

# Differences between American and Swedish cases – a study of how case studies can differ

Thomas Andersson

Halmstad University, SWEDEN

E-mail: thoand14@hh.se

**ABSTRACT:** This study aims to explore whether there are any differences between American and Swedish case studies regarding three aspects: (1) type of problem in the study, (2) way of describing the company or companies and (3) the method used. To find out a case review of twenty case studies has been conducted. Ten cases were of American companies and ten were of Swedish companies. The findings from this study is that the cases of Swedish companies had mostly descriptive problems and the cases of American companies had mostly explanatory problems. There seemed to be two prominent differences in the way the companies are described. Firstly the American cases use more numeric information. Secondly the American cases focus more on the industry, externalities, key people and accomplishments while the Swedish cases focus more on the company and the specific phenomena that gets studied. What differed in method between them was that the American cases were more extensive, more often did longitudinal studies and more often did multiple case studies. The implications from this study is that it gives expectations that could increase the understanding of which biases and flaws we might expect from the cases. One could therefore better interpret the results from cases of American and Swedish companies.

**KEYWORDS:** American cases, Swedish cases, differences, problem, description, method

## 1. Introduction

There are both fictional case studies ("arm-chair" case studies) and reality-based case studies (Søilen & Huber, 2006). This study deals with reality-based case studies. Reality-based case studies conduct in the real world by the gathering of empirical data (Wikipedia, 2016).

According to Jacobsen (2002) a case study is to make a focused study of a particular survey unit in its particular context, that's limited in both time and space. It may be one or multiple survey units, for example, one patient or three patients. A case study can also study different depths of a particular survey unit (Jacobsen, 2002). For example, one can study an entire company, just a specific department of a company or just a certain change in a company. According to Jacobsen (2002) case studies are mainly intensive, i.e. they go deep in its study. Further on, Jacobsen (2002) claims that there isn't a clear view to what a *case* exactly is. Stake

(1994) describes a case as something specifically that is not too broad or general, for example, a company. In this study, cases of economics studies will be examined. More specifically, cases of companies, and even more specifically, companies from Sweden and America.

According to Dubois & Gadde (2002) case studies are used in different specialist fields such as psychology, economics, public administration, sociology, history, urban planning and more. Each specialist field has, according to Sjøilen & Huber (2006), their own definition of what a case study is. Case studies in economics studies are according to Sjøilen & Huber (2006) a compressed history of one or more organizations (mostly companies), which aims to shed light on an important problem. The key individuals of the companies, their function etc. are presented and possibly also competitors and suppliers of the companies (Sjøilen & Huber, 2006). The problem consists of three main alternatives (Jacobsen, 2002). It can be descriptive or explanatory, i.e. either it describes a phenomena or it explains it. It is clear or unclear, i.e. either we know a lot of the problem already or we don't. It can also differ depending on if it's possible to generalize or not. Johansson (2003) emphasizes that it's hard to generalize from a case study.

A website that the University of Florida (2014) is behind claims that case studies of companies begins by placing the company in its context i.e. the company and the factors that influence its situation. The point with case studies of companies is to view the company from a particular perspective of this presented context (University of Florida, 2014). Case studies depend on the perspective from which the case is examined, therefore, the method is crucial (University of Florida, 2014). It's for example possible to combine several different data collection methods when conducting a case study (Wikipedia, 2016). Johansson (2003) states that the essence of case study methodology is triangulation with a combination on different levels of methods. According to Gerring (2004) the case study is a qualitative research method. The different methods we might see will therefore most likely be: individual interviews, group interviews, observations and document examination. Johansson (2003) on the other hand means that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches is well established in case studies but that it's difficult to codify the results when combining both qualitative and quantitative research. Meyer (2001) stress that there is a need to be very explicit about the choices one makes when conducting a case study. There's a lot of decisions that need to be made in the context of a particular case study and it's important to discuss the method considerations linked to these decisions (Meyer, 2001).

