

What Makes a Top Selling *Case Research Journal* Case?



John Lawrence, University of Idaho

Kay Guess, Samford University

Rebecca Morris, Westfield State University

Case writers write cases for a number of different reasons. Some of us love researching and understanding the case scenario and finding a compelling way to tell the case story to our audience. Others of us love the development of the detailed analysis, grounded in the theory of our discipline that produces an outstanding Instructor's Manual (IM). Many of us love the duality of the process—the yin of story-telling and the yang of analysis. Some of us write cases because we aren't quite satisfied with the cases that are available to us for our classes. For most of us, however, once we decide to commit our time and energy to writing a case, we want to see our case contribute to student learning. We want to see our cases have impact.

Often we see immediate impact when we use a case in our own classrooms and observe our students' understanding of business concepts and theories improve as a result. We seek publication of our cases in order to expand that impact beyond our own classrooms. We want our cases to contribute to student learning both locally and globally. Achieving impact from our work is also an important criterion that contributes to the maintenance of accreditation at many of our institutions (i.e., that faculty are conducting research with demonstrated impact). Impact of teaching cases is most easily measured by adoptions and usage (as opposed to by citations which is the typical way of measuring impact of traditional research).

Cases published in the CRJ become available to our colleagues around the world for easy adoption through our distribution partners, including XanEdu (which publishes the CRJ), Harvard Business School Press, The Case Centre, Irwin-McGraw-Hill, Pearson, Study Net, and others. Adoptions of CRJ cases have increased significantly over the past few years, especially after we added the Harvard Business School Press to our growing list of distribution partners. In 2014 CRJ cases were used by more than 35,000 students around the world, and in 2015 that number was well over 55,000 students. These numbers do not include when authors use their cases in their own classes or when cases are subsequently selected and included in textbooks and used by faculty members who have adopted the textbook. Our data tells us that CRJ cases are increasingly being adopted not only by faculty members at institutions of higher education in North America, but also by educators around the globe. Acceptance in the

Copyright © 2015 by the *Case Research Journal* and by John Lawrence, CRJ Editor, Kay Guess, NACRA Treasurer, and Rebecca Morris, NACRA VP of Case Marketing.

CRJ can amplify a case's potential impact because of the access it gives to distribution. But simply gaining acceptance of your case in the CRJ does not guarantee that it will have widespread impact, just as gaining acceptance to a highly influential traditional journal will not guarantee that your work will be widely cited.

We were therefore curious as to what makes for a top selling, high impact CRJ case. Are there case features that distinguish top selling cases? What characteristics appear to matter, and what characteristics do not appear to matter? We have heard a lot of conjecture from North American Case Research Association (NACRA) members on this question. We have heard people say that long, comprehensive cases sell the best, while others argue that shorter cases sell better. We have heard it said that case sales are a function of discipline, with strategy and marketing cases selling the best. It has been suggested that NACRA has a handful of gifted case writers who dominate the best seller list. Our goal in this paper was to look at the data and see what the evidence would tell us and to see if we could develop some guidance for our readers who themselves desire to write a top selling case.

To answer the question of what makes a top selling CRJ case, we identified the twenty best-selling CRJ cases in 2014 and the twenty best-selling CRJ cases in 2015. We focused only on individual adoptions of cases for inclusion in course packs where we knew the case was specifically assigned to students for classroom use and did not attempt to account for the fact that some CRJ cases are reprinted in textbooks and may see a lot of usage as a result. We neglected textbook adoptions here not because they are unimportant or produce less impact, but because we have no way of knowing how many times that a case that appears in a textbook actually gets assigned and used in the classroom. The best-selling CRJ cases based on individual adoptions are shown in **Exhibit 1** at the end of the article.

