

Delphi consensus process round 2 questionnaire

Note: Direct output from Qualtrics survey software

OCS delphi round 2 - final

Thank you for your contribution to this work so far. In this second round, you will have the opportunity to agree or disagree with the responses given in Round One, whether you participated in Round One or not. Following from the many helpful comments we received via the initial questionnaire and others submitted to HS&DR, we would like to clarify some aspects of this project and survey: Though NIHR HS&DR initially proposed “a common quality and publication standard for organisational case study research”, the research team anticipated that generic standards for the conduct of organisational case studies would not be feasible. We therefore chose to focus on quality of reporting rather than scientific quality more broadly (i.e. Are there aspects of case study reporting that could facilitate the reading and judgment processes used by peer reviewers and other audiences?) However, if you believe that a reporting standard is also not possible or desirable, there is now the option to make this clear at the beginning of this round. The initial list of reporting items were derived from the published academic literature, using the authors’ own wording wherever possible. The language and paradigmatic assumptions related to each item are likely to reflect the position of the original academic author (e.g. the application of concepts such as ‘validity’ and ‘reliability’ to case study come directly from the publications of Yin). One aim of this consultation is to establish whether there can be any consensus on using items from the published literature to inform reporting standards. As researchers, we have explicitly tried to avoid making any assumptions or judgements about any of the items. This meant including some items that might be considered inappropriate, difficult to understand, not meaningful, or concerned more with methodology than reporting. We anticipated such items to be poorly rated in the consultation, and this seems to have broadly been the case in Round One. We have no prior view on the length or content of any future reporting standard that might derive from this work. Just ten of the 112 items from round one met the consensus threshold, and most of these relate to good practice for reporting research in general.

In this round, the items will again be presented grouped into the following sections:

- Describing the design · Background, context and theory
- Describing the data collection · Describing the data analysis
- Interpreting the results · Sharing the results and conclusions

Within each section, you will be asked to rate two types of item: 1. Items that were initially rated as “Essential” by over 70% of respondents in Round One; 2. “Non-essential” items that failed to meet this threshold. These items have been ordered by the ratio of positive to negative responses (i.e. (Essential+Desirable)/Not necessary), in decreasing order of positivity. A major issue that was anticipated is the tension between items that can be applied to organisational case studies in general, and those that only apply to a specific paradigm or context. Items may be appropriate to some types of case study and not others. Indeed, this was picked up by the ratings and comments in Round One. In this round, there is the opportunity to distinguish between items that should be reported for organisational case studies in general, those that should be reported for a particular approach, and those that do not need to be reported. At this stage, the “Does not need to be reported” option should be used to capture any items that cannot be said to comfortably satisfy either of the first two options. Therefore, any items you consider to be inappropriate, unintelligible, irrelevant, or unrelated to reporting should be marked “Does not need to be reported”. This second questionnaire should take about 30 minutes to complete, and responses should be submitted by 5pm (UK time) on Monday 30th March.

Did you take part in round 1 of this Delphi exercise?

- Yes
- No

Do you think that a publication standard for reporting organisational case studies is desirable?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- No opinion
- Other _____

Do you think that a meaningful publication standard for reporting organisational case studies is possible?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- No opinion
- Other _____

Describing the design: "Essential" items Over 70% of respondents in round 1 rated the following three items as 'essential' for describing the design of an organisational case study. Please state whether you agree that these items should be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies.

Define the research as a case study (74% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

State the broad aims of the study (84% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

State the research question(s)/hypotheses (79% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Describing the design: "Non-essential" items 24 items for describing the design of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential items to be included in a generic reporting standard (i.e. "should be reported...") for organisational case studies, or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. "Does not need to be reported").

Describe why case study is the appropriate method (18.0)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Define the policy relevance (18.0)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify the purpose of the case study (e.g. exploratory, explanatory, evaluative, intrinsic, instrumental) (18.0)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify the process(es) (18.0) (e.g. single or multiple/collective, embedded/nested, parallel, sequential, retrospective, cross-sectional, longitudinal)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify the specific case(s) and justify the selection (18.0)e.g. Key case (good example; classic or exemplary case); Outlier case (showing something interesting

because it is different from the norm); Local knowledge case (example chosen on the basis of personal experience)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe setting/context (physical, economic, historical, cultural, aesthetic) surrounding the case (18.0)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify the broad approach(es) (8.5) e.g. Testing a theory; Building a theory; Illustrative; Descriptive; Interpretive; Experimental

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Define the case broadly (8.5)e.g. in a case study of “neighbouring” the case might be defined as either a group of neighbours (people) or as a geographical neighbourhood (place)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Show a prior appreciation of the theoretical issues and setting(s) (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Acknowledge the potential conflicts between the needs and interests of any sponsoring organizations and the requirements of the research objectives. Show judgment to ensure that an appropriate balance between these is maintained (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State the implications of the resources available to the researcher (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the boundaries of the case (3.75) i.e. distinguish the subject of the case study (the “phenomenon”) from external data to the case (the “context”). Spatial, temporal, and other concrete boundaries should be considered. Abstractions (e.g. the concept of ‘neighbouring’) cannot be considered a case.

