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A B S T R A C T

Business-to-business marketing research has a long tradition of using qualitative case studies. Industrial Marketing Management (IMM) has actively encouraged the use of case methods, resulting in many important theoretical advances in the field. However, debate still rages over what constitutes “good case research”. This article addresses this issue from a positivist standpoint. We examine the how authors address issues of quality in the 105 qualitative case studies published in IMM between 1971 and 2006. Four periods were identified: 1971–1979, 1980–1989, 1990–1999, and 2000–2006. Findings demonstrate that, from a positivist viewpoint, there has been a steady improvement in how authors addressed issues of research quality in published qualitative case studies. Suggestions for changes in data presentation, reviewer expectations, the IMM reviewer feedback form, and the use of web-based appendices containing data pertinent to reader judgments of research quality are suggested.

© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Industrial marketing research is characterized by the use of qualitative case studies to build theory2 (Dubois & Araujo, 2004, 2007; Easton, 2000; Harrison & Easton, 2004). The value of case studies to business marketing theory is recognized in editorial missions of all three-specialist business-to-business (B2B) marketing journals (IMM, Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, and Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing). Researchers have employed case studies partly because the inherent flexibility of the method suits the study of the complex, evolving relationships and interactions in industrial markets (Dubois & Araujo, 2004).

However, the nature of case quality and its associated practices varies widely (Dubois & Araujo, 2004; Easton, 2000; Harrison & Easton, 2004). Several authors have noted the need for greater sensitivity to quality criteria in business marketing case research to avoid inappropriate practices (Hillebrand, Kok, & Biemans, 2001), including the preferencing of one type of design (multiple cases) over rich, single cases (Dubois & Araujo, 2007). As well, others, desiring greater pluralism in method, have called for greater sensitivity to the epistemological issues underpinning quality criteria in qualitative case research (Easton, 2000; Harrison & Easton, 2004). We respond to these calls (and that of the special issue) by conducting a longitudinal examination of how authors have addressed research quality in Industrial Marketing Management. Besides space considerations, we chose IMM because the journal is recognized as the leading journal in industrial marketing and is a top ten journal by influence within marketing over a thirty-year period (Baumgartner & Pieters, 2003). As such, IMM was judged to provide preeminent examples of case research within the sub-discipline of B2B marketing. We focus on qualitative case studies published between 1971 and 2006. Although sensitive to other traditions such as realism (Easton, 2000), interpretivism (Beverland, 2005) and postmodernism (Rinallo & Golletto, 2006), we focus on case quality from the dominant positivist viewpoint—a summary of case quality criteria from this standpoint is presented in Table 1.

We believe that addressing research quality is important for qualitative case researchers for at least six reasons. First, attention to quality is likely to lead to better practices in the field (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Second, being sensitive to how quality is addressed may result in richer insights and therefore better theory. Third, active debate over research quality is a sign of a healthy research community, and thus will improve the status of the method (Silverman, 2004a). Fourth, having explicit standards of quality will improve the legitimacy of case research, thus improving the status of the B2B field, and potentially increasing the impact of case research. Fifth, such debates can alleviate concerns raised by other researchers over the value of qualitative research (including cases) in marketing (Levy, 2005). Finally, having clear guidelines on how case quality can be addressed is essential for B2B doctoral candidates.
First, we conducted a keyword search (looking for the terms and issues during the period 1971–2006 are covered in Fig. 1. The analysis occurred in three phases. First, we analyzed explicit evidence of quality-related practices. This process was done by both explicit addressed research quality, we analyzed each case for positivist criteria. Second, given that relatively few researchers may have missed. The second period coincided with the publication of a special issue on qualitative methodology in Administrative Science Quarterly (see Van Maanen, 1983 for review), which included several articles addressing case quality. As well, Yin and Miles and Huberman published their books on case studies in 1984. Other influential works including Sage’s Qualitative Research Series (e.g., Kirk & Miller, 1986; McCracken, 1988), Bonoma (1985), Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1983) (among others) were also published during this period. Each of these provided expert guidance on conducting qualitative case research. As well, the so-called “epistemology wars” in marketing occurred during this period (Levy, 2005).

