# Online supplementary material for "Realists and Idealists in QCA", Political Analysis, forthcoming

Carsten Q. Schneider
Department of Political Science
Central European University (CEU)
schneiderc@ceu.edu

November 16, 2017

In order for a minimally necessary disjunction of minimally sufficient conjuncts to be causally interpretable, at least three criteria must be fulfilled: (a) the disjunction must pass the necessity consistency threshold; (b) each conjunction must pass the sufficiency consistency threshold; (c) there cannot be model ambiguity.

Column 'Causally interpretable' summarizes if all three conditions conditions are met. Column 'Cons. Nec.' reports the consistency value of the most parsimonious solution formula interpreted as a necessary condition. Column 'Model ambiguity' indicates if there is model ambiguity and column 'Number models' reports how many models there are. In case of model ambiguity, no consistency value is reported. Column 'Notes' provides further information on peculiarities of some of the results for specific studies. This includes situation in which either no or all truth table rows pass the consistency threshold and when the prime implicant chart is too large to calculate all solution models. In none of these scenarios can a causally interpretable model obtained and the study in question coded accordingly in column 'Causally interpretable'.

**Outcome Y,  threshold  0.9**

| Study | Causally intepretable | Cons. Nec. | Model ambiguity | Number models | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AVD | 0 | 0.769 | 0 | | |
| BAN | 0 | 0.809 | 0 | | |
| BAS | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| CEB | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| DAR | 0 | | 1 | 13 | |
| DAV | 0 | 0.478 | 0 | | no disjunction |
| EMM | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| EPP | 0 | | 1 | 9 | |
| FIS | 0 | 0.885 | 0 | | |
| HAM | 0 | 0.730 | 0 | | |
| ISH | 0 | | 1 | 9 | |
| KAR | 0 | | 1 | 33 | |
| LIL | 0 | | 1 | | PI chart too large |
| MEL | 0 | 0.668 | 0 | | |
| MET | 1 | 1 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| PAH | 0 | | 1 | | PI chart too large |
| PAL | 0 | | 1 | 10 | |
| PAR | 0 | | 1 | 4 | |
| SCH | 0 | 0.192 | 0 | | no disjunction |
| THO | 0 | | 1 | 9 | |
| VER | 0 | 0.884 | 0 | | |
| | | | | | |
| **sum** | **1** | | | | |

**Outcome Y, threshold 0.75**

| Study | Causally intepretable | Cons. Nec. | Model ambiguity | Number models | Notes |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-------|
| AVD | 1 | 0.769 | 0 | | |
| BAN | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| BAS | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| CEB | 1 | 0.815 | 0 | | |
| DAR | 0 | | 1 | 13 | |
| DAV | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| EMM | 0 | | 1 | 6 | |
| EPP | 1 | 0.917 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| FIS | 1 | 0.885 | 0 | | |
| HAM | 0 | 0.874 | 0 | | one conjunct cons<.75 |
| ISH | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| KAR | 0 | | 1 | 52 | |
| LIL | 0 | | 1 | | PI chart too large |
| MEL | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| MET | 1 | 1 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| PAH | 0 | | 1 | 15 | |
| PAL | 0 | | 1 | 10 | |
| PAR | 0 | | 1 | 4 | |
| SCH | 1 | 0.861 | 0 | | no conjunctions |
| THO | 0 | | 1 | 4 | |
| VER | 0 | | na | | all rows above threshold |
| | | | | | |
| **sum** | **6** | | | | |

**Outcome ¬Y,  threshold    0.9**

| Study | Causally intepretable | Cons. Nec. | Model ambiguity | Number models | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AVD | 0 | 0.585 | 0 | | |
| BAN | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| BAS | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |
| CEB | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| DAR | 0 | | 1 | 11 | |
| DAV | 0 | 0.688 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| EMM | 0 | | 1 | 112 | |
| EPP | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| FIS | 0 | | na | | no row above threshold |
| HAM | 0 | | na | | no row above threshold |
| ISH | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| KAR | 0 | | 1 | 134 | |
| LIL | 0 | | 1 | | PI chart too large |
| MEL | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| MET | 1 | 1 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| PAH | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| PAL | 0 | | 1 | 6 | |
| PAR | 0 | | 1 | 4 | |
| SCH | 0 | | na | | no row above threshold |
| THO | 0 | | na | | no row above threshold |
| VER | 0 | 0.375 | 0 | | no disjunction |
| | | | | | |
| **sum** | **2** | | | | |