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the resolution of etic and emic issues in developing the research question. (3.75) (Etic issues are brought in from the researcher from outside; emic issues emerge from inside the case. As the researcher begins to integrate etic and emic, the research question(s) evolves)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe how the final research question(s) was developed and refined from the broad prima facie question(s) (2.80)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Report "Progressive focusing" i.e. if early research questions are not helping to thoroughly understand the case, or if new issues become apparent, describe how this changed the research questions (2.80)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Specify the need for recommendations (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Offer some evidence to the audience that the heterogeneity of the sample of cases is representative of the heterogeneity of the target population (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Include "issue questions" or "issue statements" when describing the research question. (2.17) ("Issues" identify one or more aspects of the situation or circumstance surrounding the case, in order to frame the inquiry)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Mention any rival cases that were considered (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State the deliverables required (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Present the case study protocol and describe how it was used (1.11)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the likely burden and risks associated with participation for those who (or the site(s) which) comprise the case study (1.11)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe some early assessments of progress to see if the case should be dropped and another selected (1.11)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Background, context, and theory: “Non-essential items” All 11 items for describing the background, context and theory of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential

items to be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies (i.e. “should be reported...”), or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. “Does not need to be reported”).

Outline the conceptual structure (i.e. themes or issues) (38.0)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Report the findings of a thorough literature review (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the theory, propositions and related issues developed to guide the case study and to generalise its findings (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Outline the (logical) connection between the research question(s) and the data collected (8.50)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Define the logic linking the data to the propositions (i.e. what kind of analytic techniques were used) (8.50)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe any other preparatory research components (e.g. expert interviews, expert workshop) (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Report whether a pilot case study has been conducted (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Define the criteria for interpreting the findings (3.75) i.e. explicitly consider rival explanations (theories) at the outset, to guide decisions about which data should be collected, unless using grounded theory

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

For purely exploratory studies without any initial propositions, state a purpose and the criteria by which the exploration is judged successful or not (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State which of the variables being investigated are hypothesized to be most important for explaining the phenomenon (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe whether a range of experts were consulted during the final stages of developing the conceptual framework and report the findings of this consultation (1.38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describing the data collection: “Essential items” Over 70% of respondents in round 1 rated the following three items as “essential” for describing the collection of data in an organisational case study. Please state whether you agree that these items should be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies.

Describe how data were collected (95% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Describe the sources of evidence used (95% rated "Essential") e.g. Documentation; Archival records; Interviews; Direct observations; Participant-observation; Physical artefacts

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Describe any ethical considerations and obtainment of relevant approvals, access and permissions (79% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Describing the data collection: “Non-essential items” 10 items for describing the background, context and theory of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential items to be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies (i.e. “should be reported.”);, or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. “Does not need to be reported”);).

Describe the data collection tool(s) (e.g. questionnaire or observation protocol, including a description of any piloting or field testing of the tool) (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the likely impact of the researcher on events and the behaviour of participants at the case study site, and the researcher's own beliefs, values and prior assumptions (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the observation plan and how it was developed (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe how the data were coded (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe whether the data provided an “up close” and “in-depth” coverage of the case (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Search for data until saturation is reached, that is, the evidence becomes redundant, with no new information (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe data protection measures (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State whether a comprehensive case study database, in which the raw data can be inspected (including notes, documents, tables and narratives) is available to readers (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

List evidence sources in order of importance; give further details about specific items within each source (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State that all the evidence was examined (1.38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describing the data analysis: “Essential” items Over 70% of respondents in round 1 rated the following item as “essential”; for describing the analysis of an organisational case study. Please state whether you agree that these items should be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies.

Describe the analysis methods (90% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Describing the data analysis: “Non-essential items”; 18 items for describing the background, context and theory of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential items to be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies (i.e. “should be reported...”), or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. “Does not need to be reported”).

State whether an inductive (e.g. grounded) or deductive (e.g. hypothesis testing / theoretical framework) approach to the analysis has been taken (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Present raw data (including illustrative quotes) where necessary (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe how promising patterns, insights and concepts were identified (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Address the concept of external validity (8.5)(i.e. defining the domain to which a study’s findings can be generalised)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the analytic approach in detail (5.33) e.g. Pattern matching; Explanation building; Time-series analysis; Logic models; Cross-case synthesis.

