Supplementary online appendix for:

Thomann, E. 2025. Explaining regulatory intermediaries' compliance through the Accountability Regimes Framework,

Policy & Society, DOI: 10.1093/polsoc/puaf029

Eva Thomann, Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Konstanz, Germany, Eva.thomann@uni-konstanz.de

All datasets and R replication files are published at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/NGHLNQ .

A1: Supplementary information about datasets

Table A1: Semi-structured interview guide (dataset 2)

Introduction (should not take longer than 5 min)

Thank you very much for your willingness to speak with us today. We are a politically and financially independent team of researchers interested in the reality of implementing the Prevent Duty at social science departments of UK universities, from the perspective of the lecturers. Having completed the online survey part of the research in which you have participated, we are now conducting interviews with lecturers who have made actual experiences with a situation where the Prevent Duty could potentially have applied. By speaking to us, you are giving us invaluable information that helps us better understand the on-the-ground experiences of lecturers who have been involved in actual decisions regarding the possible application of the Prevent Duty. We are very grateful for your time and insights!

These interviews are confidential. We will record and transcribe them and then remove all identifiable information from the transcripts (personal information, university affiliation, specifics of events described) and delete the recordings permanently. The literal written transcripts will not be made publicly available, but we may include anonymous quotes from interviews in our publications. The project has received ethics approval from the University of Exeter. We have sent you a link to the consent form via e-mail prior to the interview. By signing the form, you consent to us recording the interview and using the information you give us in anonymized form for our research. If you have not done so already, please use the link now, enter your name and click to consent.

The interview consists of six questions and will last about 1h—if we run over time, please do not hesitate to signal if you have to end the conversation. In case the internet connection becomes unstable, I would first try to switch off camera and mute my microphone and if that does not work, end the conversation and try to join the zoom conversation again. If you agree, I will now start recording.

1. **Prevent Duty experience**. You indicated that in your daily work you have experienced a situation when you had to decide about whether to apply the Prevent Duty. Just to briefly kick us off, could you please describe the events to us— What was your relationship with the person who posed a potential risk, what was the reason you believed the Prevent Duty could have been potentially applicable?

2. **Prevent Duty awareness**/training. How aware were you of the Prevent Duty at that time, and what training you had received when that situation occurred?

3. **Prevent Duty response.** In response to this situation, what actions did you consider? What further action, if any, did you end up taking?

4. **Motives.** what were the main considerations that shaped your choice of action?

5. **Accountabilities.** The daily experience of a lecturer entails a range of work relationships with other colleagues, students, the university as employer, and the broader public/democratic society. Additionally the government expects lecturers to help implement the Prevent Duty.

    a) When thinking about these different work relationships, do you personally give more weight to some of them than to others?

    b) How compatible are your additional responsibilities under the Prevent Duty with the demands and relationships of your day-to-day work?

6. **Attitudes toward policy**. What do you think about the Prevent Duty policy?

Table A2: Qualitative coding scheme (dataset 2)

Themes	Sub-theme	Question
General characteristics of experience	Code- Experience Event	Did the respondent experience a particular scenario where they applied/could have applied the Prevent Duty?
	Experience Setting/Context	What was the context of the experience?
	Experience Relationship	What was the relationship with the person suspected of radicalisation?
	Experience Outcome	How did the situation conclude itself? What actions did the respondent take to deal with the situation?
	Code- Experience Outcome	What further action did the respondent take?
Training and knowledge	Prior knowledge	What knowledge or previous experiences (aside from that being reported) did the respondent have with/of the Prevent Duty?
	Training	What type of training, if any, did the respondent receive?
	Code- Training	Did the respondent receive any training from their institution?
	Training (other)	Does the respondent provide any other comments or opinions regarding the Prevent Duty training?
Accountability Pressures	Rule pressure	To what extent does the respondent experience the [professional, market, societal, political] pressure in their daily work as a lecturer?
	Code - Rule Pressure	
	Professional pressure	
	Code - Professional Pressure	
	Market pressure	
	Code - Market Pressure	
	Societal pressure	
	Code - Societal Pressure	
	Political pressure	
	Code - Political Pressure	
	Code- Most Relevant Pressure	What pressure was most referenced by the respondent?
Accountability Dilemmas	Professional dilemma	To what extent do the [professional, market, societal, political] pressures conflict with the requirements of the Prevent Duty?
	Code - Professional dilemma	
	Market dilemma	
	Code - Market Dilemma	
	Societal dilemma	
	Code - Societal Dilemma	
	Political dilemma	
	Code - Political Dilemma	
	Code- Most Relevant Dilemma	What dilemma was most referenced by the respondent?
Threat perception	Threat determination	(In what way) did the respondent perceive that the situation did or did not pose a threat?
	Threat action	(How) did the threat perception influence their course of action?
	Code - Threat action	Did the threat perception influence their course of action?
Outcomes and mechanisms (experience-related)	Professional effect	Did the [professional, societal, market, political] dilemma affect the decision to implement/not implement the policy? IBID possible
	Code - Professional Effect	
	Market effect	
	Code - Market Effect	
	Societal Effect	
	Code - Societal Effect	
	Political Effect	
	Code - Political Effect	

