensen and Rodgers are correct in their basic refutation of criticisms of the case study method as being intrinsically unscientific. In this author's opinion, they are also correct in asserting the importance of a meta-analytic strategy as a way of cumulating case study knowledge, though this argument might have been framed more generally in terms of development of grounded theory (Anells, 1997; Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 1997). Though their recommendations urge an effort to "refine case methodologies" (p. 241), however, they do not discuss strategies of case selection. Case selection strategies are more fundamental to the advance of case study methodologies than is meta-analytic instrumentation and, as such, more pertinent to criteria which might be used by funding organizations which might consider promoting a new generation of case study research or by departments seeking to develop a center of excellence around case studies in some research arena. Each of these three points (the scientific basis of case study research, the nature of meta-analytic strategies in relation to grounded theory, the importance of case selection strategies) is discussed below in turn.

THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF CASE STUDY RESEARCH

Without repeating Jensen and Rodgers's justifications of case study research as a cumulative, generalizable, scientifically-sound form of investigation, one may note that the authors might have gone even further in their defense. Arguably, case study research is a social science substitute for scientific experimenta-

tion. It is interesting to note that case study research plays an important role in the natural sciences as well as social sciences. Many scientific fields, such as astronomy, geology, and human biology, do not lend themselves to scientific investigation through traditional controlled experiments. For instance, Darwin's theory of evolution was based, in essence, on case study research, not experimentation.

It is argued that case studies are unscientific because they cannot be replicated. It is true that a later researcher using case methods will of necessity be studying a different case, if only because he or she comes later, and, therefore, may come to different conclusions. Similarly, in experimental and quasi-experimental research, the subjects will differ, meaning relationships may differ. What makes research replicable in either case study or experimental research is not the units of analysis but whether the research has been theory-driven. If the case researcher has developed and tested a model of hypothesized relationships, then a future case researcher can replicate the initial case study simply by selecting cases on the basis of the same theories, then testing the theories through pattern matching. If pattern matching fails to uphold theories supported by the first case researcher, the second case researcher may engage in explanation building to put forward a new model.

It is also argued that case studies are unscientific because findings cannot be generalized (Kennedy, 1979). Generalizability of findings is a function of the range and diversity of settings in which a theory is tested, not of the testing methodology per se. It is true that randomization of subjects in experimental research and random sampling in quasi-experimental research, along with larger sample sizes, mean that research of these types can more easily lay claim to range and diversity than can case study research projects. Nonetheless, judicious case selection to identify cases illustrating the range of a theory (e.g., a theory about causes of divorce) may result in more generalizable research than, say, the attempt to test the same theory based on a random sample of students in one university. Moreover, if case research is replicated, generalization of case-based findings can be enhanced further. A defense of the scientific nature

of case study research in relation to the crucial issues of replication and generalizability thus must rest critically on case selection strategies to be discussed below.

META-ANALYSIS AND GROUNDED THEORY

Grounded theory is a form of comparative case-oriented explanation-building related to ethnography. It has been popularized in sociology by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The researcher examines cases which are similar on many variables but which differ on a dependent variable in order to discern unique causal factors. Similarly, the researcher may examine cases which are similar on the dependent variable in order to discern common causal factors. In this way, advocates of grounded theory seek a continuous interplay between data collection and theoretical analysis. Whereas the conventional scientific method starts with *a priori* theories to be tested and then collects data, grounded theory starts with data collection and then induces theory.

Though not strictly part of its methodology, grounded theory also implies a focus on generation of categories by the subjects themselves, not *a priori* creation of typologies by the researcher. In this, it is similar to phenomenology. The researcher may even try to label variables in the terminology used by subjects, reflecting their perceptions of a phenomenon. In this way, grounded theory is context-based and process-oriented. Good grounded theory meets three criteria: (1) fit—it makes sense to those active in the phenomenon being studied; (2) generality—it can be generalized to a describable range of phenomena; and (3) control—it anticipates possible confounding variables that may be brought up by challengers to the theory.

Also, the data for grounded theory may be broader than traditional case studies, and may include participant observations, field notes, event chronologies, or other textual transcripts. As analysis of such transcripts is central, coding becomes an important issue, though it ranges from the informal to the quantitatively structured. As a rule, research based on grounded theory will have a tabular schedule of coded variables which are being tracked in the transcripts.

Paradigms, in the jargon of grounded theory, consist of the following elements: the phenomenon (the dependent variable of interest), the causal conditions (the set of causes and their properties), the context (value ranges and conditions of the causal variables which affect the model), intervening conditions (intervening, endogenous variables in the model), action strategies (goal-oriented activities subjects take in response to conditions), and consequences (outcomes of action strategies).

