SCIENTIFIC REPORT

by Benoît Rihoux

With the help of : Heike Grimm (joint convenor), Sakura Yamasaki and Astrid Spreitzer (Cluster 1), Lasse Cronqvist (Cluster 2), and Barbara Befani and Axel Marx (Cluster 3)

1. Executive Summary: Statement of aims, context and main issues

This workshop's aim is to provide a decisive push to the further development and application of innovative and specific comparative methods for the improvement of policy analysis within a European context. It brings together methodologists and specialists from a broad range of social scientific disciplines and policy fields, as well as senior and more junior researchers.

During the last few years, an increasing number of social scientists and policy analysts have been opting for multiple case-studies as a research strategy. This choice is based on the need to gather in-depth insight in the different cases and capture the complexity of the cases (Ragin 1987). Indeed in policy studies particularly, many relevant and interesting research objects are 'naturally' limited in number: nation states or regions, different kinds of policies in different states, policy outputs, policy styles, etc. These naturally limited or "small-N" populations are in many instances especially relevant from a policy perspective, particularly in a European context.

In many instances the (ex-post) comparison of the case study material is rather 'loose' or not formalised. The major scientific objective of this exploratory workshop is to further develop methods for systematic comparative cases analysis in a small-N research design, with a key emphasis laid on policy-oriented applications within a European context.

In order to do so, this workshop focuses mainly on two recently developed research methods/techniques which enable researchers to systematically compare a limited number of cases : Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Fuzzy-Sets (FS) (Ragin 1987; Ragin 2000). An increasing number of social scientists and policy analysts – particularly in Europe – are now beginning to use these methods. The range of policy fields covered is also increasing (De Meur and Rihoux 2002) (see also database on the resource website at : http://www.compasss.org). So is the number of publications, papers, and also ongoing Ph.D. research projects. Recently, different policy fields have been explored with the help of these methods.

The main methodological issues (which are also very concrete issues in real-life, applied policy research) we ambition to tackle are :

- how can specific technical - methodological difficulties related to systematic case-study research and systematic comparative case analysis (such as case selection, the integration of path-dependency, etc.) be overcome ?

- how can the "quality" of case studies be assessed ? Case studies are often refuted on the ground that they are ill-selected, data are biased, etc. In short, case-studies are

sometimes accused of being 'unscientific', as one can allegedly prove almost anything with case-studies. Using new methods such as QCA, all the important steps of case study research (selection of cases, case-study design, selection and operationalisation of variables, use of data and sources, comparing case-studies, etc.) become more transparent and open to discussion. The latter is especially relevant for policy-makers assessing case-study material.

- Can the gap between quantitative and qualitative analysis be bridged through innovative comparative methods ?

- What is the practical added-value of new comparative methods for policy analysis, from the perspective of policy analysts (academics) *and* policy practitioners (decision-makers) ? Can the following arguments (De Meur, Rihoux and Varone 2004), among others, be substantiated ?

    o The newly developed methods allow one to systematically compare policy programmes in a « small-N » design, which is often the case in the European context (cross-national, cross-regional and cross-sector [policy domains] comparisons);

    o These methods also allow one to test, both *ex post* and *ex ante*, *alternative* causal (policy intervention) models leading to a favourable/unfavourable policy output and favourable/unfavourable policy outcomes. This approach, in contrast with classical statistical and econometric tools, allows thus the identification of more than one unique path to a policy output : more than one combination of conditions can account for a result This is extremely useful within a European context, as experience shows that policy effectiveness is often dependent upon national/regional settings as well a upon sector-specific features, and that different cultural, political and administrative traditions often call for differentiated implementation schemes (Audretsch, Grimm and Wessner 2005). This is of course even more the case in an enlarging Europe, with an increased diversity of economic and institutional-political configurations;

    o They allow one to engage in a systematic *quasi-experimental design* : this design enables the policy analyst (or policy evaluator) to examine under which conditions (or more precisely : under which *combinations* of conditions) a specific policy is effective or not ;

    o These methods are very transparent ; the policy analyst can easily modify the operationalisation of the variables for further tests, include other variables, etc.. Thus it is also useful for pluralist/participative analysis;

    o These methods are useful for the synthesis of existing (qualitative) analyses, as well as for meta-analyses.

In concrete terms, the workshop is separated in 3 clusters :

1. mapping approaches, methods and techniques (4 papers + keynote lecture)

2. innovative methods to analyse policy-making processes (agenda-setting, decision-making) : applications (6 papers)

3. innovative methods for policy implementation and evaluation : applications (3 papers)

2. Scientific content of the workshop

2.1 Cluster 1 : mapping approaches, methods and techniques

This first cluster gathers papers which confront set-theoretic methods such as QCA and FS with some other existing – mainly quantitative – methods, in an intermediate-N setting. Some papers also address prior issues of comparative research design and case selection in systematic case study research.

