

Corrigendum to:

Thiem, Alrik. 2016. "Conducting Configurational Comparative Research With Qualitative Comparative Analysis: A Hands-On Tutorial for Applied Evaluation Scholars and Practitioners." *American Journal of Evaluation*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1098214016673902.

On page 9, the two sentences

At second sight, however, the PI chart for HPF in Table 3 reveals that any single one of the presented causal paths is already minimally necessary for HPF. Put differently, in the presence of any single one of the causal paths to HPF listed by Cragun et al. (2014), all others become redundant.

are replaced by

At second sight, however, the PI chart for HPF in Table 3 reveals that four two-way combinations of the presented INUS conditions are already minimally necessary for HPF. Put differently, in the presence of any single one of these combinations, all others become redundant.

Accordingly, the four models presented in Expressions (5) to (8) change from

$$m_{HPF.1}: \quad AR \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (5)$$

$$m_{HPF.2}: \quad DR \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (6)$$

$$m_{HPF.3}: \quad \neg DC \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (7)$$

$$m_{HPF.4}: \quad \neg PR \leftrightarrow HPF. \quad (8)$$

to

$$m_{HPF.1}: \quad AR \wedge DR \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (5)$$

$$m_{HPF.2}: \quad DR \wedge \neg DC \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (6)$$

$$m_{HPF.3}: \quad \neg DC \wedge \neg PR \leftrightarrow HPF, \quad (7)$$

$$m_{HPF.4}: \quad AR \wedge \neg PR \leftrightarrow HPF. \quad (8)$$