

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

Vighnarajah, S.

Faculty of Education, Open University Malaysia, Malaysia

ABSTRACT: Qualitative case study is widely employed across disciplines to investigate contemporary phenomena within their real-life contexts. Despite its growing popularity, novice researchers frequently encounter conceptual misunderstandings that undermine the methodological coherence of their studies. Common misconceptions include confusing the research topic with the case, inadequately defining the boundaries of a case, overlooking the significance of context, relying on a single source of evidence, and applying quantitative notions of statistical generalisation to qualitative case study research. This paper provides an overview of six key concepts that underpin qualitative case study, namely the nature of the case, bounded systems, case selection, context, multiple sources of evidence, and the generalisation of findings. Drawing upon established methodological literature, each concept is explained through practical examples while addressing common misconceptions encountered in postgraduate research. Rather than presenting procedural steps for conducting qualitative case studies, the paper aims to strengthen conceptual understanding of the methodological principles that distinguish qualitative case study from other qualitative approaches. By clarifying these fundamental concepts, the paper seeks to support novice researchers in designing more coherent, rigorous, and contextually grounded qualitative case studies and to serve as a practical reference for research supervision and methodology courses.

KEYWORDS: Qualitative, Case study, Contextual Inquiry, Bounded system, Unit of analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Qualitative case study has become one of the most widely employed research approaches across disciplines, particularly in education, business, healthcare, and the social sciences. Its ability to facilitate an in-depth investigation of contemporary phenomena within their real-life contexts makes it especially suitable for examining complex issues where the phenomenon and its context are closely intertwined. Consequently, qualitative case study has been widely adopted to investigate educational innovations, organisational practices, policy implementation, professional experiences, and community-based initiatives.

Despite its widespread application, qualitative case study continues to be interpreted in different ways within the methodological literature. Recent methodological discussions continue to refine the application of qualitative case study across disciplines while reaffirming its emphasis on context, boundedness, and in-depth inquiry (Harrison et al., 2017; Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2022). While scholars generally agree that it provides an in-depth understanding of a bounded case situated within its real-life context, they differ in their philosophical orientations, methodological assumptions, and conceptual emphases. These diverse perspectives have enriched the development of qualitative case study research but have also contributed to varying interpretations of several fundamental concepts, including the nature of the case, bounded systems, context, and the use of multiple sources of evidence.

As the application of qualitative case study continues to expand across disciplines, a clear understanding of its underlying concepts has become increasingly important. This paper provides an overview of six key concepts that underpin qualitative case study, namely the nature of the case, bounded systems, case selection, context, multiple sources of evidence, and the generalisation of findings. In addition, common misconceptions associated with these concepts are discussed to promote greater conceptual clarity in qualitative case study research.

Instead of presenting procedural steps for conducting qualitative case studies, this paper focuses on the conceptual foundations that distinguish qualitative case study from other qualitative approaches. By clarifying these key concepts, it seeks to provide a concise methodological overview that supports a more coherent understanding of qualitative case study research.

II. IDENTIFYING A CASE

The concept of the case lies at the centre of qualitative case study research. Although the term is widely used in methodological literature, its meaning is often interpreted differently, leading to varying conceptualisations of what constitutes a case. A clear understanding of this concept is therefore essential, as the identification of the case influences the scope, boundaries, and overall design of the study.

A case is not synonymous with the research topic or phenomenon under investigation. Rather, it refers to the specific unit of analysis through which a phenomenon is explored. The phenomenon represents the issue or process of interest, whereas the case is the bounded entity within which that phenomenon is examined. Depending on the purpose of the study, the case may comprise an individual, a group, an organisation, a programme, a community, an event, or another clearly identifiable entity situated within its real-life context.

This distinction is consistently reflected in the methodological literature. Stake (1995) describes a case as a specific, bounded, and functioning system, while Merriam and Tisdell (2016) define qualitative case study as an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system. Similarly, Yin (2018) characterises case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-world context, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident. Although these perspectives differ in their philosophical orientations and methodological emphases, they converge in recognising the case as the primary unit of investigation rather than the phenomenon itself.