In a keynote lecture, Charles C. Ragin discusses the particular usefulness and relevance of set-theoretic methods (both "crisp" and "fuzzy") for policy-oriented research. His main point is that such methods offer a type of causal analysis that is both innovative and congruent with the requirements of policy research, in five respects. First, they are compatible with theoretical (and policy) discourse about causation, which tends to be set-theoretic in nature. Second, they permit the examination of explicit, as opposed to tendential (i.e. correlational) connections between variables. Third, they allow one to systematically examine necessity and sufficiency, which are central to policy research. Fourth, they permit the analysis of causal complexity. Finally, they are inherently compatible with notions of causal asymmetry. In sum, set-theoretic methods are more useful to policy research than mainstream (i.e. correlational) quantitative methods.

David Levi-Faur discusses the heuristic of comparative research, relying on his own research endeavours, and attempts to provide a comparative research design which would be more suited for policy researchers. The main research problem is : how to increase the number of cases without loosing in-depth case knowledge? On the one hand, he provides a critical overview of Lijphart's and King-Keohane-Verba's advocated designs, which meet respectively the (contradictory) needs of internal validity (by control and comparison) and external validity (by correlation and broadening of the scope). The problem is to meet both needs, while also avoiding the contradiction between in-depth knowledge and generalisation. On the other hand, building on Mill and on Przeworksi & Teune, he attempts to develop a series of 4 case-based comparative inferential strategies to be used in a stepwise and iterative model.

Gisèle De Meur and Alain Gotcheiner present and discuss the potential of a specific technique (developed by De Meur & Berg-Schlosser) : MSDO/MDSO (Most Similar, Different Outcome / Most Different, Similar Outcome). It is presented as a technique to be used as a prior step before using a technique such as QCA, so as to take into account many potential explanatory variables which are grouped into categories, producing a reduction in complexity. The main intention is to operationalise Przeworski and Teune's concepts of most similar system design (MSSD) and most different system design (MDSD), through an algorithm of MSDO/MDSO, though softening somewhat the Przeworski and Teune criteria. (Most similar design outcome) and MDSO (Most different design outcome). MSDO/MDSO is to be used as a first step to select pertinent conditions. Focus lies on distances, meaning similarities and dissimilarities. The data space property thus obtained is non linear, non metric and non homogeneous.

Carsten Schneider, Bernhard Kittel and Claudius Wagemann first discuss the respective merits and limitations of QCA versus regression analysis. One of the main difficulties of QCA is that it produces many "remainders" (non-observed cases). Their main argument, within a QCA procedure, is that a "two-step" procedure should be followed, so as to reduce the number of remainders. First, "proximate" and "remote" conditions need to be distinguished. This distinction is also relevant in policy analysis. Second, the "first step analysis" includes

only the remote conditions. Third, the "second step analysis" takes into account only the relevant remote factors (i.e. those which have been single out by the QCA analysis) and the proximate factors. This can be seen as a structure – agent model, but not necessarily. In their discussion of this potentially promising procedure, they also lay the emphasis on some key challenges for any QCA-type analysis, such as the explicitation of causal mechanisms between micro- and macro-level conditions.

Finally, Astrid Spreitzer and Sakura Yamasaki discuss the possible combinations of QCA and social network analysis (SNA). First, they identify some key problems of policy analysis : representing and deciphering complexity, formalizing social phenomena, allowing generalisation, and providing pragmatic results. It is argued that both QCA and SNA provide useful answers to these problems : they assume complexity as a pre-existing context, they assume multiple and combinatorial causality, they offer some formal data processing, as well as some visualization tools. They follow by envisaging two ways of combining QCA and SNA. On the one hand, a QCA can be followed by SNA, e.g. for purposes of vizualisation and interpretation of the QCA minimal formulae. On the other hand, a QCA can complement a SNA, e.g. by entering some network data into a QCA matrix. In conclusion, they argue that the combination of QCA and SNA could cover "blind areas" in policy analysis, while also allowing more accurate comparative policy analyses and offering new visualization tools for the pragmatic necessity of policy makers.

2.2 Cluster 2 : innovative methods to analyse policy-making processes (agenda-setting, decision-making) : applications

This second group of papers pursues the confrontation of set-theoretic methods (FS in particular) with mainstream statistical methods. It also gathers some concrete QCA and MVQCA (Multi-Value QCA) policy-oriented applications, in the "first half" of the policy-making cycle (agenda-setting & decision-making). Finally, it opens some perspectives towards another innovative method : scenario-building.