Meta-analysis is a particular methodology for extending grounded theory to a number of case studies. In meta-analysis, the researcher creates a meta-analytic schedule, which is a cross-case summary table in which the rows are case studies and the columns are variable-related findings or other study attributes (ex., time frame, research entity, case study design type, number and selection method for interviewees, threats to validity like researcher involvement in the research entity). The cell entries may be simple checkmarks indicating a given study supported a given variable relationship, or the cell entries may be brief summaries of findings on a given relationship or brief description of study attributes. The purpose of meta-analysis is to allow the researcher to use the summary of case studies reflected in the meta-analytic table to make theoretical generalizations. In doing so, sometimes the researcher will weight the cases according to the number of research entities studied, since some case studies may examine multiple entities. See Jensen and Rodgers (2001, 239 ff.).

Problems of meta-analysis include what even case study advocates admit is the "formidable challenge" (Jensen and Rodgers, 2001, 241) involved in developing a standardized meta-analytic schedule which fits the myriad dimensions of any sizeable number of case studies. No widely accepted, standardized schedules exist. Moreover, for any given proposed schedule, many or most specific case studies will simply not report findings in one or more of the column categories, forcing meta-analysts either to accept a great deal of missing data or to have to do additional research by contacting case authors or even case subjects.

CASE SELECTION STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING CASE STUDY DISSERTATION RESEARCH

Development of useful meta-analytic instruments is merely one of a number of strategies for enriching grounded theory development through case studies. One might term improvement of such instrumentation an output strategy insofar as it is a post-hoc approach for making the best use of case study research designed for disparate other purposes. While highly desirable, the call for improved meta-analytic instrumentation should not obscure the much more critical input strategy need for theoretically-based case selection. Agencies considering funding a new generation of case study research would do well to embrace an input strategy as well as an output strategy.

Unlike random sample surveys, case studies are not representative of entire populations, nor do they claim to be. The case study researcher must take care not to generalize beyond cases similar to the one(s) studied. Provided the researcher refrains from over-generalization, case study research is not methodologically invalid simply because selected cases cannot be presumed to be representative of entire populations. Put another way, in statistical analysis one is generalizing to a population based on a sample which is representative of that population. In case studies, in comparison, one is generalizing to a theory based on cases selected to represent dimensions of that theory.

Case selection should be theory-driven. When theories are associated with causal typologies, the researcher should select at least one case which falls in each category. That cases are not quantitative does not relieve the case researcher from identifying what dependent variable(s) are to be explained and what independent variables may be relevant. Not only should observation of these variables be part of the case study, but ideally the researcher would study at least one case for every causal path in the model suggested by theory. Where this is not possible, often the case, the researcher should be explicit about which causal types of cases are omitted from analysis. Cases cited in the literature as counter-cases to the selected theory should not be omitted.

Cross-theoretic case selection is desirable. As multiple theories can conform to a given set of data, particularly sparse data as in case study research, the case research design is strengthened if the focus of the study concerns two or more clearly contrasting theories. This enables the researcher to derive and then test contrasting expectations about what would happen under each theory in the case setting(s) at hand.

Pattern matching is the attempt of the case researcher to establish that a preponderance of cases are not inconsistent with each of the links in the theoretical model which drives the case study.

Process tracing is the a more systematic approach to pattern matching in which the researcher attempts, for each case studied, to find evidence that each link in the theory-based causal model actually existed, was of the sign predicted by theory, and was of the effect magnitude predicted by theory. While process tracing cannot resolve indeterminacy (selecting among alternative models, all consistent with case information), it can establish in which types of cases the model does not apply.

Controlled observation is the most common form of process tracing. Its name derives from the fact that the researcher attempts to control for effects by looking for model units of analysis (e.g., people in the case of hypotheses about people) which shift substantially in magnitude or even valence, on key variables in the model being investigated. In a study of prison culture, for instance, an individual may shift from being free to being incarcerated; or in a study of organizational culture, an individual may shift from being a rank-and-file employee to being a supervisor. Such shifts can be examined to see if associated shifts in other variables (ex., opinions) also change as predicted by the model. Controlled observation as a technique dictates that the case study (1) be long enough in time to chronicle such shifts, and (2) favor case selection of cases where shifts are known to or are likely to occur.

Time series analysis is a special and more rigorous case of process tracing, in which the researcher also attempts to establish not only that the existence, sign, and magnitude of each model link is as expected, but also the temporal sequence of events relating

the variables in the model. This requires observations at multiple points in time, not just before-after observations, in order to establish that the magnitude of a given effect is outside the range of normal fluctuation of the time series.

Congruence testing is an even more systematic approach to pattern matching which requires the selection of pairs of cases that are identical in causal type, except for the difference of one independent variable. Differences in the dependent variable are attributed to incongruence on the independent. Where there are a large number of cases, it may be possible to replace congruence testing with statistical methods of correlation and control.