Having identified these best-selling cases, we then looked at a number of the characteristics of these cases and IMs to determine if these cases shared any common characteristics. We attempted to consider the characteristics that we had heard the most speculation about, but we looked at other characteristics as well. In some sense our focus here was on secondary factors that we felt might contribute to making a best-selling case. Most CRJ readers would agree on the primary factors that contribute to a great case, and would agree that the stronger the case is with respect to these factors, the more likely it is to be adopted. We're talking about the existence of a compelling case story told in a way that engages the student in the case. We're talking about the existence of a well-developed case protagonist (or protagonists) facing a not easily solved dilemma that provokes classroom debate. We're talking about a well-crafted IM that positions instructors to ground student debate in relevant business theory to achieve a number of important learning objectives within a specific classroom context. We didn't attempt to assess the quality of these factors for the top selling cases. Doing so would have been difficult and in our opinion of minimal value since most of us associated with the journal would agree that the better we can do these things, the stronger the case will be.

What follows are our findings from this analysis. We look first at characteristics of cases that seemed to contribute to writing a best seller. These characteristics can provide guidance to authors on how to design their next case research project in ways to increase the probability that it will lead to the development of a best seller. Following that, we present the characteristics that we didn't see as really making a difference—characteristics that didn't seem to contribute to whether a case was on the best-seller

list or not. We think that this second section is equally important as the first and will provide encouragement to case writers who might perceive that the “type” of cases they write aren’t likely to become best sellers.

WHAT SEEMS TO CONTRIBUTE TO BEST-SELLING STATUS

Recency of Publication (and to a lesser extent, recency of the decision)

Table 1 shows the distribution of the cases on the best seller list by publication year.¹ Cases published in the preceding three years are the majority of the best sellers in both years. In 2014, 65 percent of the cases on the list had been published between 2011 and 2013.² In 2015, 60 percent of the cases on the list had been published between 2012 and 2014. Most instructors want to keep their classes current and as a result regularly look to refresh at least a portion of the cases that they use in their classes. Cases likely get a more careful look the first year or two after publication when they are the “freshest.” While we all may use a few “classic” cases that we have found to work exceedingly well with our students, that probably doesn’t represent the majority of our cases. While we certainly hope that the cases we write will fall in that category, new cases have as much or more potential to be a best seller in a given year.

Year Published	# on 2015 Best Seller List	# on 2014 Best Seller List
Pre-2008	0	1
2008	2	3
2009	1	1
2010	4	2
2011	1	4
2012	7	8
2013	3	1
2014	2	N/A

We also looked at the year of decision within the case, as this is also an indication of how “recent” the case is. The year of the decision in the case necessarily lags the publication year by at least a year and more typically two to four years as a result of the time it takes for the researcher to become aware of and develop the case around the decision, to present the case at a conference and then to shepherd the case through several rounds of review with the journal. Some organizations also prefer to wait a year or two after a decision point before they are willing to share their story and allow it to be made the subject of a case. In 2014, 70 percent of the best-selling cases had decision points between 2005 and 2013 and in 2015, 80 percent of the cases had decision points set in time between 2006 and 2013. It would appear that at the time of adoption instructors are looking for cases with decision points set mostly within the past ten years. This suggests that if you seeking to write a best-selling case, you should focus on scenarios no more than three to five years old. This allows for the case to be

in distribution for at least a few years before potential adopting instructors begin to see the case as going stale.

A For-Profit Business Context

Cases about for-profit businesses dominate the best seller list. Only two of the top twenty cases in 2015 were about nonprofits, and only four of the top twenty cases in 2014 were about nonprofits. Perhaps even more telling, all four of the cases across the two years that were set in nonprofits were about operations that many other organizations operate as for-profit businesses—a pub, a radio station, a bookstore, and a hospital. Two of these four were nonprofits only because they were owned by a nonprofit university (the pub and the bookstore). Only one of the cases, “Radio Station WEAA,” about a public radio station, had learning objectives connected with the organization’s status as a nonprofit. The conclusion on this one seems clear—if you want to write a top seller, focus in on a for-profit business organization rather than a nonprofit as the market for such cases appears much smaller. This finding surprised us, as we have been seeing and publishing more nonprofit cases in the past few years. This finding shouldn’t be interpreted as suggesting that you stop writing nonprofit cases, nor that we at the CRJ will stop considering them for publication, only that such cases appear less likely to become best sellers. Interestingly, one of our contacts at the HBSP has told us that their Harvard specific collection of cases doesn’t include a lot of nonprofit cases, as Harvard faculty usually work with for-profit businesses. As such, CRJ nonprofit cases tend to complement and fill out the Harvard collection in that area.