The problem, the way of describing the company and the method is, based on what has been mentioned, important parts of case studies of companies. The focus in this study will therefore be to, between cases of American and of Swedish companies, examine the differences in these parts, i.e., differences in types of problems, the way of describing companies and the method used. This is an important problem since the background of a case (the problem and the context) and the method used, might reflect about what the study will result in, i.e. the conclusions that will be made. For instance, Yang et al (2006) talks about how data collection of different research methods will influence the reliability and validity of the results.

## **2. Method**

This study is a literature review of case studies of Swedish and American companies. The study is based on qualitative information that's found through scientific articles, scientific literature and case studies. Other sources have been websites found through Google. The scientific articles, the scientific literature and the case studies has been found through the databases "Summon" and "Web of Science". The scientific articles and literature has been developed in order to better understand the differences between the case studies. For example regarding which parts of case studies that may differ. To make the comparison of cases reasonably comparable, all cases were company cases. Mainly product-based companies. Ten case studies of Swedish companies and ten case studies of American companies was examined to compare the differences. It's a somewhat thin basis for significant conclusions but twenty companies made it manageable to compile to get a basic image of the differences. The parts from the case studies that has been compared are: (1) type of problem in the study, (2) way of describing the company or companies and (3) the method used.

## **3. Case review**

### **3.1 Cases of Swedish companies**

#### Wapnö AB (Svensson & Wagner, 2012)

Problem: How to implement and apply a "sustainable business cycle".

Description: What the company do and the geographical location. For how long they have been working on the project and what the market and competitors felt about the project at the start of it. Reasons for why the study is relevant. History about the company and the company today (how many employees and the annual turnover). Reasons for the project. How the company is managed. Its core business attributes, what they stand for and how they show in the real world. Background information about the company's supply chain and production cycle.

Method: A single case study with an inductive approach. Data was collected through: non-structured interviews with managers, observations of operations at company site and corporate documentation.

#### Cofc, Dricon, Swedblades, Tech and GMA (Rundh, 2015)

Problem: The process of how SME exporting firms develop on the international market.

Description: the companies was presented with their development on the international market and the author's interpretation of how it happened. In a table there were short information about each company regarding five factors: background, exports, market entry, obstacles and marketing. Then in another table there were information about: Market event in international activity and International market behavior. The information in the tables were very short. In the appendix you could find more background information about each company.

Method: A qualitative research approach with a multiple case study. The data was collected by using secondary data, but also through face-to-face interviews with export executives in the firms. Secondary data was documents, reports, media articles, internal video clips, internet documents and previous personal observations.

IKEA (Andersen & Skjoett-Larsen, 2009)

Problem: How to implement and manage CSR practices in global supply chains.

Description: What the company do. When and who created the company and how it's controlled today. Numbers about the company: stores, employees, in which countries it's most active etc. Why suppliers are important for the company. How the company have changed from demanding from the suppliers to develop together with the suppliers. The company's criteria for suppliers and how they choose suppliers. How the company has worked with the supply chain before and how they do it today. How this "way" looks (a model to certify the suppliers and how they work with this model). How they implement this "way" and why they do it. What the company's "way" results in.

Method: Personal interviews with eight employees from one of the company's trading areas. Semi-structured interview guide.

Glimåkra Akvamatik AB (Søilen & Huber, 2004)

Problem: Long term investment in new technology.

Description: The industry. What the company do, its strategy and the geographical location. How the company have developed: when the company started, new products, ownerships etc. How an external change affected the company and how the company reacted to this change. The company started with a new focus because of this. How this new idea started, how the company had to change and if this new focus could work. The company's prospects for success: competitors, markets etc. The company hired to develop new products. Requirements for the new products. How these new products gave competitive advantages. How the company looks on the future.

Method: Interviews with the CEO and the export manager and some written sources (brochure, web page).