A common misconception in qualitative case study research is to define the phenomenon itself as the case. Concepts such as teacher motivation, inclusive education, online learning, or generative artificial intelligence are frequently presented as cases when they more appropriately represent the phenomena under investigation. This distinction is not merely semantic. Misidentifying the phenomenon as the case may obscure the unit of analysis and create ambiguity in subsequent methodological decisions, including the identification of boundaries, case selection, participant recruitment, sources of evidence, and the interpretation of findings. Distinguishing the case from the phenomenon is therefore fundamental, as it establishes the conceptual basis upon which qualitative case study research is designed and conducted.

For example, consider a researcher interested in the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) for lesson planning. It would be conceptually inaccurate to identify GenAI as the case because GenAI represents the phenomenon being investigated rather than the unit of analysis. Likewise, defining the case simply as teachers' use of GenAI or lesson planning remains insufficient, as these describe the phenomenon but do not identify the bounded entity through which it is examined. Instead, the case should refer to a specific, identifiable unit of investigation, such as a secondary school implementing GenAI-supported lesson planning, a faculty of education integrating GenAI into teacher preparation, or a cohort of beginning teachers adopting GenAI in their first year of professional practice. Although the phenomenon remains constant across these examples, the case differs according to the organisational setting, contextual conditions, and unit of analysis. Consequently, the research questions, participant selection, sources of evidence, and interpretation of findings would vary depending on the case selected.

III. UNIT OF ANALYSIS

Among the methodological decisions in qualitative case study research, identifying the unit of analysis is one of the most conceptually important yet frequently misunderstood. Although researchers often define the case, they do not always explicitly identify what is being analysed within that case. As a result, the unit of analysis is frequently conflated with the case itself, the phenomenon under investigation, or even the study participants. Such ambiguity may result in inconsistencies between the research questions, case definition, participant selection, data collection, and interpretation of findings. A clearly articulated unit of analysis is therefore essential for maintaining methodological coherence throughout the study.

The methodological literature consistently recognises the unit of analysis as a defining element of case study research. Yin (2018) describes the unit of analysis as the entity to which the research questions and subsequent analyses are directed, whereas Stake (1995) conceptualises the case as the bounded system that provides the focus of inquiry. Although these concepts are closely related, they perform different methodological functions. The case establishes the boundaries within which the investigation is conducted, whereas the unit of analysis determines what is actually analysed within those boundaries. Consequently, the case answers the question, "*Where is the phenomenon being investigated?*" whereas the unit of analysis answers, "*What is being analysed within that case?*" Distinguishing these two concepts is fundamental because the unit of analysis determines how evidence is organised, analysed, interpreted, and ultimately presented.

The unit of analysis is determined by the purpose of the study and the nature of the research questions rather than by the availability of participants or the methods used to collect data. In some qualitative case studies, the case and the unit of analysis are identical. For example, a study investigating the leadership practices of a single school principal may define the principal as

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

both the bounded case and the unit of analysis. In many studies, however, the two concepts differ. Consider a study exploring the implementation of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) within a secondary school. If the research questions seek to understand how the school implements GenAI as an organisational initiative, the school remains both the case and the primary unit of analysis. However, if the research questions focus on teachers' experiences of implementing GenAI within the same school, the school continues to function as the bounded case, while teachers become the unit of analysis because the analysis is directed towards understanding their experiences within that context. Although the case remains unchanged, the unit of analysis shifts according to the analytical focus of the investigation.

Table I Components of unit of analysis

Component	Role in Qualitative Case Study	Example
Phenomenon	What is being investigated	Implementation of GenAI
Case	The bounded entity	Secondary School X
Unit of Analysis	What is analysed	School implementation processes
Participants	Sources of evidence	Teachers, school leaders, ICT coordinators

An equally important distinction should be made between the unit of analysis and participants. Participants are selected because they possess knowledge, experiences, or perspectives relevant to the unit of analysis; they do not necessarily constitute the unit of analysis themselves. For example, when organisational implementation is the unit of analysis, teachers, school leaders, students, and institutional documents may all contribute evidence that explains how the school implements GenAI. These sources provide different perspectives on the same analytical entity rather than representing separate units of analysis. Consequently, increasing the number of participants enriches the evidence available to the researcher but does not alter the unit of analysis or transform a single-case study into a multiple-case design.