Inclusion of Financial Statements in Some Disciplines

Inclusion of financial statements in finance and strategy cases appears to be important for a case in those disciplines to make the best seller list. In 2015, only eleven of the twenty top-sellers contained financial statements (at least the income statement and in most cases the balance sheet as well), but all eight of the cases in either finance or strategy on the best seller list included an income statement and balance sheet. In 2014, twelve of the twenty cases contained at least some financial information and seven of the twenty cases contained full income statements and balance sheets. As in 2015, all of the strategy and finance cases on the top seller list in 2014 contained income statements and balance sheets. While financial statements appear necessary in finance and strategy cases, financial statements weren’t necessary to achieve best seller status in disciplines like marketing, ethics, OB/HR/management and information systems.

A Detailed but Focused Instructor’s Manual

In 2015 cases on the top-seller list averaged five learning objectives, and 60 percent of the cases had five or fewer learning objectives. In 2014, cases on the best seller list averaged 4.5 learning objectives, and 80 percent of the cases had five or fewer learning objectives. In neither year did any case have more than eight learning objectives. The sweet spot seemed to be three to five learning objectives. This suggests that perhaps greater focus within the IM contributes to increased adoptions, or at the very least, that having a large number of learning objectives in an effort to broaden the appeal of a case does not help move a case onto the best seller list. It is worth noting that a focused IM does not mean that the IM is short on detail. In 2014 the average IM of a best

seller was nineteen pages long, and in 2015 the average IM of a best seller was twenty-two pages in length. For most cases, the IM was at least fourteen pages or longer, and on average, IMs were about 10 percent longer than the case. The IMs of the top selling cases are rich in detail, just pedagogically very focused.

Case Length (but not in a simple way)

There has been a lot of discussion among case writers of late about how long a good case should be, with a recognized trade-off between longer cases that can communicate a lot of real world detail and complexity and shorter cases that are more likely to be read in their entirety by students. Cases on the best seller lists tend to either be relatively long or relatively short with few cases in between. In 2015 the average case on the best seller list was 20.3 pages in length and twelve of the twenty (60 percent) were twenty pages or longer. Two of the cases were more than thirty-five pages (although one of these contained a sixteen page supplement to the case published as part of the case). Five of the cases, however, were twelve pages or less (25 percent). Only three cases (15 percent) were in between (i.e., 13–19 pages). The same pattern was present in the 2014 list: ten of the cases on that list were twenty pages or more (50 percent), seven of the cases were twelve pages or less (35 percent), and only three cases (15 percent) were in between. Our conclusion is that most of the best-selling cases were either very comprehensive in nature (i.e., twenty pages or more) or relatively concise cases (i.e., twelve pages or less) and that authors who want to write best sellers should target one type of case or the other.