Charles C. Ragin's contribution concentrates on research which does not study the policy process, but which is relevant for the policy process, at it strives to influence policy making. He focused on the *Bell Curve Debate* (discussion on social inequalities in the U.S.) which lies at the connection of social scientific and policy-relevant debates. He opposes the "net-effect" thinking in the Bell Curve Debate, which is found behind much social science thinking. In the discussion on social inequalities, it is known that these inequalities do intersect and reinforce each other. Thus, does it really make sense to separate these to analyse their effect on the studied outcome? Using Fuzzy-Sets to perform an analysis of the Bell Curve Data, Ragin finds that in all paths explaining the phenomenon of poverty, parental income is found as a causal condition; thus it is a necessary condition. This is directly opposing the findings of the *Bell Curve* Thesis, based on standard statistical procedures.

In their paper focusing on entrepreneurship policy and regional economic growth in the USA and Germany, Heike Grimm and Robert Gamse develop several qualitative approaches focusing on institutional policies to define the concept of "Entrepreneurship Policy" more precisely. They implement these approaches with QCA to check if any (or any combination) of these approaches can be identified as a causal condition contributing to regional growth. By using six conditions derived from previous qualitative cross-national and cross-regional qualitative surveys for each 30 cases in the USA and in Germany, no "one-size-fits-it-all" explanation could be found, confirming the high complexity of the subject predicted by the authors. Summing up, QCA seems to be a valuable tool to, on the one hand, confirm (causal)

links obtained by other methodological approaches, and, on the other hand, allow a more detailed analysis focusing on some particular contextual factors which are influencing some cases while others are unaffected.

In a paper on trust in political institutions in East and Central Europe, Algis Krupavicius attempts to use QCA to see if different cultural, social and economical settings exert some influence on the trust in concrete political institutions. Using some aggregate data covering 12 countries, he is able to distinguish four groups of countries. This also leads him to discover how complex (and sometimes even contradictory) some of the cases (i.e. countries) are. He then performs, in a sequence, some linear regression analyses, as well as some exploratory FS/QCA analyses. The first series of more conventional analyses allows him to obtain some preliminary results, whereas the FS/QCA analysis produces too many contradictions to proceed further. In conclusion, he suggests some changes in the operationalisation of some variables, which may solve a certain number of contradictions and – possibly – allow him to obtain some more convincing results.

Lasse Cronqvist and Dirk Berg-Schlosser, in their paper on the conditions of occurrence of HIV prevalence in Sub-Saharan Africa, illustrate and test quantitative methods as well as Multi-Value QCA (MVQCA). The goal is to explore the causes in the differences of HIV prevalence rate between Sub-Saharan African countries. While regression tests and factor analysis show that the religious context and colonial history have had a strong impact on the spread of HIV, the popular thesis, according to which high education prevents high HIV prevalence rates, is invalidated. In countries with a high HIV prevalence rate, MVQCA then allows one to find connections between the mortality rate and the increase of the prevalence rate, as well as between the economical structure and the increase of the prevalence rate, which might be of interest for further HIV prevention policies. Methodologically, the introduction of finer-graded scales with MVQCA is proved useful, as it allows a more genuine categorization of the data. However, the authors do warn not to over-use fine graded scales with MVQCA, as this would "individualize" the data and hence not lead to any useful MVQCA application.

In his paper on the use of FS in comparative welfare state research, Jon Kvist shows how FS can be used to perform precise operationalisation of theoretical concepts. He further demonstrates how to configure concepts into analytical concepts. Using unemployment insurance and child family policies as an example with four Scandinavian countries, he exemplifies these approaches by using fuzzy memberships indicating the orientation towards specific policy ideal types. Using longitudinal data, he is then able to identify changes in the policy orientation in the '90s by identifying changes in the fuzzy membership sets. Thereby an approach is presented which allows to compare diversity across countries and over time in ways which conventional statistical methods but also qualitative approaches not have been able to do before.

Finally, António Brandao Moniz presents a quite different method, Scenario-Building, as a useful tool for policy analysis. Scenarios describe possible sets of future conditions. By building a scenario, one has to consider a number of important questions, and uncertainties as well as key driving forces have to be identified and deliberated about. The goal is to understand (and maximize) the benefits of possible strategic decisions, while also taking uncertainties and external influences into consideration. He further discusses some of the forecasting methods used in concrete projects, and exemplifies them by presenting scenario-building programs in the field of technological research, performed in Germany, Japan and by the United Nations.