Bräcke Trähuskomponenter AB (Søilen & Huber, 2004)

Problem: Dependency on State Subsidies.

Description: The geographical location. When the new CEO took office and what she thought had to be done in the company. What she wanted to do and what was done based on the conditions. The company wanted State Subsidies but didn't get it. When the company started and what they do. How many employees they got and their turnover. The new CEO where she came from (internal) and what she thinks about the company's situation. How the CEO engaged

in corporate development project and came in contact with a person that helped her. That the staff is the most valuable resource. How the company implemented a model to improve operations. How they worked with it, how it changed the staff, what the effort did cost and the results from it. How the company still struggles to make profit but still don't get State Subsidies. The situation with State Subsidies and the company's options in this situation.

Method: Interview with the CEO and some written sources (web page).

Ericsson (Iveroth, 2012)

Problem: How global companies lead IT-enabled transformation across cultures.

Description: What the company do, when it started, seize, where it's active, where the HQ is and how many employees. They made a transformation and what that transformation was. When the transformation was made. How they did prior the transformation and how they do now. What it was that enabled the transformation. How the transformation showed in practice. Company locations that got effected. Positive and negative effects from the transformation.

Method: Interviews over 6 years, in different phases. 29 interviews, 17 respondents. Formal managers and informal actors from different offices that initiated, designed, sponsored and implemented the change. Internal documentations (monthly newsletters, strategy documents, organizational and policy documents, operational documents). Both informal and formal in nature.

Nymek AB (Søilen & Huber, 2004)

Problem: Choosing an alternative strategy to maximizing profits.

Description: What the company do and the geographical location. The company has made internal changes, how these have affected the company and why they did it. The company's objective. History of how the company have developed: when the company started, products, ownerships etc. The company today: competence, products, competitors etc. How a project started to motivate the staff. What it did cost and alternatives to it. How the project was conducted, the idea with it, how it played out in practice and the effects of it (positive and negative). How the company will continue working with the project and the objective of it.

Method: Interview with the CEO and some written sources (web page).

Lars Höglund AB (Søilen & Huber, 2004)

Problem: Lean production implementation.

Description: What the company do and the geographical location. The company's work philosophy. The company discovered lean production which led to development of the company which has led to positive results. History of how the company have developed: when the company started, products, growth, ownerships, etc. The company today: employees, turnover, what the company mean for the city etc. The company's objectives and the competitive

situation. How they try to raise competitiveness with lean production and what it is. How the company worked with lean production, what made it a success and what it resulted in. How the company will continue to work with lean production, the difficulties they face to do it and how they shall succeed.

Method: Interview with the CEO and some written sources (web page).

#### Zetterbergs AB (Søilen & Huber, 2004)

Problem: A program on technology and design ends up in new strategy.

Description: What the company do. The company have been involved in a project for competence increase. They realized what they should do through the education from this project. History of how the company have developed: when the company started, geographical location, activities, products, ownership, external factors that have affected, takeovers etc. The company today: ownership structure, products, activities, turnover, employees. How the company came in contact with the project and the intent of the project. How the project was formed, what was done, how the company did before the project and what it resulted in. Why not everything went exactly as the company thought, how they shall continue their work and why the new ideas are good for the company.

Method: Interview with a product development manager from the company and some written sources (web page).

#### IKEA (Jonsson, Rudberg & Holmberg, 2013)

Problem: Prerequisites and effects of centralized supply chain planning. How the planning process, planning system, and planning organization make up a centralized planning approach.

Description: What the company do, the vision, annual sales, employees, visitors per year, number of stores, geographical locations of stores, how they are run, web site, main marketing channel (copies, items, visitors, language, editions). The supply chain (stores, geographical areas, number of suppliers, countries). How supply is made. Per cent per area. Where they purchase and sell. Factors that contributed to a centralized planning approach. Why supply chain planning is a challenge. How the supply chain works. An overview of the old planning concept. An overview of the new planning concept with a figure of the company's global supply chain planning processes.

