

## **In Search of the Worlds of Compliance? A Response.**

The reply of Gerda Falkner, Miriam Hartlapp, Simone Leiber, and Oliver Treib to my analysis of the 'Worlds of Compliance' is a welcomed reaction that hopefully can spark further discussion on the analytical leverage of the typology. In this necessarily brief response I want to take up only two points of more general concern.

First of all, the potential deficiencies of survey and other large-N data cannot be an excuse to avoid the application of quantitative analyses. Often what is lost in terms of reliability is compensated by the generalizability and replicability gained. At the very least, such an exercise forces one to specify very clearly what should and what should not be expected according to a theory in terms of falsifiable hypotheses.

The empirical results of the paper also lead us to reconsider and clarify the theory in important ways. For example, observing that broad popular attitudes are not directly linked with the compliance types forces a shift of focus to the compliance culture of the relevant experts. But this qualification of the theory becomes necessary only *after* the empirical analysis has indicated possible discrepancies. In a similar way, we might think of various explanations why, unexpectedly, the variance of country-level yearly transposition performance within the world of domestic politics turns out to be smaller than in the world of neglect only *after* we have established this empirical fact. The overall conclusions of my paper leave open the question whether the 'Worlds of Compliance' theory can withstand the weight of such adjustments and qualifications.