**Outcome ¬Y,   threshold   0.75**

| Study | Causally intepretable | Cons. Nec. | Model ambiguity | Number models | Notes |
|-------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-------|
| AVD | 1 | 0.864 | 0 | | |
| BAN | 0 | | 1 | 12 | |
| BAS | 0 | | 1 | 2 | |
| CEB | 1 | .906 | 0 | | |
| DAR | 0 | | 1 | 11 | |
| DAV | 1 | 0.758 | 0 | | |
| EMM | 0 | | 1 | 112 | |
| EPP | 1 | 0.922 | 0 | | |
| FIS | 1 | 0.891 | 0 | | no disjunction |
| HAM | 1 | 0.75 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| ISH | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| KAR | 0 | | 1 | 252 | |
| LIL | 0 | | 1 | | PI chart too large |
| MEL | 1 | 0.767 | 0 | | |
| MET | 1 | 1 | 0 | | atomic condition solution |
| PAH | 0 | 0.978 | 0 | | one conjunction cons<.75 |
| PAL | 0 | | 1 | 3 | |
| PAR | 0 | | 1 | 4 | |
| SCH | 0 | | na | | no row above threshold |
| THO | 0 | | 1 | 12 | |
| VER | 0 | 1 | 0 | | conjunction cons <.75 |
| | | | | | |
| **sum** | **8** | | | | |

# Reference List

1. Avdagic, Sabina. 2010. When are concerted reforms feasible? Explaining the emergence of social pacts in Western Europe. Comparative Political Studies 43(5):628-57.

2. Bank, Andre, Thomas Richter, and Anna Sunik. 2015. Long-term monarchical survival in the Middle East: A configurational comparison, 1945-2012. Democratization 22(1):179-200.

3. Basedau, Matthias, and Thomas Richter. 2014. Why do some oil exporters experience civil war but others do not? Investigating the conditional effects of oil. European Political Science Review 6(4):549-74.

4. Cebotari, Victor, and Maarten P. Vink. 2013. A configurational analysis of ethnic protest in Europe. International Journal of Comparative Sociology 54(4):298-324.

5. Da Roit, Barbara, and Bernhard Weicht. 2013. Migrant care work and care, migration and employment regimes: A fuzzy-set analysis. Journal of European Social Policy 23(5):469-486.

6. Davidsson, Johan B., and Patrick Emmenegger. 2013. Defending the organisation, not the members: Unions and the reform of job security legislation in Western Europe. European Journal of Political Research 52(3):339-63.

7. Emmenegger, Patrick. 2011. Job security regulations in Western Democracies: A fuzzy set analysis. European Journal of Political Research 50(3):336-64.

8. Epple, Ruedi, Martin Gasser, Sarah Kersten, Michael Nollert, and Sebastian Schief. 2014. Institutions and gender time inequality: A fuzzy-set QCA of Swiss cantons. Swiss Journal of Sociology 40(2):259-78.

9. Fischer, Manuel. 2015. Institutions and coalitions in policy processes: A cross-sectoral comparison. Journal of Public Policy 35(2):245-68.

10. Hamidov, Ahmad, Andreas Thiel, and Dimitrios Zikos. 2015. Institutional design in transformation: A comparative study of local irrigation governance in Uzbekistan. Environmental Science and Policy 53(0):175-91.

11. Ishiyama, John, and Anna Batta. 2012. The emergence of dominant political party systems in unrecognized states. Communist and Post-Communist Studies 45(1-2):123-30.

12. Karlas, Jan. 2012. National parliamentary control of EU affairs: Institutional design after enlargement. West European Politics 35(5):1095-113.

13. Lilliefeldt, Emelie. 2012. Party and gender in Western Europe revisited: A fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis of gender-balanced parliamentary parties. Party Politics 18(2):193-214.

14. Mello, Patrick A. 2012. Parliamentary peace or partisan politics? Democracies' participation in the Iraq War. Journal of International Relations and Development 15(3):420-53.

15. Metelits, Claire M. 2009. The consequences of rivalry: Explaining insurgent violence using fuzzy sets. Political Research Quarterly 62(4):673-84.

16. Pahl-Wostl, Claudia, and Christian Knieper. 2014. The capacity of water governance to deal with the climate change adaptation challenge: Using fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis to distinguish between polycentric, fragmented and centralized regimes. Global Environmental Change 29:139-54.

17. Palm, Trineke. 2013. Embedded in social cleavages: An explanation of the variation in timing of women?s suffrage. Scandinavian Political Studies 36(1):1-22.

18. Park, Sung H., and Kevin L. Young. 2015. Wage moderation in the public sector: The experiences of 11 EMU countries in the recent economic crisis, 2008-2010. Economic and Industrial Democracy 36(4):575-609.

19. Schneider, Carsten Q., and Kristin Makszin. 2014. Forms of welfare capitalism and education-based participatory inequality. Socio-Economic Review 12(2):437-62.

20. Thomann, Eva. 2015. Is output performance all about the resources? A fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis of street-level bureaucrats in Switzerland. Public Administration 93 (1):177-94.

21. Verweij, Stefan, Erik-Hans Klijn, Jurian Edelenbos, and Arwin Van Buuren. 2013. What makes governance networks work? A fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis of 14 Dutch spatial planning projects. Public Administration 91(4):1035-55.