Method: A single longitudinal case study. 2 external and 1 internal researcher (participatory research). Analyzed before and after the implementation. In-depth interviews (3 phases), observations, internal documents (process descriptions, job descriptions, project reports and Power Points) and quantitative performance data (internal files). Interviewees included the project manager and supply planners. Literature review generated a framework.

### **3.2 Cases of American companies**

#### WorldCom and Nortel Networks (Heracleous & Werres, 2016)

**Problem:** Examined the process leading to strategic misalignment and explored this linkage to eventual corporate failure.

**Description:** Background of the companies: when they were founded, the start and how they expanded (ownerships, takeovers, growth, strategies etc.). Externalities and important conditions that effected each company. The strategy work for each company. How the companies worked and their problems. What each company did in practice and the consequences from this. How the industry changed and how the companies acted on this. Consequences in numbers (workforce reductions, stock price drops, loans etc.). When things went bad (CEO resign etc.). Conclusions afterwards (main events, what was done in the companies and main misalignments).

**Method:** A longitudinal qualitative research in the form of a dual, in-depth case study. Triangulated data from archival materials (industry publications, scholarly journals, case studies, and press reports). The study made both individual case analysis and cross-case analysis.

#### Gojo Industries (Kennedy & Marting, 2016)

**Problem:** The use of biomimicry to drive environmentally sustainable product innovation.

**Description:** What the company do. History about the innovations that the company have made. Their strategic approach to innovations and how this led to good partnerships. What the company do today: products, customers, new demand etc. Why they turned to biomimicry, how they worked with it, how they developed in the field, what they learned and what it resulted in (patents). What these patents were, how they got the inspiration to them and how they improved prior technology.

**Method:** 1 external and 1 internal researcher (participatory research). Compared the effort from biomimicry with an historical project in the company. Quantitative data from internal project documentation. Cross-checked the documents by interviewing employees who were involved in one or both projects. Structured interviews with two engineers who participated in both projects.

#### Polaroid Corporation (Tripsas & Gavetti, 2000)

**Problem:** The response of an established firm to the ongoing shift from analog to digital imaging.

**Description:** History of the company: founded, founder, emergence, products, major developments, years, growth (in percent), what it resulted in (capabilities and beliefs). Capabilities and beliefs from early years and how they influenced subsequent search activities

related to digital imaging. Capabilities: position, patents, money spent on development, competition, manufacturing, distributors, years. Beliefs: the result of the beliefs. A figure of the evolution of capabilities and beliefs over the years. New CEO, new period and new decisions. What they were and what they resulted in (investments (in numbers and percent), patents, technology, employees, business model etc.). New capabilities and beliefs that this resulted in. Externality that changed the industry and how the company reacted to this. What this resulted in and the capabilities and beliefs today (competitors, investments, reactions). Continued uncertainty in the market and how the company looks to the future.

Method: In-depth, inductive case study of a long-term historical involvement in digital imaging. Public data (historical annual reports, financial analyst reports, prior historical studies and business press articles on both the company and the industry), company archives (historical strategic plans, organization charts, internal memos, and technical papers) and interview data. 20 interviews with 15 individuals. Individuals from multiple levels of the organizational hierarchy (ex-CEOs, senior managers, mid-level project managers, firstline research scientists and marketing specialists). Individuals from multiple functional areas (research and development, marketing, and manufacturing). Individuals present at different points in history (retired employees and employees who had moved to other companies). All key managers involved was interviewed. Some individuals were contacted multiple times. Interviews were open ended, but based on a common set of questions. They lasted from 1 hour to all day.

#### Corning, GE, Motorola and Monsanto (Lynn, Morone & Paulson, 1996)

Problem: The market for discontinuous innovations. What are and what should be the actual practices employed in the management of discontinuous innovations?