	Code- Most consequential dilemma	What dilemma was most consequential in shaping how the respondent implemented/or did not implement the Prevent Duty?
	Other factors	In relation to the experience, what reasons did the respondent give for choosing to implement/not implement the policy?
Generic Outcomes	Willingness	Are there any situations (in general) where the respondent would apply the Prevent Duty?
	Reasons for willingness	What reasons did the respondent provide for being willing/unwilling to implement the policy in general?
Attitudes towards policy	General views	What are the general views of the respondent about the Prevent Duty?
	Improvement	In what way could the Prevent Duty be improved, according to the respondent?
	Effectiveness	Does the respondent consider the Prevent Duty to be effective?
Organizational context		Please report any organization (i.e.: university) level factors or dynamics that the respondent references
Other		Was there any other part of the interview that was particularly insightful? Please report any quotes here.

Answer categories for questions marked "CODE": Yes, no, NA.

Each interview was coded by two independent, trained coders, whose codes were later double-checked and corrected by a senior scientist. While the two initial coders did discuss and resolve disagreements between each other, this process was not fully documented. The senior scientist's double checking and correcting led to a correction of approximately 15 per cent of the initial codes, mainly by diving back into the interview transcripts and resolving codes that were initially marked as ambiguous by the trained coders. Overall, thus, each case has been coded three times, and the codes are documented in a separate excel sheet including the interview quotations that they are based on. The overall confidence in the coding is therefore high and traceable, even if inherently subject to some degree of interpretation. The sensitive nature of this research came with very strict conditions for obtaining ethics approval. Thus, while the corresponding author can share the excel file upon request with individuals, it cannot be shared publicly: the combination of several quotations, even though anonymized, can potentially allow conclusions about the identity of the lecturers.

Table A3: Measurement of sets, dataset 1

Set	Variable	Operationalization
COMP1	Likelihood to report	Vignette: "You are having a conversation with a student of yours. The student tells you they have been browsing on a website of a group that is known for its approval of the use of violence or of illegal means, which it sees as unavoidable for changing the existing societal order. The student expresses sympathy with the philosophy of the group and the readings promoted on that website, and speaks about the need to get involved in the cause." Having evaluated the scenario, how likely would you be to report the student though Prevent Duty protocol?[2]
COMP2	Implementation willingness	I intend to put effort into implementing Prevent Duty to achieve its goals.[3]
RULE	Reference to public-administrative pressure	Implementing Prevent Duty as intended to prevent extremism is a major priority in my daily work.[3]
DPROF	Rule-professional dilemma	I fear that having to apply Prevent Duty may cause me to compromise my standards of educating students and defending academic freedom[1]
DSOC	Rule-societal dilemma	I fear that having to apply Prevent Duty may conflict with my commitment of providing equal treatment & opportunity, mentoring, and pastoral care to students[1]
DPOL	Rule-political dilemma	I fear that having to apply Prevent Duty may cause me to compromise on my political and ideological principles and values[1]
TRAIN	Training received	Since 2015, what types of training have you received that explains Prevent Duty and how to apply it? You may select more than one option.[4]

[1] Please indicate your feelings towards the following statements on the scale provided, where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 7 signifies strong agreement with the statement.
[2] 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely likely)
[3] Please indicate your feelings towards the following statements on the scale provided, where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 7 signifies strong agreement with the statement.
[4] Binary variable; coded as 1 if respondent indicated "Online/video/document self-guided induction provided by university" or "University-led discussion, seminar or meeting". Coded 0 if respondent indicated "independently sought materials", "unsure", "I have not received any training", or "other (please specify)".
More details see Thomann et al. (2023).