This finding is somewhat inconsistent with what we are hearing from our distribution partners who are telling us that shorter cases are increasingly in demand and that short cases make up a lot of their overall best sellers. We suspect that many instructors are looking for a number of shorter cases that they feel their students will be more likely to read complemented with a handful of more comprehensive cases to provide students some experience dealing with scenarios of greater depth and complexity. The length of cases on the top-seller list did seem to be related to discipline. All of the finance cases, all but one each of the strategy and marketing cases, and both the operations management and information technology cases on the lists were twenty pages or longer. Most of the shorter cases (i.e., twelve pages or less) were in management/OB/HR, business ethics, or entrepreneurship. The top seller in both 2014 and 2015, however, was a relatively short, eleven page marketing case, and half of the ten cases that appeared on both lists were short cases. It is worth noting that CRJ cases do tend to be longer on average than other published cases. Looking at all of the cases published in the CRJ between 2010 and 2014, almost half (48 percent) were twenty pages or longer while only 15 percent were twelve pages or less. Given that 25 percent to 35 percent of the best sellers came from among the 15 percent of CRJ cases that were short suggests there might be significant opportunity to make the best seller list with an excellent short case.

Extra Features

Some of the cases on these best seller lists have unique and/or extra features that might have helped drive a higher rate of adoption. The number one best seller in both 2014 and 2015 has an accompanying SPSS data set which the authors believe has contributed significantly to the case's high rate of adoption. Three of the cases across the two

years are available in multiple languages (English and Spanish or English, Spanish and Portuguese). While our data is incomplete on this, we can tell that some case adoptions for these cases were in one of the languages other than English. Two of the cases on the list in 2015 are part of a six part case set focusing on different disciplinary challenges facing the same organization at the same point in time (the “Daktronics” case series). One of the cases has an accompanying video, and the first two pages of another case are presented in graphic novel format. Taking the time to develop extra features like these may generate a return in terms of increased rate of adoption.

WHAT DOES NOT SEEM TO MATTER

Our analysis uncovered more characteristics that did not seem to matter than those that did. But these findings, we believe, are just as important as our findings about what did matter, as they provide evidence that many of the things we might have seen as constraints need not be viewed as such.

Discipline

No discipline dominates the best seller list—we see cases in all business disciplines making the list and a relatively healthy balance across disciplines, as seen in **Table 2** below. We find this encouraging. Clearly one factor driving case adoptions is the number of students who take specific courses that cases are targeted at, but the best seller list provides evidence that it is possible to write a top selling case in any discipline. We had heard speculation that strategy cases sold better because students across disciplines take strategy, and 25 percent to 30 percent of the cases published in the CRJ are strategy cases. But only 15 percent to 20 percent of the best sellers were strategy cases. So while the potential audience for strategy cases might be larger, there are many strategy cases for instructors to choose from, and it might actually be harder to write a best-selling strategy case given this competition. By comparison, a larger percentage of the marketing, management, and finance cases published in the CRJ appear on the best seller list. The fact that the best seller lists contain one or two operations management, accounting, and information technology cases despite the relatively small number of cases the CRJ has published in these areas (2 percent to 5 percent of all CRJ cases) seems to suggest significant opportunity in these areas as well.

Primary Discipline	# on 2015 Best Seller List	# on 2014 Best Seller List	% of CRJ Cases 2010–2014
Strategy	4	3	28%
Entrepreneurship	2	2	16%
Ethics/Governance	3	3	13%
Marketing	3	4	12%
Mgmt/OB/HR	3	4	10%
Finance	4	1	9%
Operations Management	1	0	5%
Accounting	0	2	2%
Information Technology	0	1	2%

Industry

Cases on the best seller lists come from a wide variety of industries as opposed to just a few industries. Only one industry, food and beverage (including alcohol) seemed to be disproportionately represented on this list. It is possible that cases within this industry are seen as more approachable or engaging, either by students or by the faculty teaching them. So perhaps writing cases set in the food and beverage industry gives you a slightly better chance of writing a best seller, but we think the more important finding is that best sellers come from across a wide variety of industries.

Geography

While most of the cases on the best seller lists are set in North America, about 25 percent of the cases on each list either take place outside of North America or have a significant focus on happenings outside of North America. Any bias on the list toward cases set in North America is likely more an artifact of where the majority of our case writers are located and where the majority of CRJ cases are set. But the lists also make clear that a case need not focus on North America to be a top seller.