A recurring misunderstanding is that the unit of analysis is determined by the number of participants or the volume of data collected. Such assumptions reflect quantitative notions of sampling rather than the methodological principles of qualitative case study research. The unit of analysis is established through the research questions and the methodological design, not through sample size. A clearly defined unit of analysis therefore provides the conceptual bridge between the case, the phenomenon, the sources of evidence, and the analytical procedures, ensuring that every component of the study remains aligned with the overall purpose of the inquiry.

IV. BOUNDED SYSTEM

A defining characteristic of qualitative case study research is that the case constitutes a bounded system. The concept of boundedness extends beyond merely identifying the setting in which a study is conducted. Rather, boundedness is established through the methodological decisions that define the scope of inquiry and determine the unit of analysis. In other words, it is not the physical limits of a setting alone that define a bounded system, but the conceptual and contextual boundaries that distinguish the case from the broader phenomenon under investigation. These boundaries specify what is included within the study, what falls outside its scope, and the context within which the case is interpreted. Consequently, boundedness is not merely a descriptive characteristic of qualitative case study but a fundamental methodological principle that enables the researcher to investigate a case as a coherent, identifiable, and analytically manageable unit.

The notion of a bounded system is consistently emphasised within the case study literature. Stake (1995) conceptualises a case as a bounded and integrated system, while Merriam and Tisdell (2016) describe boundedness as the defining feature that differentiates case study from other qualitative approaches. Similarly, Yin (2018) argues that a case must represent a contemporary phenomenon situated within a clearly defined real-world context. Although these perspectives differ in their philosophical orientations, they converge in recognising that a case cannot exist independently of its boundaries. Without clearly established boundaries, researchers are unable to determine what constitutes the case, where the case begins and ends, or which contextual elements should be included in the investigation.

Boundaries may be established in several ways depending on the nature and purpose of the study. They may be defined by place, such as a school, university, organisation, or community; by time, such as a semester, an academic year, or a specific implementation period; by programme or event, such as the introduction of a new curriculum or professional development initiative; or by individuals or groups whose experiences constitute the focus of the inquiry. In many qualitative case studies, these

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

boundaries overlap to create a clearly delimited unit of analysis. The purpose of establishing such boundaries is not to restrict the richness of the investigation but to ensure that the inquiry remains conceptually coherent and methodologically manageable.

A recurring misunderstanding is to assume that identifying a research site automatically establishes a bounded case. For example, describing the case simply as *teachers in School X* does not necessarily define the boundaries of the investigation. Important questions remain unanswered. Which teachers are included? During what period? Within which programme, initiative, or organisational context? What distinguishes this case from similar settings? Unless these boundaries are explicitly articulated, the case remains insufficiently defined and risks becoming a broad qualitative inquiry rather than a qualitative case study. Clearly established boundaries therefore provide the methodological basis for subsequent research decisions, including case selection, participant recruitment, data collection, and the interpretation of findings.

V. SELECTING A CASE

Case selection is a fundamental methodological decision in qualitative case study research because it determines the context through which the phenomenon will be investigated. Unlike quantitative research, where samples are often selected to achieve statistical representativeness, qualitative case study seeks to identify a case that can provide an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon within its real-life context. Consequently, the selection of a case is guided not by its ability to represent a population but by its potential to generate meaningful and contextually grounded insights. A carefully selected case enables researchers to examine the complexity of a phenomenon as it unfolds within a specific setting, thereby contributing to a richer understanding of the issue under investigation.

The methodological literature presents different perspectives on case selection. Stake (1995) distinguishes between intrinsic, instrumental, and collective case studies according to the purpose of the investigation, whereas Yin (2018) proposes several rationales for selecting cases, including critical, unusual, common, revelatory, and longitudinal cases. Although these classifications differ in terminology and emphasis, they share a common methodological principle: a case should be selected because it is capable of illuminating the phenomenon under investigation. Case selection is therefore a purposeful process in which the researcher establishes a clear methodological rationale for why a particular case is appropriate for addressing the research objectives.

The suitability of a case depends on the knowledge it is capable of generating rather than on its convenience or accessibility. A case may be selected because it represents a typical situation, exhibits unique characteristics, provides access to a previously unexplored phenomenon, or offers an opportunity to examine an issue of particular theoretical or practical significance. The objective is not to identify the "best" case but to justify why the selected case provides the most appropriate context for investigating the phenomenon of interest.