2.3 Cluster 3 : innovative methods for policy implementation and evaluation : applications

This third and final cluster gathers papers which concentrate on the "second half" of the policy-making cycle : policy implementation and evaluation. It contains some concrete applications in two specific policy domains, as well as some more methodological reflections so as to pave the way for improved applications.

In his paper, Pentti Luoma applies QCA and regression analysis to a research project on the ecological, physical and social sustainability of some residential areas in three growing and three declining municipalities in Oulu province (Finland). He presents preliminary results of a study of 13 residential areas in Oulunsalo, a municipality close to the city of Oulu with a fastly growing population in connection to the urban sprawl. He identifies several variables which might influence this sustainability such as issues related to the attachment to a local place (local identities), physical features of the built environment and social characteristics such as the presence of young people, children, etc. The main focus of the paper is placed on social sustainability and integration, which are operationalised as dependent variables in terms of satisfaction of present living conditions in a certain neighbourhood (are respondents satisfied with where they are living), inclination to migrate (do respondents want to out-migrate) and a measure of local social capital (local network: do people know other people from the neighbourhood). QCA and regression are used to analyse the occurrence of social integration in a model which consists out of social, physical and local features. In the analytical process, the author encounters some concrete difficulties with QCA, particularly in terms of contradictions.

Frédéric Varone, Benoît Rihoux and Axel Marx aim to explore in what ways QCA can contribute to challenges for policy evaluation. They identify four challenges: linking policy interventions to outcomes and identifying causal mechanisms which link interventions to outcomes; identifying a net effect of policy intervention and purge out the confounding factors; answering the 'what if'-question (i.e. generate counterfactual evidence); and triangulating evidence. It is argued that QCA offers some specific answers to these challenges, as it allows for a three way comparison, namely a cross-case analysis, a within-case analysis, and a comparison between empirical reality and theoretical ideal types. However, they also point out that QCA should address the contradictions/uniqueness trade-off. If one includes too many variables, a problem of uniqueness might occur, i.e. each case is then simply described as a distinct configuration of variables, which results in full complexity and no parsimony (and is of limited relevance to policy-makers). On the other hand, if one uses too few variables the probability of contradictions increases. This problem easily occurs with models containing less than 4 variables, which indicates that there is an important omitted variables bias. Some possibilities to deal with this trade-off are discussed.

Finally, Fritz Sager and Barbara Befani outline the benefits and challenges of the mixed Realistic Evaluation-QCA approach. A study from the evaluation of the Swiss Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is presented, in which three types of different outcomes are evaluated. Following the realist paradigm, initial assumptions are made on which Context-Mechanism-Outcome configurations explain the different types of policy results (in "generative" terms). The propositions constituting this type of working material are then "translated" into a set of Boolean variables (switching the epistemological basis of the study to multiple-conjunctural causality). A QCA model deriving from those initial assumptions is then constructed and empirical data are collected in order to fill in a data matrix on which QCA is performed. The QCA produces minimal configurations of conditions which are, in turn, used to refine the initial assumptions (on which mechanisms were activated in which

contexts to achieve which outcomes). The theory refinement made possible by QCA covers both directions on the abstraction to specification scale: downward, it offers more elaborate configurations able to account for a certain outcome; upward, it aggregates relatively specific elements into more abstract ones. The latter process is also known as "realist synthesis". The paper finally argues that QCA has the potential to expand the scope and possibilities of Realistic Evaluation, both as an instrument of theory refinement and as a tool to handle realist synthesis when the number of cases is relatively high.

3. Assessment of the results: Mains points of discussion

3.1 Mapping methods; research design

As for the first set of more methodology and epistemology-centred papers (Cluster 1), some of the points of discussion deal with "classical" issues (difficulties) of comparative research design. As far as case selection is concerned, it is argued that, in social science research (and in policy research in particular), one should not broaden too much the variety of cases; hence the quest for generalisation should always be "bounded". Some problems with the Przeworski and Teune models are also identified, such as the fact that they do not take into account differences in the outcome (same v/s different outcome). It is hence suggested that the Mill logic should suffice.

The respective merits of different techniques are also subject to debate. For instance, what is the added value of MSDO/MDSO as compared with "conventional" cluster analysis ? Isn't the potential "fit" between QCA and SNA somewhat overstated, as SNA deals with interrelated cases, whereas QCA deals with interrelated variables/conditions ? In any case, the transparency (and hence usefulness for practitioners) of both QCA and MSDO/MDSO is viewed as a key asset.