Author's Name or Institution

The best seller list is not dominated by a few “superstar” case writers or premier case writing institutions. In 2015, no individual was an author on more than one case on the best seller list. Forty-seven different authors contributed to the 2015 best sellers. Three of the cases included student authors (although none of the cases were authored entirely by students and on none of these cases was the student the first author.) Looking across the thirty cases that appear on the two lists, only two authors appeared on more than one unique case. Armand Gilinsky (Sonoma State University) was a coauthor on three of the thirty cases and Javier Silva (IAE Business School, Universidad Austral in Argentina) was a coauthor on two of the cases. A handful of institutions were represented on two or three of the cases across the two lists: Bentley University, IAE Business School, San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, Sonoma State University, and the University of Denver. Only two of these institutions had faculty contributing to three cases (Sonoma State University and the University of Denver). Faculty or students from a total of twenty-seven institutions contributed to the thirty cases that were on these two lists, including faculty members from five institutions outside of the U.S. or Canada.

We also looked at the number of authors on the cases on these lists and were a little surprised to discover that many of the cases were authored by relatively small teams of authors. Nine of the twenty cases on both the 2014 and 2015 lists were single authored, so clearly multiple authors are not required to write a top-selling case. Many of these single authored cases were authored by an experienced case writer, however, so we don't think this finding should discourage authors from collaborating with colleagues in their case writing efforts. But twenty-five of the thirty cases on these lists were authored by teams of three or fewer authors, so it doesn't appear that more authors (at least beyond a team of three) contribute to greater case adoptions.

We did observe that many of the cases on the lists had at least one author who either has been or is active in the operations and leadership of NACRA and that many of the authors of these cases are also active reviewers for the CRJ. Greater engagement with NACRA and the CRJ means these authors are spending more time immersed in

the craft of case research—it means greater interaction with outstanding case writers and more time spent critically evaluating and thinking about how to improve cases developed by others. We believe that this type of ongoing engagement helps to refine case researchers' abilities to identify outstanding case research opportunities and to develop these opportunities into outstanding cases. The fact that many of the authors of these cases are active with NACRA and the CRJ also reflects the fact that the organization's leadership actively seeks out case researchers who are making an impact and inviting them to become more engaged with the organization in order to advance the status of case writing and help newer case researchers hone their skills.

Previous Presentation at a Conference

We were surprised to find that only half of the top selling cases in both 2014 and 2015 had been previously presented at a NACRA conference or at a conference of one of our affiliate organizations. This is a lower percentage of cases having been presented at a conference than of recently accepted cases by the journal. For example, twenty of the twenty-nine cases (69 percent) published in the CRJ in 2015 (volume 35) had been previously presented at a conference. We do not interpret this finding as suggesting that conference presentation is not valuable. On the contrary, we know that a higher percentage of cases that are first presented at a conference are accepted by the CRJ. Conference presentation helps authors strengthen their cases such that they make a better initial impression on editors and reviewers and as such are more likely to win reviewer support. But the CRJ review process is rigorous, and all cases that make it through that process and gain acceptance are outstanding regardless of whether or not the case was first presented at a conference. So if your case gains acceptance to the CRJ, it is of sufficiently high quality to become a best seller, regardless of whether it started at a conference.

Positioning of the Case

While a majority of the best-selling cases were positioned by authors as being appropriate for either undergraduate or graduate students, three of the 2015 best sellers were positioned as primarily for undergraduates and four were positioned as being primarily or exclusively for graduate students (MBA and/or Executive MBA). The findings were similar in 2014 (two cases positioned as primarily for undergraduates and three cases positioned as primarily or exclusively for graduate students). Positioning a case as either primarily for undergraduates or primarily for graduate students does not appear to reduce the market potential of the case such as to preclude it from being a best seller.