For example, a researcher investigating the implementation of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in teaching may purposefully select a school that has formally adopted institutional AI guidelines rather than one where AI use remains informal or experimental. Such a case is more likely to provide meaningful insights into how organisational policies, leadership support, and teacher practices interact during implementation. Similarly, a newly established mentoring programme may be selected because it offers an opportunity to examine how participants experience and respond to an educational initiative during its initial stages. In both examples, the methodological justification lies not in the accessibility of the case but in its capacity to generate rich understanding of the phenomenon within its natural context.

An important distinction should also be made between case selection and participant selection, as the two concepts are frequently conflated. Case selection concerns the identification of the bounded unit of analysis, whereas participant selection occurs only after the case has been established and involves identifying individuals who can provide relevant information about that case. Consequently, participants are selected because they possess knowledge or experience of the case, not because they constitute the case itself. Recognising this distinction enhances methodological coherence and ensures that the unit of analysis remains clearly aligned with the purpose of the qualitative case study.

VI. SINGLE-CASE AND MULTIPLE-CASE DESIGNS

An important methodological decision in qualitative case study research concerns whether the investigation should adopt a single-case or multiple-case design. This decision should be determined by the purpose of the study rather than by assumptions regarding sample size or methodological rigour. Both designs are well established within the case study literature and are capable of producing rich and meaningful insights when appropriately aligned with the research objectives.

A single-case design focuses on one bounded case that is examined in depth within its real-life context. According to Yin (2018), a single case may be justified because it represents a critical, unusual, revelatory, or longitudinal case, or because it provides a unique opportunity to investigate a phenomenon that cannot be adequately understood through broader comparisons. Similarly,

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

Stake (1995) argues that a single case may be selected because of its intrinsic value or because it provides an opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of a particular issue. The strength of a single-case design therefore lies in the depth and richness of the investigation rather than in the number of cases examined.

In contrast, a multiple-case design involves the investigation of two or more bounded cases within the same study. Each case is examined individually before comparisons are made across cases to identify similarities, differences, or recurring patterns. Yin (2018) emphasises that the purpose of a multiple-case design is not to increase sample size but to strengthen the robustness of findings through analytical replication. Consequently, each case should be selected because it contributes meaningfully to the research purpose rather than because additional cases are assumed to improve methodological quality.

Within both single-case and multiple-case designs, researchers may adopt either a holistic or an embedded approach. A holistic design examines the case as a single unit of analysis, whereas an embedded design investigates one case through multiple units of analysis. For example, a study exploring digital transformation within a university may treat the university as a single holistic case. Alternatively, the same university may remain the case while individual faculties, academic departments, or administrative units constitute embedded units of analysis. Importantly, the inclusion of multiple units of analysis does not automatically transform a single-case study into a multiple-case study, as the overarching case remains unchanged.

A frequent source of confusion is the assumption that increasing the number of organisations, participants, or research sites automatically strengthens a qualitative case study. Such reasoning reflects quantitative assumptions regarding sample size rather than the methodological principles underpinning case study research. The distinction between a case and a participant is therefore critical. Interviewing twenty participants within one school does not create twenty cases; rather, it provides multiple perspectives on a single bounded case. Likewise, investigating several schools does not necessarily constitute a multiple-case study unless each school is explicitly conceptualised, bounded, and analysed as a distinct case. The methodological decision should therefore focus on the nature of the case and the purpose of the inquiry, rather than on the number of participants or settings included in the study.

Table II Types of Case Study Designs

Design	Description	Example
Single holistic case	One case, one unit of analysis	One secondary school implementing GenAI
Single embedded case	One case, multiple units of analysis	One university with faculties as embedded units
Multiple holistic cases	Several distinct cases, each analysed as a whole	Three secondary schools implementing GenAI
Multiple embedded cases	Several cases, each with multiple embedded units	Three universities, each with faculties as embedded units

VII. CONTEXT

Context is an essential characteristic of qualitative case study research because it provides the conditions within which a phenomenon is understood and interpreted. Unlike research approaches that seek to isolate variables or minimise contextual influences, qualitative case study recognises that phenomena are inseparable from the settings in which they occur. Consequently, understanding a case requires careful consideration of the contextual factors that shape participants' experiences, interactions, and actions. Context therefore extends beyond the physical setting of the study and forms an integral component of the case itself.