Finally, some more concrete suggestions come out of the discussion. One of them is to refine and ground more solidly – empirically and theoretically – the distinction between "remote" v/s "proximate" conditions. One of the theoretical guides for this might be, for instance, Scharpf's actor centred-institutionalism, or Coleman's model (articulation of "macro" and "micro" determinants). Another suggestion is not to strive to integrate QCA and SNA, but rather to use them in another sort of "two-step" analysis. To sum up, many of the methodological issues (difficulties) discussed are not specific to policy analysis, but rather common to social science research.

3.2 Developing further concrete policy-oriented applications

Apart from some details pertaining to individual papers, clusters 2 and 3 are discussed jointly. Most of the concrete discussions on policy-oriented applications concentrate on QCA, as well as on its MVQCA extension and on FS.

The first key issue that is discussed at length pertains to measurement and coding. Indeed, both in QCA, MVQCA and FS, one often encounter difficulties when it comes to coding variables. It is argued that, indeed, this is a difficulty with all formalized methods. The specificity – and advantage – of QCA (and its extensions) it that such operations are carried out in a more transparent way. One more technical aspect is the placement of the dichotomization (0/1) threshold. In this respect, in spite of the fact that one should only use statistical criteria (mean, median etc.) in last resort, one should still pay attention to the size of

the two subsets. A rule of thumb (still to be fine-tuned) could be that each subset should contain at least one third of the cases.

The second main point of discussion relates to logical contradictions: how important are they and how to deal with them? It is agreed that it is actually good to obtain contradictions at some stages of the analysis : the researcher can learn from these contradiction, and it forces him/her to go back to the empirical cases and to theory. With regards to contradictions, there are two ways to use QCA. The first way is to start with a "long" model (many conditions), with very little chances of obtaining contradictions, and then to reduce the model following a stepwise procedure, until it is not possible to shorten the model anymore without creating contradictions. The second way is to start with a very "short" model (very few conditions), thus very likely to produce contradictions, and then to solve the contradictions by using techniques such as MSDO/MDSO to systematically compare the cases on many other attributes, and eventually add some specific conditions. Apart from this, using MVQCA may also help to suppress some contradictions, as one may transform a problematic dichotomous variable into a 3-category or 4-catefory variable (hence adding some differentiation between cases). In the process, frequency considerations can also be used to arbitrate (if one has to make a choice as to where to place some cut-off points). In a careful way, frequency considerations may also be used in the interpretation of the minimal formula. To sum up: there are no "absolute" rules as how to treat contradictions. It also depends on whether QCA is used for hypothesis-testing or for theory-building.

Thirdly, a recurrent topic of QCA-type analysis is discussed : the arbitration between parsimony and complexity. How much reduction of complexity should we aim at ? This translates, in practical terms, in the following question : when and how should "simplifying assumptions" be used ? It is argued that the "most minimal" expression should not always be aimed at, as it requests the use of very "hard" (v/s "easy") counterfactuals. In any case, especially in policy research, it is a virtue of QCA (v/s. most statistical methods) to obtain a solution which is not too simple.

3.3 Nourishing a dialogue with the policy community

The first issue which is discussed in connection with the requirements of policy-makers is : at which point of the policy-making cycle is QCA most useful ? In the field of evalution, for instance, should efforts be placed primarily on *ex ante* or *ex post* types of evaluation, or rather on *in itinere* evaluation? This discussion should be pursued. More generally, some effort should be done to provide a more fine-grained mapping of QCA in connection with the number of cases, with the number of variables, but also with the type of (policy) research questions. Ideally, this mapping exercise should include many different (qualitative, comparative-configurational, quantitative) methods. Some research teams are already engaged in this effort.

Further, the discussion centres on the dilemma between requirements of policy actors, on the one hand, and methodological "purity" on the other hand. One key topic is case selection : how deeply and in what forms do political process factors influence the choice of cases to be included in the analysis? Two opposite situations do occur in real-life policy research : either policy actors insist on including cases which should be discarded on methodological grounds, or, on the contrary, they demand to drop some "embarrassing" case which are methologically or substantively important from the researchers's viewpoint. There are many other "political" constraints such as finance, time available, lack of transparency in data transmission etc. At the end of the process, there is also the difficulty of providing "easy-to-read" and "easy-to-

use" conclusions to decision-makers. Probably one reason why mainstream quantitative techniques are so popular is that they do provide such "simple" conclusions.