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify software and describe how it was used (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Address the concept of internal validity [in explanatory or causal studies] (5.33)(i.e. establishing a causal relationship, whereby certain conditions are believed to lead to other conditions, as distinguished from spurious relationships)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe how triangulation was carried out, especially in confirming and disconfirming major assertions (5.33) e.g. data triangulation (validation); investigator triangulation; theory triangulation; methodological triangulation

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Outline a chain of evidence that allows the reader to follow the derivation of any evidence from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions, via the collected data (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Discuss plausible rival explanations for the observed data (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Describe the criteria used to maintain the overall quality of a case study (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

In collective case studies, describe analysis of data relating to the individual component cases first, before making comparisons across cases (2.80)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Structure the reporting of the analysis around the research questions (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Omit secondary data that is not essential for understanding and evaluating the case study analysis (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Address the concept of construct validity (2.17) (i.e. identifying correct operational measures for the concepts being studied)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Present data in tabular form to summarise and compress data (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Address the concept of reliability (1.71)(i.e. demonstrating that the operations of a study can be repeated with the same results)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Array and display data in different ways (1.11)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Interpreting the results: “Essential items” Over 70% of respondents in round 1 rated the following three items as “essential” for interpreting the results of an organisational case study. Please state whether you agree that these items should be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies.

Describe any inherent shortcomings in the design and analysis and how these might have influenced the findings (79% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Consider the appropriateness of methods used for the question and subject matter and why it was that qualitative methods were appropriate(79% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Discuss the data analysis (i.e. was it conducted in a systematic way and was it successful in incorporating all observations and dealing with variation) (74% rated "Essential")

- I agree, this should be reported for all organisational case studies
- I disagree, this should only be reported for the following specific type of organisational case study: _____
- I disagree, this does not need to be reported

Interpreting the results: “Non-essential items” 11 items for describing the background, context and theory of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential items to be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies (i.e. “should be reported..”), or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. “Does not need to be reported”).

Draw attention to any discrepant data / evidence that complicates emerging understanding (38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Ensure that the assertions are sound, neither over- nor under-interpreting the data (38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

State any caveats about the study (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Discuss the sampling (or case selection) and explanation of sampling strategy (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Discuss the worth and relevance of the research (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Display enough evidence for the reader to reach their own conclusions (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Use description to provide the reader with a "vicarious experience", or a sense of being there in person, and to enable understanding of the experience from the informants' perspectives. (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Outline the researcher's perspective and relationship to the case(s). The audience needs to understand researcher's role and perspective to accept findings (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Ensure the account is reflexive i.e. "Sensitivity to the ways in which the researcher and research process have shaped the data collection" and provision of sufficient information of research process for readers to judge (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Discuss the representativeness of data - incorporate all shades of opinion (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Provide enough raw data prior to interpretation for readers to consider their own alternative interpretations (1.71)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Sharing the results and conclusions: “Non-essential” items All 17 items for describing the background, context and theory of an organisational case study failed to meet 70% consensus in round 1. These items are ranked below in decreasing order of popularity (positive/negative rating ratio is given in parentheses). Please state whether you believe any of these items should be upgraded to become essential items to be included in a generic reporting standard for organisational case studies (i.e. “should be reported...”), or remain excluded from the reporting standard (i.e. “Does not need to be reported”).

Identify the researcher position. If the researcher has a close relationship or a past history with the case being studied, this information should be made transparent (38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Publish the report (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Disseminate to scientific (exploratory and explanatory case studies) and policy audiences (exploratory and example case studies) (18)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Aim for a thoughtful, balanced, and transparent tone of reporting (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Ensure the report is easy to read (8.5)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Aim for a sense of story to the presentation (5.33)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Be very clear about the research outcomes and how the organization(s) will benefit from involvement (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Explicitly consider the most appropriate overall reporting structure(3.75) e.g. Linear-analytic; Comparative; Chronological; Theory-building; “Suspense”; Unsequenced; A chronological or biographical development of the case; A researcher’s view of coming to know the case; Description one-by-one of several major components of the case

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Acknowledge revision of the report taking account of feedback from stakeholders (3.75)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Define the intended audience (2.80)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Report checking ideas and explanations with those in the culture (e.g. organization) (2.80)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Identify the relevant stakeholders (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Where possible have informants / participants review the draft report (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Be reflective and have feedback workshops with on site collaborators to "road test" early formulations (2.17)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Think about narrative dramaturgically i.e. in terms of actors, roles and stages (1.38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Consult with a range of experts with diverse points of view during after drafting conclusions (1.38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

Include the reactions of data sources (and other prospective readers) to the accounts (1.38)

- Should be reported for all organisational case studies
- Should be reported for the following type of organisational case study:

- Does not need to be reported

That is the end of the rating section for this round of the Delphi exercise. All responses are anonymous. In order to assist in ensuring we have an appropriate range and distribution of respondents, we ask you to provide the following information in relation to your primary role/interest:

Designation

- Health, education, or social care practitioner
- Policy maker
- Commissioner / funder of research
- Researcher
- Research methodologist
- Journal editor / board member / involved in publishing
- Other _____

Main area(s) of research interest related to organisational case studies

How many organisational case studies have you authored?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- >10

How many organisational case studies have you been involved with other than as an author? (e.g. peer review; commissioning; advisory role)

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- >10

What proportion of your work relates to research methodology?

- 0
- 1-40%
- 41-60%
- >60%