The significance of context is consistently emphasised within the methodological literature. Yin (2018) describes case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-world context, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident. Similarly, Stake (1995) argues that a case can only be understood through careful examination of the circumstances surrounding it, while Merriam and Tisdell (2016) maintain that meaning is constructed through interactions within particular social, organisational, and cultural contexts. Collectively, these perspectives position context not as an external influence on the case but as an integral element of its interpretation.

Context may encompass organisational structures, institutional policies, historical developments, leadership practices, cultural norms, available resources, interpersonal relationships, and other environmental conditions that shape the phenomenon under investigation. These contextual factors rarely operate independently; rather, they interact to influence how participants perceive,

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

experience, and respond to events within the case. Consequently, similar phenomena may manifest differently across cases because they are embedded within different contextual conditions.

For example, two secondary schools may implement the same generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) initiative to support lesson planning. Although both schools adopt identical technologies, differences in leadership commitment, institutional policies, teacher readiness, professional development opportunities, and organisational culture may result in substantially different implementation processes and outcomes. Examining the technology alone would provide only a partial understanding of the phenomenon. It is the interaction between the phenomenon and its context that enables researchers to explain why similar initiatives produce different experiences across cases.

A frequent source of misunderstanding is to regard context as merely descriptive background information presented at the beginning of a study. In qualitative case study research, however, context serves a methodological rather than simply descriptive function. It provides the interpretive lens through which evidence is understood, and findings are explained. Consequently, contextual information should be integrated throughout data collection, analysis, and interpretation, allowing the researcher to develop a coherent explanation of how and why the phenomenon unfolds within the particular case under investigation.

VIII. MULTIPLE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

The use of multiple sources of evidence is a defining characteristic of qualitative case study research. Because case studies seek to develop an in-depth understanding of a bounded case situated within its real-life context, no single source of evidence is usually sufficient to capture the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation. Instead, a qualitative case study draws upon different forms of evidence to construct a comprehensive and contextually grounded understanding of the case. The integration of multiple sources therefore strengthens the completeness and depth of the investigation rather than simply increasing the quantity of data collected.

The methodological literature consistently recognises multiple sources of evidence as a fundamental feature of case study research. Yin (2018) identifies the use of diverse evidence as one of the major strengths of case study methodology because it enables researchers to examine a phenomenon from different perspectives. Similarly, Stake (1995) advocates the collection of varied forms of evidence to develop a holistic understanding of the case, while Baxter and Jack (2008) emphasise that combining different sources contributes to a more comprehensive interpretation of the phenomenon. Collectively, these perspectives suggest that no single source of evidence can adequately represent the complexity of a qualitative case.

The selection of evidence should therefore be guided by the research purpose, the nature of the case, and the phenomenon under investigation. Depending on the objectives of the study, evidence may be derived from interviews, observations, documents, archival records, field notes, photographs, artefacts, digital materials, or other relevant sources. These sources should not be viewed as independent datasets but as complementary forms of evidence that collectively contribute to understanding the case. Consequently, the value of multiple sources lies in their ability to reveal different dimensions of the same phenomenon rather than to duplicate information obtained from one another.

For example, a qualitative case study investigating the implementation of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in a secondary school may draw upon interviews with teachers and school leaders, classroom observations, institutional AI guidelines, and lesson plans. Each source contributes a different perspective on the same case. Interviews provide insight into participants' experiences, observations capture actual classroom practices, institutional documents explain organisational expectations, and lesson plans demonstrate how GenAI is integrated into teaching. Considered together, these complementary sources provide a more comprehensive understanding of the case than any single source of evidence alone.

A common misconception is that multiple sources of evidence are employed primarily to achieve triangulation or to satisfy methodological expectations. Although triangulation is often presented as a strategy for enhancing the credibility or trustworthiness of qualitative findings, this view can be overly narrow if it reduces multiple data sources to a technical validation tool. In qualitative case study research, the principal purpose of using multiple sources is more fundamentally epistemological: it is to facilitate a holistic, contextually embedded understanding of the case as a complex and bounded system. This means that different forms of evidence are not simply used to confirm one another, but to illuminate different dimensions of the phenomenon that would remain partially or entirely invisible if only a single source were used. Researchers should therefore select evidence because it contributes meaningfully to explaining the phenomenon within its context, not simply because methodological conventions recommend the use of multiple methods. In qualitative case study research, the strength of the evidence lies not in the number of sources employed but in the extent to which they collectively illuminate the complexity of the case.