Description: Seize of companies and what they sell. How the companies used conventional market research techniques (years, techniques, projects, major customers, results and key person's reactions). How the companies probed and learned and by this developed in the market for discontinuous innovations. How they probed: products and markets (geographical locations, years), how it went, what they learned and how they acted on this. How their continued work developed (years, products, market shares, money made). Figures of each company's probing and learning process, showing critical events. The strategic context that the companies developed in (external factors).

Method: A diverse set of in-depth, historical, case studies of successful discontinuous innovations. Compared four exploratory case studies of success that were as different as possible. 78 personal interviews with people both inside and outside the innovating companies. Individuals interviewed ranged from the original innovators to their CEOs.

#### Intel Corporation (Burgelman, 2002)

Problem: Examine the consequences of a period of extraordinary success for the long-term adaptive capability of a firm's strategy-making process and the long-term adaptive implications of a CEOs strategic leadership approach.

Description: When the CEO came, the state of the company then and how long he stayed. Where the CEO got the inspiration for his strategy-thinking, what the strategy was and the consequences from it. The CEOs impact on the company's strategy making and the strategic actions from this. How key people viewed the strategy. Projects and main highlights. Effects during this period (successes, products, markets, revenues and net income in numbers and percent etc.) and how conditions look afterwards.

Method: A comparative, longitudinal multistage, nested case study focused on three major periods: (1968-1985), (1985-1998), (beyond 1998) with emphasis of Andy Grove's tenure as CEO (1985-1998). Data from 63 informants from interviews, informal interactions and transcripts of earlier interviews (conducted by Intel consultants). Interviewed managers from different levels, functional groups, and businesses and current and former employees. Most interviews lasted 1-2 hours. Internal archival data (documents describing the company's history, annual reports, and reports to financial analysts) and external archival data (industry publications, financial analysts' reports and business press articles).

Air Products, Analog Devices, Dupont, GE, GM, IBM, Northern Telecom, Polaroid, Texas Instruments and United Technologies Corporation (McDermott & O'Connor, 2002)

Problem: Examine how firms manage the new product development process for potential game-changers.

Description: All 10 companies and their cases got a brief description in an appendix. It consisted of what project the company was working on, what it was, why they started with it and where it was heading.

Method: A cooperation with the Industrial Research Institute (IRI). A longitudinal, multidisciplinary study of the management of radical innovations using an exploratory, multiple case study design. Real time data gathered at multiple times within each of the ongoing projects. 12 projects from 10 firms. Multiple interviewees with senior management, project managers and individual team members. Observations from visits.

Kate Spade & Company (former Liz Claiborne Inc.) (Siggelkow, 2001)

Problem: The relationship between fit and organizational inertia when a firm is confronted with environmental change.

Description: Seize and what the company do. A historical overview (year when founded, starting capital, reached revenues, accomplishments, sales and the stock price, problems that occurred and the effects, new CEO). A table with financial data for the company over 15 years (sales, growth, net income, inventory, debt, market value etc.). The company's initial success. Choices the company made (production, distribution, retailers, presentation and marketing). A map displaying the interaction among the choices. How the choices fit into existing external conditions (customer taste and demand, retailers' requirements and available technology). How these environmental factors changed and with that came new choices. How the company

responded to the changes and the consequences. Its subsequent actions with new leadership and how it went (another map of the choices and the interactions among them).

Method: A longitudinal study of how a firm responded to environmental changes. Data from primary and secondary sources. Personal interviews and follow-up telephone interviews with members of the management team (the CEO, the CFO, the vice president for corporate planning and division presidents) over a period of one and a half years. Interviews with one of the founders and industry experts. About 900 articles about the company in trade journals and magazines and company documents (annual reports, IOEs, and documents provided by management).

Starclick, Topmobile, Cellcruise, Phonemix, Mobilate and Airburst (Ozcan & Eisenhardt, 2009)

Problem: How companies originate high-performing portfolios.