To sum up, the participants agree that there is a need to bring more "theory" in policy-oriented research instead of being too inductive (too data-driven). Such theory-guided work is perfectly compatible with the "pragmatic" requirements of policy research. Indeed, while "analytical induction" is theory-guided, it does also allow one to produce relatively "short" (i.e. parsimonious) models, which is a major advantage in policy research. It is also agreed that there is a need to teach policy practitioners that they can learn from (non-policy) social science research – provided such research can be made accessible and "readable" to policy actors. Finally, all participants are convinced that much progress can still be made in terms of concrete policy-oriented applications of QCA-type methods, most often in conjunction and/or in sequence with some other qualitative or quantitative methods. This will be the main task ahead. One first milestone will be an edited volume (forthcoming, 2005; Kluwer/Springer) gathering improved papers from this very fruitful exploratory workshop.

Sources

DE MEUR, Gisèle and RIHOUX, Benoît (2002), *L'analyse quali-quantitative comparée (AQQC-QCA): approche, techniques et applications en sciences humaines*, collab. YAMASAKI, S., Louvain-la-Neuve, Academia-Bruylant.

DE MEUR, Gisèle, RIHOUX, Benoît, and VARONE, Frédéric (2004), "L'analyse quali-quantitative comparée (AQQC): un outil innovant pour l'étude de l'action publique", *Pyramides*, 8, 137-147.

AUDRETSCH, David B., GRIMM, Heike, and WESSNER, Charles W. (2005): *Local Heroes in the Global Village. Globalization and New Entrepreneurship Policies*. International Studies in Entrepreneurship Series, #7, New York, Springer Science + Business Media, Inc.

RAGIN, Charles C. (1987), *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, University of California Press.

RAGIN, Charles C. (2000), *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

4. Final Workshop Program

University of Erfurt
Université catholique de Louvain

Innovative Comparative Methods for Policy Analysis

**An Interdisciplinary European Endeavour for Methodological Advances
and Improved Policy Analysis/Evaluation**

Erfurt
September 25-28, 2004

Chair:

Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux
Dr. Heike Grimm

19:00h	**Saturday, September 25**

Reception
Venue: Sorat Hotel ("Wintergarten")

19:30h	**Key Note Speaker:** **Prof. Dr. Charles Ragin** University of Arizona *"Innovative Causal Analysis and Policy Research"*

9:00h	**Sunday, September 26**

Venue: Sorat Hotel, Conference Room 1

Word of Welcome: **Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux, Dr. Heike Grimm**

Cluster I

State-of-the-Art in Systematic Comparative Case Study Methods (Mapping Approaches, Methods and Techniques/Software)

09:20h	**Dr. David Levi-Faur**
	A Question of Size? *On the Ontology of Kind and the Methodologies of Size in Social Science Research*
09:40h	Discussion
10:00h	**Prof. Dr. Gisèle De Meur, Dr. Alain Gotcheiner**
	MSDO-MDSO Revisited for Policy Analysis
10:20h	Discussion
11:00h	**Coffee Break**
11:20h	**drs. Carsten Schneider, drs. Claudius Wagemann (and Prof. Dr. Bernhard Kittel)**
	Causal Complexity and Policy Analysis. *Making Use of Remote and Proximate Causal Conditions*
11:40h	Discussion
12:00h	**drs. Astrid Spreitzer, drs. Sakura Yamasaki**
	Beyond Methodological Tenets *- The Worlds of QCA and SNA and their Benefit to Policy Analysis-*
12:20h	Discussion

12:40h	**Lunch** Venue: Sorat Hotel
14:00h	**Cluster II:** *Innovative Methods to Analyse Policy-Making Processes (Agenda-Setting, Decision-Making): Applications* *- Part I -*
14:00h	**Prof. Dr. Charles Ragin** *A Critique of the "Net Effects" Thinking in Policy Research*
14:20h	Discussion
15:00h	**Coffee Break**
15:20h	**Dr. Heike Grimm, Robert Gamse** *"Entrepreneurship Policy" and Regional Economic Growth.* *Exploring the Correlation*
15:40h	
	Discussion
16:00h	**Prof. Dr. Algis Krupavicius** *Trust in Political Institutions in East Central Europe:* *An Application of the QCA Approach*
16:20h	
	Discussion
16:40h	**Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux** Wrap-Up and Implications
17:00h	**End of Workshop – First Day**
17.30h- **19:00h**	**Guided Tour of Erfurt**
19:00h	**Dinner** **Sorat Hotel**

9:00h	**Monday, September 27**
	Venue: Sorat Hotel

Cluster II

Innovative Methods to Analyse Policy-Making Processes (Agenda-Setting, Decision-Making): Extensions of QCA and other Approaches