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

IX. GENERALISATION OF FINDINGS

The generalisation of findings remains one of the most widely discussed aspects of qualitative case study research. Questions are frequently raised regarding the extent to which findings derived from a single case may contribute beyond the specific context in which the study was conducted. Such discussions often arise because qualitative case study is evaluated using assumptions associated with quantitative research, particularly those relating to statistical representativeness.

Table III Summary of Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

Concept	Defining Characteristic	Common Misconception
Case	Unit of analysis	A case is the research topic
Bounded system	Clearly defined limits	A research site alone defines the case
Case selection	Purposeful selection	Convenience is sufficient justification
Context	Integral to interpretation	Context is merely background information
Multiple sources of evidence	Holistic understanding	Interviews alone constitute a case study
Generalisation	Analytical generalisation and transferability	Findings cannot extend beyond the case

Methodological scholars consistently distinguish qualitative case study from approaches that seek statistical generalisation. Yin (2018) argues that case study contributes through analytical generalisation, whereby findings are used to develop, refine, or extend existing theoretical propositions rather than to estimate population characteristics. Similarly, Stake (1995) emphasises that readers derive meaning from case studies through recognition and interpretation of similarities with other situations, while Lincoln and Guba (1985) introduce the concept of transferability, whereby readers determine the applicability of findings to other contexts based on the richness of the contextual description provided by the researcher. Although these perspectives differ in emphasis, they share the view that the value of qualitative case study lies in the depth and significance of the insights generated rather than in statistical representativeness.

Therefore, the contribution of qualitative case study extends beyond the individual case itself. A well-designed case study may enhance conceptual understanding, illustrate the application of theoretical ideas, reveal previously unrecognised relationships, or provide insights into complex processes occurring within particular contexts. These contributions enable researchers and practitioners to reflect on similar situations and consider how the findings may inform future research, policy, or professional practice. For example, a qualitative case study examining the implementation of an inclusive education policy in a single school does not claim that identical experiences will occur in all schools. Nevertheless, the study may identify organisational conditions, leadership practices, or implementation challenges that contribute to a broader understanding of inclusive education in comparable educational settings. Readers are then able to judge the relevance of these insights to their own contexts by considering the similarities and differences between the reported case and their own circumstances.

A common misconception is that findings from qualitative case study cannot be generalised because they are derived from a single case. Such a view overlooks the distinctive contribution of qualitative inquiry. Rather than seeking universal conclusions, qualitative case study generates contextually grounded knowledge that may inform theory, practice, and future investigations. Consequently, the significance of a qualitative case study should be evaluated according to the richness of its insights, the transparency of its methodological procedures, and the clarity with which the relationship between the case and its context is presented.

X. CONCLUSIONS

Qualitative case study has become an established methodological approach for investigating complex phenomena within their real-life contexts. Despite its widespread application, several of its defining characteristics continue to be interpreted differently within the methodological literature, contributing to conceptual ambiguity regarding the nature of the case, bounded systems, case selection, context, multiple sources of evidence, and the generalisation of findings. A clear understanding of these concepts is essential, as they collectively distinguish qualitative case study from other qualitative approaches and provide the methodological foundation upon which rigorous case study research is developed.

This paper has presented an overview of six key concepts that underpin qualitative case study while clarifying common misconceptions associated with each concept. Rather than proposing new methodological procedures, it has synthesised

Qualitative Case Study Research: Key Concepts and Common Misconceptions

established perspectives from the case study literature to promote greater conceptual clarity and methodological coherence. It is anticipated that the discussions presented in this paper will contribute to a more consistent understanding of qualitative case study and serve as a useful reference for researchers, research supervisors, and methodology educators across disciplines.

REFERENCES

- 1) Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- 2) Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- 3) Hamilton, L., & Corbett-Whittier, C. (2022). *Using case study in education research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- 4) Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 18(1), Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-18.1.2655>
- 5) Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- 6) Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- 7) Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications.
- 8) Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.