Description: 10 tables with information about each firm (area, founded, initial investors, age of founders, numbers of founders, prior firm of founders, number of hit games, percentage of hit games, industry ranking, number of games, vision, actions, portfolio consequence, financial consequence and some quotes about this, partners, actions, portfolio consequence, financial consequence and some quotes about this, market emergence, market growth etc.). There was a lot of citations in the text e.g. from CEOs. An appendix gave some history about the industry.

Method: An inductive, multiple-case study of 6 entrepreneurial rivals in the gaming industry with 3 waves of longitudinal data collection. Field and archival data. Qualitative and quantitative data from 10 pilot interviews with individuals from several industries, and then from over 80 interviews with executives in both the focal and partner firms (CEOs, founders, VP of different departments etc.). Data sources: (1) extensive archives (business publications, Internet sources and corporate materials), (2) interviews with leading experts, (3) attendance at multiple industry conferences, (4) repeated semi structured interviews with executives of the focal and partner firms, and (5) informal follow-ups with e-mails, phone calls, and observations.. Interviews from 60 to 150 minutes. Interviews with 6 industry experts (journalists, investors etc.). Individual case histories and then a triangulation of data with a cross-case analysis.

Apple Inc. (Montgomerie & Roscoe, 2013)

Problem: Examine the Apple business model with focus on the mundane and outdated elements of its processes.

Description: Seize of company in shares, market capitalization, compared to competitors, percentage on stock indexes. The power of the company. Explanations to the company's success. How the company have developed (products, business model, competition, figure of the share price over time with highlights of important events etc.). The current business model (what it is and what it results in). The company's consumers. The physical supply chain and the content supply-chain. Comparison with competitors, practical examples, projects, products,

profits, challenges and limits etc. The company's relationship with retailers. The company's business model compared with other companies (from other industries).

Method: An evaluation of the company's physical and content supply chains and its retailing strategy. A case study of a defined period compared with existing literature. Used a business model framework to analyze what made the company so successful after 2003.

#### Capitol Plastics, Tower Automotive and Progressive Industries (MacDuffie & Helper, 1997)

Problem: Examine Honda's supplier support efforts.

Description: A table with the companies' characteristics (product, ownership, plant location, annual sales in millions in different years, employees, when plants opened, when they began selling to Honda, sales to Honda in per cent in different years). Brief information about Honda: history of the company (when founded and how they established in the US), supplier relations philosophy, the core suppliers and what it means to be a core supplier to Honda. The three companies was presented one by one. Short information of the companies (founded, founders and what they do). Why they started as suppliers for Honda, what they did and how it went. How the cooperation developed in to projects, how the projects went and how Honda's philosophy affected the companies. How the companies continued after the projects ended and how Honda had effected the companies.

Method: Case studies of three of Hondas suppliers. 1-2 days at each of the supplier sites. Interviews with managers, shop-floor workers, supervisors, union officials, production engineers and corporate staff at each company.

#### **4. Results**

Five problems of the cases of Swedish companies was how a phenomenon could or should go. The other five were company-specific, where something happened in the company and the case studied the effects of this and what it resulted in. Implementation was a problem that came up three times. It is also notable that both cases of IKEA was about the company's supply chain. Two problems of the American cases were about how companies react to external changes which none of the Swedish cases were. The American cases mostly used distinct problems. Three problems of the American cases were very descriptive. The other seven were more explanatory. The American problems in this study were mostly unique.

The Swedish companies were described with focus on the company with basic information such as: what the company do, the geographical location of the company, how many employees and the annual turnover. There was often a historical picture and a picture of how it looks today with details such as the start of the company and ownership of the company. Then focus came to the specific phenomenon for the company: what it was, what enabled it, why it was done, how it was done before, how it looks in practice and what it resulted in. The Swedish cases often ended with the company's opportunities for the future. The American cases had much focus on describing the industry, externalities and key people (e.g. the CEO) in the company rather than just the company. The American companies also gave an historical and today's view

of the company but with more focus on growth and on the products, innovations, accomplishments etc. rather than what the company is. The special phenomenon in the American cases was mostly described with what it was and what it resulted in. The American cases gave a lot of numeric information like stock price, earnings, years etc. They also used a lot of tables and figures and sometimes presented information in appendix.