The third period coincided with the publication of three seminal articles on case research between 1989 and 1991 (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991; Eisenhardt, 1989, 1991), two editions of Strauss and Corbin’s sourcebook on qualitative research, Spiggle’s article on data analysis (1994), revised versions of the Handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), Yin (1994) and Miles and Huberman (1994), and an increased acceptance of qualitative research in major marketing journals. The final period reflects several things—the diffusion of the aforementioned two decades of published work on conducting qualitative case research and addressing research quality, the widespread acceptance of qualitative research in marketing, and subsequent increase in trained doctoral candidates using qualitative methods.

3. Findings

It is important to bear several issues in mind when reading the findings section. Since our task involves critically analyzing others’ authors wrote memos on each article, identifying key issues and practices (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Cross-case analysis involved looking for patterns across time. We used four time-periods to guide our analysis: 1971–1979, 1980–1989, 1990–1999, and 2000–20064 (feedback on our interpretation was given via departmental seminars, the guest editors and the two anonymous reviewers of this paper). These periods primarily revolve around the publication of seminal texts on qualitative research, while the first period (1971–1979) represented the founding years of the journal and an era when business researchers had few resources to guide them on qualitative research quality (even classics such as Glaser and Strauss (1967) provide little explicit guidance on quality).

The second period coincided with the publication of a special issue on qualitative methodology in Administrative Science Quarterly (see Van Maanen, 1983 for review), which included several articles addressing case quality. As well, Yin and Miles and Huberman published their books on case studies in 1984. Other influential works including Sage’s Qualitative Research Series (e.g., Kirk & Miller, 1986; McCracken, 1988), Bonoma (1985), Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1983) (among others) were also published during this period. Each of these provided expert guidance on conducting qualitative case research. As well, the so-called “epistemology wars” in marketing occurred during this period (Levy, 2005).

The third period coincided with the publication of three seminal articles on case research between 1989 and 1991 (Dyer & Wilkins, 1991; Eisenhardt, 1989, 1991), two editions of Strauss and Corbin’s sourcebook on qualitative research, Spiggle’s article on data analysis (1994), revised versions of the Handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), Yin (1994) and Miles and Huberman (1994), and an increased acceptance of qualitative research in major marketing journals. The final period reflects several things—the diffusion of the aforementioned two decades of published work on conducting qualitative case research and addressing research quality, the widespread acceptance of qualitative research in marketing, and subsequent increase in trained doctoral candidates using qualitative methods.

3. Findings

It is important to bear several issues in mind when reading the findings section. Since our task involves critically analyzing others’
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### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Test</th>
<th>Theoretical Explanation of the Concept</th>
<th>Operationalized Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct Validity</td>
<td>To secure that correct operational measures have been established for the concepts that are being studied (Yin, 1994).</td>
<td>1. Triangulation through multiple sources of data or interviews. 2. Providing readers with a chain of evidence using cross-case tables or quotes from informants. 3. Allowing interviewees to review the draft case and give feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Validity</td>
<td>To make sure that a causal relationship—certain conditions lead to other conditions—has been established. Internal validity is a concern of explanatory or causal case studies but not for exploratory or descriptive cases that do not attempt to make causal statements (Yin, 1994).</td>
<td>1. Pattern matching through cross-case analysis. 2. Searching for negative cases, ruling out or accounting for alternative explanations. 3. Time series analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Validity</td>
<td>To prove that the domain to which a case study’s findings belong can be generalized (Yin, 1994).</td>
<td>1. Specification of the population of interest. 2. Replication logic in multiple case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Demonstrating that the findings from a case study can be replicated if the case study procedures are followed (Yin, 1994).</td>
<td>1. A standardized interview protocol. 2. Constructs well defined and grounded in extant literature. 3. Providing an audit-trail by providing access to data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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