Disguise

While the majority of the best-selling cases were not disguised, six of the best sellers in 2014 and three of the best sellers in 2015 were disguised in some way. Further, the use of disguise was not limited to the ethics cases—disguise was also used in one or more of the finance, management, and information technology cases on these lists. While there is value in leaving cases undisguised when possible, disguise doesn't appear to limit case adoptions so as to prevent them from becoming best sellers.

Winning the Tate Award

Each year NACRA and the CRJ presents the Tate Award to the best case published in the CRJ in the previous year, as determined by a panel of three of NACRA's recent past presidents. Interestingly, only one Tate Award winning case is on the best seller lists, "Lehman Brothers: Crisis in Corporate Governance." Our interpretation of this is that the Tate Award may be similar in a way to an Academy Award in that most Academy Award winners are not the top grossing films in a given year, and many box office hits do not win Academy Awards. Simply because your case is not recognized with the Tate Award does not mean it cannot become a top-selling case.

CONCLUSION

Our review of cases on the CRJ best seller lists for 2014 and 2015 revealed a number of useful findings that provide both guidance and encouragement to case authors wanting to write cases that achieve high rates of adoptions. A lot of factors that we looked at did not matter. Best-selling cases can come from any discipline, any industry, and any geographic setting; can come from any author at any institution; can be positioned for either undergraduates or graduate students or both; can be disguised or not; and need not have been presented first at a conference or have won a prestigious case award. Some factors did matter, and authors wanting to write best sellers should take these factors into consideration as they plan and develop their next case. Cases written about for-profit businesses dominated the best seller list and case authors should consider investing the extra time and effort that is sometimes involved in recruiting for-profit organizations as subjects for cases. Authors should think about trying to explicitly craft either comprehensive cases or relatively concise, focused cases and shy away from writing cases that are stuck somewhere in the middle. Authors should work hard to gain permission from subject organizations to include financials, especially if they are writing cases in finance or strategy. Authors should keep their IMs relatively focused (in terms of learning objectives) but within that focus, authors should provide significant depth and detail to help the instructor really deliver on those focused learning objectives. And authors should keep writing cases and trying to find relatively recent scenarios to write about, as the majority of the best sellers are coming from among the more recently published cases.

Exhibit 1: CRJ Best-Selling Cases in 2014 and 2015, Ranked by Total Adoptions

(Shaded cases appear on both lists)