To collect data the cases of Swedish companies had one case with only interviews, seven cases with interviews and written sources and two cases with interviews, observations and written sources. Five studies made interviews with 1-2 respondents. One of the cases were an in-depth study, one was a participatory research and two were longitudinal studies. Nine were single case studies and one were a multiple case study. All the cases of Swedish companies used qualitative data and one used both quantitative and qualitative data. To collect data the cases of American companies had two cases with only written sources, two case with only interviews, five cases with interviews and written sources and one case with interviews, observations and written sources. Three cases did more than 50 interviews and two did follow-up telephone interviews. Four used external data (e.g. industry publications and press reports). Five of the cases were an in-depth study, two was a participatory research and six were longitudinal studies. Three studies used both individual case analysis and cross-case analysis. Four were single case studies and six were a multiple case study (five used more than one company). All the cases of American companies used qualitative data and two used both quantitative and qualitative data.

## **5. Conclusion**

It is difficult to draw a dividing line between an explanatory or descriptive problem and most of the case studies had an element of both. However the cases of Swedish companies were mostly descriptive and the cases of American companies were mostly explanatory. Both the American and Swedish cases had fairly clear problems but the American cases was clearer, which is natural because a problem need to be clear in order to be explained. The American case studies was also more generalizable than the Swedish cases which was also natural since when a phenomena gets explained it's easier to apply the knowledge to other phenomena's. The American cases more often used several companies in their studies which also increase the possibility to generalize.

All cases are unique so it is difficult to say whether there are any common similarities that differ how Swedish and American companies gets described. From this result there seems to be two prominent differences in the way the companies are described. Firstly the American cases use more numeric information than the Swedish cases, such as stock price, growth, earnings and sales. The American cases also use more tables and figures to present the information. Secondly the American cases focus more on the industry, externalities, key people and accomplishments while the Swedish cases focus more on the company and the specific phenomena that gets studied.

The cases of American companies and the cases of Swedish companies was very similar in their ways to collect data. They mainly used qualitative data and occasionally they also added quantitative data. The most common approach for both was to combine interviews with written

sources. What differed in method between them was that the study of cases of American companies were larger and more extensive than the Swedish cases. They more often used more respondents for their interviews, had more written sources, and made deeper and longitudinal studies. The American cases more often than the Swedish cases also used more than one company in their studies (multiple case study) and cross-case analyzed.

## **6. Implications**

The results from this study provides knowledge of how case studies of American and Swedish companies can differ. This knowledge may give us some expectations on case studies of American and Swedish companies, for example regarding the choice of method. These expectations could help us better understand which biases and flaws we might expect from the studies (for instance, depending on the method). The expectations generated from this result could therefore prepare one to better interpret the results from future cases of American and Swedish companies.

## **7. Future studies**

This study has described how case studies may differ regarding what method that has been used, the way of describing the companies and the type of problem in the study. It could also be interesting to find out why these differences occur. Does it depend on the knowledge that is requested in the different countries? The availability of resources for research in the different countries? How established the companies are? To find out might be a potential topic for future studies.

## **References**

Andersen, M. & Skjoett-Larsen, T. (2009). Corporate social responsibility in global supply chains. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 14(2), 75-86.

Burgelman, R. A. (2002). Strategy as vector and the inertia of coevolutionary lock-in. *ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY*, 47(2), 325-357.

Dubois, A. & Gadde, L-E. (2002). Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 553-560.

Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *The American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341-354.