Part II

9:00h	**Prof. Dr. Dirk Berg-Schlosser, drs. Lasse Cronqvist**
	An Advanced Policy-Oriented Application with TOSMANA
9:20h	Discussion
9:40h	**Dr. Jon Kvist**
	Conceptualisation, Configuration, and Categorisation
	– Diversity, Ideal Types and Fuzzy Sets in Comparative Welfare State Research –
10:00h	Discussion
10:20h	**Prof. Dr. António Brandão Moniz**
	Methods for Scenario-building: it's Importance for Policy Analysis
10:40h	Discussion

11:00 Uhr	**Coffee Break**

Cluster III

Innovative Methods for Policy Implementation and Evaluation: Applications

11:20h	**Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux, Prof. Dr. Frédéric Varone, drs. Axel Marx**
	Policy Evaluation and Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): Challenges and Answers
11:40h	Discussion
12:00h	**Dr. Pentti Luoma**
	The Social Sustainability of the Community Structures:
	The Case of the Oulu Region in the North of Finland
12:20h	Discussion

12:40h	**Lunch**
	Venue: Sorat Hotel

14:00h	**drs. Barbara Befani, Dr. Fritz Sager**
	Realistic Evaluation and QCA
	- Theoretical Linkages and an Empirical Application -
14:20h	
	Discussion
15:00h	**Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux**
	Wrap-Up and Implications

15:30 Uhr	**End of Workshop – Second Day**

16:00h-17:00h	**Join us for a Guided Tour of the Augustinian Monastery ("Augustinerkloster")**
	You can take your time and do some shopping and sightseeing by your own
19:00h	**Dinner**
	Sorat Hotel

9:30h	**Tuesday, September 28**
	Get Together at Sorat Hotel: Tram Transport to The University of Erfurt
ca. 9:45h	Working Groups:
	Venue: University of Erfurt

10:00h-	**Cluster Reports**
12:00h	Working Groups:
	❖ Preparation of Cluster Reports
	❖ Preparation of Publication (Article)

12:00	**Summaries of Cluster Reports (max. 20 minutes each)**
	- Presentation by a Speaker of each Cluster -

13:00h	**Lunch**
	Venue: University of Erfurt

14:00h	**Moderator: Prof. Dr. Benoît Rihoux**
	Prospective Discussion:
	❖ Publications
	❖ Priorities for Future Research
	❖ Next Stages of Project

Ca. 16:00h	**End of Workshop**

Ca. 16:00h	**You can take your time and do some shopping and sightseeing by your own in Erfurt**
	Or: Excursion to Weimar: Visit of "Goethe Haus"
Ca. 19:00h	**Joint Dinner in Erfurt or Weimar**

5. / 6. Final list of participants incl. Statistical information

	Name (A-Z)	E-mail	Affiliation	Adresses	tel
1	Befani, Barbara	Barbara.Befani@uniroma1.it, sess.europhd@uniroma1.it; http://w3.uniroma1.it/sess.europhd	University of Rome	(SESS.EuroPhD), Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Via del Castro Laurenziano, 9, 00161 Roma, Italy	Tel: +39-06-49766952
2	Berg-Schlosser, Dirk	bergschl@MAILER.uni-marburg.de	Philipps-University, Institute of Political Science	Wilhelm-Röpke-Str. 6 G, Marburg, D-35032, Germany	(+49) 06421-2824397
3	Cronqvist Lasse	cronqvis@mailer.uni-marburg.de, cronqvis@staff.uni-marburg.de	Philipps-University, Institute of Political Science	Wilhelm-Röpke-Str. 6 G, Marburg, D-35032, Germany	
4	De Meur, Gisèle	gdemeur@ulb.ac.be	Universite Libre de Bruxelles, Fac. of Social, Political and Economic Sciences	Av. F.D. Roosevelt, 50, CP 135, Brussels, 1050, Belgium	(+32) 02 650 38 42
5	Gamse, Robert	robert_gamse@yahoo.com	University of Erfurt, Erfurt School of Public Policy	University of Erfurt, Nordhäuserstr. 63, 99089 Erfurt, Germany	0049-361-7374937
6	Grimm, Heike	heike.grimm@uni-erfurt.de	University of Erfurt, Research Lectureship for Public Policy	Erfurt School of Public Policy, University of Erfurt, Nordhäuserstr. 63, 99089 Erfurt, Germany	