Rank	2014	2015
1	Finale-Just Desserts by S. F. Sieloff and F. Lassak [Marketing]	Finale-Just Desserts by S. F. Sieloff and F. Lassak [Marketing]
2	Lehman Brothers: Crisis in Corporate Governance by R. D. Harris [Strategy]	Lehman Brothers: Crisis in Corporate Governance by R. D. Harris [Strategy]
3	Improving Customer Service in Sunpharma Pharmacies by Lackova, K., Polakova, M., and Winn, J. [Mgmt/OB/HR]	The Midnight Journal Entry by A. T. Lawrence [Ethics]
4	The Pub: Survive, Thrive or Die? by Grandy, G., Gunther, M. P., Couturier, A., Goldberg, B., MacLeod, I., Steeves, T. [Strategy]	Lockheed Martin's Acquisition of NationScope, Inc. by S. A. White [Finance]
5	Incentive Contracts for Financial Consultants at Private Client Services Division by Udpa, S. C. [Accounting]	Centurion Media: Doing the Right Thing by Conn, C., Guess, A. K., and Hiatt, J. [Ethics]
6	Radio Station WEAA: Leading in a Challenging Situation by Foster, M. K. [Mgmt/OB/HR]	Cooley Distillery: The Independent Spirit by Kennelly, J. J. [Strategy]
7	The Midnight Journal Entry by A. T. Lawrence [Ethics]	Daktronics (D): Keen on Lean Manufacturing at Daktronics, Inc. by N. Levenburg [Operations Management]
8	Lockheed Martin's Acquisition of NationScope, Inc. by S. A. White [Finance]	The Pub: Survive, Thrive or Die? by Grandy, G., Gunther, M. P., Couturier, A., Goldberg, B., MacLeod, I., and Steeves, T. [Strategy]
9	The University Store: Textbook Travails by E. Grace [Accounting]	Litehouse Foods: The Glass Dilemma by Lawrence, J. J., Mishra, A., and Pengilly, M. [Marketing]
10	Trome: News for the Base of the Pyramid by Silva, J., Prado, M., and D'Andrea, G. [Marketing]	Product Innovation at Aguas Danone by Silva, J., Zerboni, F., Chehtman, A., and Alonso, M. [Marketing]
11	Ceja Vineyards: Marketing to the Hispanic Wine Consumer? by Gilinsky Jr., A., Nowak, L. I., Santini, C., and Villarreal deSilva, R. [Marketing]	Daktronics (E): Dividend Policy in 2010 by Cook, T. [Finance]
12	Product Innovation at Aguas Danone by Silva, J., Zerboni, F., Chehtman, A., and Alonso, M. [Marketing]	Conflict at MRW: The New Employee's Pregnancy by Marti, M. and Montalvo, A. [Mgmt/OB/HR]
13	Centurion Media: Doing the Right Thing by Conn, C., Guess, A. K., and Hiatt, J. [Ethics]	Disability Accommodations and Promotions at Bunco by Breward, K. E. [Ethics]
14	The Lincoln Electric Company, 1996 (and/or The Lincoln Electric Company, 1989) by Sharplin, A., and Seeger, J. [Mgmt/OB/HR]	Caffébene: Master Brewer of Growth and Global Ambition by Choi, D. Y., Kiesner, F., and Byungoh, K. [Entrepreneurship]
15	Caffébene: Master Brewer of Growth and Global Ambition by Choi, D. Y., Kiesner, F., and Byungoh, K. [Entrepreneurship]	Sula Vineyards by Lopez, R., Gilinsky, A., and Shah, J. [Strategy]

16	Frog's Leap Winery in 2011 – The Sustainability Agenda {Case and Video} by Gilinsky Jr., A. [Strategy]	KaBloom Explodes on the Scene by Dumas, C., Hartstein, D., Kahn, B., Mana, J., Sergenian, G., and Vega, G. [Entrepreneurship]
17	Bright and Dedicated: What More Do You Want? by Eisenbeis, H., Hanks, S., and Shaw, L. [Mgmt/OB/HR]	New York Life Insurance Company by Michel, M. and Rovenpor, J. L. [Finance]
18	iPhone Applications: Viable Business or Time Consuming Hobby by L. Goldgehn [Entrepreneurship]	Radio Station WEEA: Leading in a Challenging Situation by Foster, M. K. [Mgmt/OB/HR]
19	A Telemedicine Opportunity or a Distraction by Gogan, J. L. and Garfield, M. [Information Technology]	CH2M Hill: Reinventing Organizational Careers by K. L. Newman [Mgmt/OB/HR]
20	Disability Accommodations and Promotions at Bunco by Breward, K. E. [Ethics]	Coal, Nuclear, Natural Gas, Oil, or Renewable: Which Type of Power Plant Should We Build? by Clendenon, G., Thurston Jr., P. W., Zhao, F., and Kidwell, S. M. [Finance]

NOTES

1. Note that CRJ has 182 cases in HBSP running mostly from 2008–2015 but with a few cases from 2004–2007. Given that HBSP accounts for over 50 percent of case adoptions, the limited availability of cases within HBSP published prior to 2008 may limit the generalizability of this conclusion. Having said that, HBSP has only been interested in including the CRJ's more recent portfolio of cases as they see evidence of a bias toward more recently published cases.
2. Note that there had been some delays in the publication process in 2013 that caused a delay in getting many 2013 cases into distribution prior to mid-2014, which likely explains why only a single 2013 case made the 2014 best seller list.