Explanation-building is an alternative or supplement to pattern matching. Under explanation-building, the researcher does not start out with a theory to be investigated. Rather, the researcher attempts to induce theory from case examples chosen to represent diversity on some dependent variable (ex., cities with different outcomes on reducing welfare rolls). A list of possible causes of the dependent variable is constructed through literature review and brainstorming, and information is gathered on each cause for each selected case.

In case study explanation-building, the researcher inventories causal attributes which are common to all cases, common only to cases high on the dependent variable, and common only to cases low on the dependent variable. The researcher comes to a provisional conclusion that the differentiating attributes are the significant causes, while those common to all cases are not. Explanation-building is particularly compelling when there are plausible rival explanations which can be rebutted by this method. Explanation-building can also be a supplement to pattern matching, as when it is used to generate a new, more plausible model after pattern matching disconfirms an initial model.

CONCLUSION

Case study research is a time-honored, traditional approach to the study of topics in social science and management. It is now a recognized methodology in such fields as evaluation research (USGAO, 1990). Because only a few instances are normally studied,

the case researcher will typically uncover more variables than he or she has data points, making statistical control (e.g., through multiple regression) an impossibility. Case study research may be used in its own right, but is more often recommended as part of a multimethod approach (triangulation) in which the same dependent variable is investigated using multiple procedures (ex., case studies, survey research, archival data). In recent years, however, there has been increased attention to implementation of case studies in a more systematic, stand-alone manner which increases the validity of associated findings (Bailey, 1992; Yin, 1994; Stake, 1995; Naumes and Naumes, 1999).

The recent article by Jensen and Rodgers performs a valuable service to the profession in rebutting the simplistic critique of case study research as inherently unscientific. Moreover, their call for increased attention to meta-analytic approaches to case study knowledge, and the call for standardization of meta-analytic instrumentation in public administration, are consistent with the increased recognition of the importance of grounded theory in qualitative social science research.

This essay has presented a survey-based synthesis of existing standards for case study dissertations and has argued in a complementary way that agencies considering funding a new generation of case study research, or a revived Inter-University Case Program, or even academic departments seeking to become centers of excellence in some subject area, would do well also to recognize theoretically-driven case selection as a prerequisite to advancement of public administration research through case study methodology. The success of strategies suggested in this paper will depend, of course, not only on the adoption of guidelines reflected above, but also on the execution of case study dissertations that adhere to these standards and guidelines. Were large numbers of dissertations to continue to fail to meet these standards, the case study strategy articulated here would also obviously fail as well. Successful execution of case study dissertations may be enhanced by formal adoption of guidelines such as those synthesized in this essay, and by implementation of guidelines within a methodological context involving case

selection strategies as well as meta-analysis as also articulated in this essay.

NOTES

1. A typical survey response was "My instructor advised me not to take up a case study based project cause it would have been hard for her to grade it, and perhaps equally hard for me to defend it in terms of generalizability."
2. Examples of dissertations which have been accepted, at least in proposal stage, reveal diversity:
 - A qualitative case study on prison privatization in Texas which described trends in various variables before and after privatization and also compared public and private prisons.
 - A dissertation on how businesses perceive non-traditional university degrees from Internet and corporate providers, based on a broad sample survey with follow-up through two or three case studies.
 - An in-depth study of the political and economic integration of Muslims into Thailand, covering three decades of policy, based on "a massive amount" of reading, travel to Thailand to interview leaders of the Islamic independence movement, with a focus on militant Muslims, explaining trends in their international support, and seeking to evaluate policies for dealing with militant Muslims: what policies worked well and less well, and what fired up bitterness.
 - A phenomenological dissertation on Boston's "Big Dig" (the Central Artery/Tunnel Project, which is the largest, most complex and technologically challenging highway project ever attempted in American history) with comparison to the Boston Harbor Cleanup, which is occurring in the same polity at the same time, focusing on interactions among public and private actors as this shapes the course of action in a mega-project.
 - An in-depth study of policy issues that emerged when two hospitals merged.
 - A three-case comparative study of reliance and social trust reflected in inter-institutional relationships during administrative processes. Variation in such relationships is compared in public administrative processes, stakeholder/policy communities of agencies and organizations, and past community history.
 - A study of the rise of advanced transportation technologies, in an aggregated form commonly known as intelligent vehicle-highway systems (IVHS) and intelligent transportation systems (ITS), through the perspective of Kingdon's (1984) agenda-setting framework.
 - A content analysis of texts from the debate over the 1996 Welfare Reform Act.
 - Based on a conceptual framework derived from economic, political, moral/ethical and 'civil society theory' views of voluntary activity development, the meanings of 'participation' for women's citizenship was studied among women volunteers in a health organization. Twenty women were interviewed in depth to generate ideas, examples, and illustrations concerning women's participation, relationships between volunteering and formal citizenship, and their implications for public policy.
3. An Internet-based survey was administered. Doctoral programs in public administration responding to the survey are listed below: American University • Arizona State University • Cleveland State University • Florida State University • Georgia State University • Hamline University • New York University, Wagner School • North Carolina State University • Northeastern University • Northern