7	Kittel, Bernhard	b.e.a.kittel@uva.nl	University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam School for Social Science Research	Oudezijds Achterburgwal 185, Amsterdam, 1012 DK, The Netherlands	+31 20 525 7375
8	Krupavicius, Algis	akr239@kaunas.omnitel.net, pvai@adm.ktu.lt	Kaunas University of Technology, Policy and Public Administration Institute, Kaunas University of Technology	Donelaicio 20, Kaunas, 3000, LITHUANIA	+370- 7- 300 111
9	Kvist, Jon	jk@sfi.dk	Danish National Institute of Social Research (SFI), Centre for Welfare State Research	Herluf Trolles Gade, 11, Copenhagen, DK-1052, DENMARK	(45) 33 48 0800
10	Levi-Faur, David	david.levi-faur@social-studies.oxford.ac.uk, david.levi-faur@anu.edu.au	University of Oxford, Center for European Politics, Economics & Society	3 George Street Mews, Oxford, OX1 2AA, 31905, United Kingdom	(44) 1865 288 565
11	Luoma, Pentti	pentti.luoma@oulu.fi	University of Oulu, Sociology & Women's Studies, Dept. of Educational Sciences	P.O. Box 2000, FIN-90014, FINLAND	358 8 553 3452
12	Marx, Axel	Axel.Marx@soc.kuleuven.ac.be	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KUL), Departement Sociologie	2B Van Evenstraat, Leuven, 3000, BELGIUM	016/ 32 31 72
13	Moniz, António Brandão	abm@mail.fct.unl.pt	Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Faculdade de Ciencias e Tecnologia	Quinta da Torre, Monte de Caparica, Caparica, P-2829-516, Portugal	212948300 (ext.10402)
14	Ragin, Charles	cragin@email.arizona.edu	University of Arizona/Tucson	Social Science Building 400, TUCSON, AZ 85721, USA	1 520 621 38 04 (35 31)

15	Rihoux, Benoît	rihoux@spri.ucl.ac.be	University of Louvain-la-Neuve, Centre de Politique Comparee	Place Montesquieu 1/7, Louvain-la-Neuve 1348, Belgium	(+32) 010/47-41-90
16	Romme, A.G.L.	a.g.l.romme@uvt.nl	Tilburg University, Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen	P.O. Box 90153, Tilburg, NL-5000, THE NETHERLANDS	(31) 13 466 20 47
17	Sager, Fritz	sager@ipw.unibe.ch	Institute of Political Science University of Bern	Institute of Political Science University of Bern Unitobler Lerchenweg 36 CH-3000 Bern 9	phone ++41 31 631-3285 fax ++41 31 631-8590 E-Mail sager@ipw.unibe.ch www.ipw.unibe.ch/mitarbeiter/sager/
18	Schneider, Carsten	carsten.schneider@iue.it	Central European University, Dep. of Political Science	Central European University, Dep. of Political Science, Nador tca 9, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary	
19	Spreitzer, Astrid	astrid.spreitzer@ihs.ac.at	Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna	Stumpergasse 56, Vienna, A - 1060, Austria	0043-1-59991-187
20	Sprinz, Detlef	dsprinz@rz.uni-potsdam.de	University of Potsdam	Telegrafenberg, P.O. Box 60 12 03, Potsdam, D-14412, GERMANY	+49 (331) 288-2555/-2532
21	Varone, Frédéric	varone@spri.ucl.ac.be	Université catholique de Louvain, Association Universitaire pour la Recherche sur l'Action Politique	Place Montesquieu 1/7, Louvain-la-Neuve 1348, Belgium	(+32) 010/47-42-74
22	Wagemann, Claudius	claudius.wagemann@iue.it	EUI	European University Institute (EUI), Dep. of Pol. And Socials Sciences, Via Die Roccettini 9, 50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy	

23	Yamasaki, Sakura	Yamasaki@spri.ucl.ac.be	Université catholique de Louvain, Centre de Politique Comparée	Place Montesquieu 1/7, Louvain-la-Neuve 1348, Belgium	(+32) 010/47-41-11
24	Audretsch, David	audretsch@mpiew-jena.mpg.de	Director Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy Max Planck Institute for Research into Economic Systems,	MPI Jena, Kahlaische Straße 10, 07745 Jena, Germany	+49 - 3641 - 68 67 00
25	Nowakowski, Nicolette	nicolette.nowakowski@uni-erfurt.de	University of Erfurt	University of Erfurt, Nordhäuserstr. 63, 99089 Erfurt, Germany	49(361)737-4936

Geographical Distribution

Nr	Country
1	AT
5	BE
1	CH
7	DE
1	DK
1	FI
1	HU
3	IT
1	LT
2	NL
1	PT
1	UK
1	US

Gender Distribution

M	F
20	6

19