Heracleous, L. & Werres, K. (2016). On the Road to Disaster: Strategic Misalignments and Corporate Failure. *LONG RANGE PLANNING*, 49(4), 491-506.

Iveroth, E. (2012). Leading global IT-enabled change across cultures. *European Management Journal*, 30(4), 340-351.

- Jacobsen, D. I. (2002). *Vad, hur och varför? Om metodval I företagsekonomi och andra samhällsvetenskapliga ämnen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Johansson, R. (2003). Case study methodology. *Open House International*, 32(3), 22-24.
- Jonsson, P., Rudberg, M., & Holmberg, S. (2013). Centralised supply chain planning at IKEA. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 18(3), 337-350.
- Kennedy, E. B. & Marting, T. A. (2016). Biomimicry: Streamlining the Front End of Innovation for Environmentally Sustainable Products. *Research Technology Management*, 59(4), 40-47.
- Lynn, G. S., Morone, J. G., & Paulson, A. S. (1996). Marketing and discontinuous innovation: The probe and learn process. *CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 38(3), 8-&.
- MacDuffie, J. P. & Helper, S. (1997). Creating lean suppliers: Diffusing lean production throughout the supply chain. *CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 39(4), 118-&.
- McDermott, C. M. & O'Connor, G. C. (2002). Managing radical innovation: an overview of emergent strategy issues. *JOURNAL OF PRODUCT INNOVATION MANAGEMENT*, 19(6), 424-438.
- Meyer, C. B. (2001). A Case in Case Study Methodology. *Field Methods*, 13(4), 329-352.
- Montgomerie, J. & Roscoe, S. (2013). Owing the consumer - Getting to the core of the Apple business model. *Accounting Forum*, 37(4), 290-299.
- Ozcan, P. & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2009). ORIGIN OF ALLIANCE PORTFOLIOS: ENTREPRENEURS, NETWORK STRATEGIES, AND FIRM PERFORMANCE. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 52(2), 246-279.
- Rundh, B. (2015). International market development: The small and medium sized firm's opportunity or dilemma. *Management Decision*, 53(6), 1329-1354.
- Siggelkow, N. (2001). Change in the presence of fit: The rise, the fall, and the renaissance of Liz Claiborne. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 44(4), 838-857.
- Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2006). *20 svenska fallstudier för små och medelstora företag*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2004). *Bräcke Trähuskomponenter AB: Case study, Case ID-007*. Jönköping: Jönköping International Business School.
- Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2004). *Glimåkra Akvamatik AB, Case ID-004*. Jönköping: Jönköping International Business School.

Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2004). *Lars Höglund AB: Case ID 001*. Göteborg: proDesign, Chalmers Lindholmen, Industrihögskolan.

Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2004). *Nymek AB: Case ID-011*. Jönköping: Internationella Handelshögskolan i Jönköping.

Søilen, K. S. & Huber, S. (2004). *Zetterbergs AB: Case ID 002*. Göteborg: proDesign, Chalmers Lindholmen, Industrihögskolan.

Stake, R. E. (1994). *Case Studies*. Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Svensson, G. & Wagner, B. (2012). Implementation of a sustainable business cycle: the case of a Swedish dairy producer. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 17(1), 93-97.

Tripsas, M. & Gavetti, G. (2000). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. *STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 21(10-11), 1147-1161.

University of Florida. (2014). *Case Study + Lit Review Components*. Received 2016-12-12, from [http://users.clas.ufl.edu/msscha/landarch/CaseStudyComponents.html#Step\\_Two:\\_site\\_analysis](http://users.clas.ufl.edu/msscha/landarch/CaseStudyComponents.html#Step_Two:_site_analysis)

Wikipedia. (2016). *Fallstudie*. Received 2016-12-12, from <https://sv.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fallstudie>

Yang, Z., Wang, X., & Su, C. (2006). A review of research methodologies in international business. *International Business Review*, 15, 601-617.