Illinois University • Old Dominion University • Pennsylvania State University • Portland State University • Purdue University • RAND Graduate School • SUNY - Albany • Texas A & M • Tufts University • University of Arizona, Tucson • University of Connecticut • University of Illinois at Springfield • University of Kentucky • University of La Verne School of Public Affairs and Health Administration • University of Maryland - Baltimore County University of North Carolina, Public Policy Analysis, Planning, and Business • University of Pittsburgh • University of Southern California School of Policy, Planning, and Development • University of Texas at Arlington • Virginia Commonwealth University • Wayne State University • Western Michigan University • Flinders University, Australia • Manchester University, UK • Shih-Hsin University, Taiwan • Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

4. Formalization of policy was, in fact, the local purpose of the present study at the author's institution.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, P. R. 1992. *A Case for Case Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Adams, Guy B., and Jay D. White 1994. "Dissertation Research in Public Administration and Cognate Fields: An Assessment of Methods and Quality." *Public Administration Review*, 54(6):565-76.
- Allison, Graham T. 1971. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Allison, Graham T., and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2nd edition. New York: Longman, 1999.
- Anells, M. P. 1997. "Grounded Theory Method, Part 1: Within the Five Moments of Qualitative Research," *Nursing Inquiry*, 4:120-129; and "Grounded Theory Method, Part 2: Options for Users of the Method," *Nursing Inquiry*, 4:176-180.
- Bailey, Mary Timney. 1992. "Do Physicians Use Case Studies? Thoughts on Public Administration Research." *Public Administration Review*, 52(1):47-55.
- Bonoma, T. 1985. "Case Research in Marketing: Opportunities, Problems, and a Process." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12:199-208.
- Campbell, D. 1975. "Degrees of Freedom and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies*, 8:178-185.
- Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989. "Building Theories from Case Study Research." *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4):522-550.
- Eckstein, Harry. 1975. "Case Study and Theory in Political Science." In Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, 94-137.
- Evans, R. 1976. "Smoking in Children: Developing a Social Psychological Strategy of Deterrence." *Preventive Medicine*, 5:122-140.
- Feagin, J., A. Orum, and G. Sjöberg, eds. 1991. *A Case for Case Study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Goetz, J. P., and M. D. LeCompte 1984. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. London: Academic Press.
- Hamel, J., S. Dufour, and D. Fortin 1993. *Case Study Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jensen, Jason L. and Robert Rodgers 2001. "Cumulating the Intellectual Gold of Case Study Research." *Public Administration Review*, 61(2): 236-246.
- Kazdin, A. E. 1982. *Single-case Research Designs: Methods for Clinical and Applied Settings*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Kennedy, Mary M. 1979. "Generalizing from Single Case Studies." *Evaluation Quarterly*, 3: 661-78.
- Kingdon, John. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Lee, A.S. 1989. "A Scientific Methodology for MIS Case Studies." *MIS Quarterly*, 13:1: 33-52.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review*, 65: 682-93.
- McCurdy, Howard E., and Robert E. Cleary, 1984. "Why Can't We Resolve the Research Issue in Public Administration?" *Public Administration Review*, 44(1): 49-55.
- Merriam, S. B. 1988. *The Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, David L. 2001. *Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Naumes, William, and Margaret J. Naumes 1999. *The Art and Craft of Case Writing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Odel, John S. 2000. "Case Study Methods in International Political Economy." Paper presented at the International Studies Association, 41st Annual Convention, Los Angeles, CA, March 14-18, 2000. Retrieved 4/30/02 online at <http://www.ciaonet.org/isa/odj01/>.
- Pressman, J., and A. B. Wildavsky 1973. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland*. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press.
- Ragin, Charles. 1981. "Comparative Sociology and the Comparative Method." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 22(1-2): 102-120.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ragin, Charles, and David Zaret. 1983. "Theory and Method in Comparative Research: Two Strategies." *Social Forces*, 61(3): 731-754.
- Sabatier, Paul C. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, Paul C., ed. 1999. *Theories of the Policy Process: Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stake, Robert E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin, eds. 1997. *Grounded Theory in Practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- U. S. General Accounting Office. 1990. *Case Study Evaluations*. Washington, DC: USGPO. GAO/PEMD-91-10.1.9.
- Whyte, William F. 1955. *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yin, Robert K. 1994. *Case Study Research*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

G. David Garson is professor of public administration at North Carolina State University, where he specializes in research methodology, geographic information systems, and information technology. His most recent work is *Writing Quantitative Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* (Marcel Dekker, 2001). He may be contacted by e-mail at David_Garson@ncsu.edu.