Table A4: Descriptive comparison of datasets 1 and 2

	Dataset 1						Dataset 2				
Variable	**N**	**Mean**	**St. Dev.**	**Min**	**Max**	**Tendency to middle**	**N**	**Mean**	**St. Dev.**	**Min**	**Max**
Male	781	0.571	0.495	0	1		NA				
Age	709	47.711	11.023	25	79		NA				
Likelihood_to_report	809	3.606	1.892	1	7		NA				
COMP	809	0.4	0.31	0.05	0.95	19.7	19	0.474	0.513	0	1
Willingness to comply	803	2.956	1.672	1	7		NA				
Training_selfguided	809	0.485	0.500	0	1		NA				
Training_seminar	809	0.169	0.375	0	1		NA				
Training_independent	809	0.150	0.357	0	1		NA				
Training_unsure	809	0.048	0.214	0	1		NA				
Training_notraining	809	0.363	0.481	0	1		NA				
TRAIN	809	0.553	0.498	0	1		19	0.579	0.507	0	1
Rule pressure	809	1.707	1.245	1	7		NA				
RULE	809	0.13	0.17	0.05	0.95	5.3	19	0.368	0.496	0	1
Societal_dilemma	805	4.484	1.971	1	7		NA				
DSOC	805	0.54	0.33	0.05	0.95	13.2	19	0.737	0.452	0	1
Professional_dilemma	805	4.396	1.933	1	7		NA				
DPROF	805	0.53	0.33	0.05	0.95	14.4	19	0.632	0.496	0	1
Political_dilemma	803	4.056	2.061	1	7		NA				
DPOL	803	0.47	0.34	0.05	0.95	14.9	19	0.632	0.496	0	1

Tendency to the middle= % of respondents who chose indifferent value of 4.

Discussion: For dataset 1, respondents are broadly representative of the composition in most British university departments regarding age, gender, and teaching experience, although academics with permanent contracts are over-represented (Thomann et al. 2023). For ethical reasons, interview transcripts (dataset 2) had to be blinded regarding any socio-demographic details of the interviewees. The comparison of the two datasets suggests that while compliance levels as well as levels of prior training about Prevent Duty by one's university are quite similar, the interviewees in dataset 2 consistently report higher levels of both reference to rule pressure (likely a social desirability effect) and of accountability dilemmas than the respondents in dataset 1 who represent the underlying population of UK based social science lecturers. This suggests that the experience of actually having dealt with a real-life Prevent Duty case, as the respondents in dataset 2 have, might itself trigger stronger conflicting attitudes toward the policy. At the same time, the differences become negligible if we account for respondents choosing the indifferent middle category in dataset 1, which might suggest some levels of reactivity of the interview situation largely eliminating indifferent responses when prompted by interviewers. It is also possible that there was some self-selection into the subset of interviewees of people with stronger attitudes. In short, dataset 1 is largely representative of the population and dataset 2 is representative of the population regarding compliance and training levels, while over-representing stronger attitudes toward Prevent Duty. The ability of the results to travel from dataset 2 to the broader population (as represented by dataset 1) is discussed in appendix A4.

A2: Analysis of sufficiency for COMP, dataset 2

Table A5: Truth Table

Row nr.	*TRAIN*	*RULE*	*DPROF*	*DSOC*	*DPOL*	*Cons. COMP*	*Cons. ~COMP*	*N*	*Cases*
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
17	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	15
19	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	13
22	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	8
25	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	27
27	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	17
28	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	21
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	16
24	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0,5	2	2,11
7	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	6
8	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	1,7,18,35
14	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	31
16	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	29
20	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	9
31	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	34

Cons. = raw consistency (threshold: 1).

Note: rows 27 and 28 are logical remainders in dataset 1. This is likely because of the lower probability of indicating an indifferent stance toward DPROF or DPOL during the interview situation, relative to the survey setting.

Conservative solution (solution consistency 1.0, PRI 1.0, solution coverage 0.889):

TRAIN*~DPROF*~DPOL + TRAIN*RULE*DSOC*DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*~DSOC*~DPOL + TRAIN*~RULE*DPROF*~DSOC*DPOL → COMP

Parsimonious solution models (consistency 1.0, PRI 1.0, coverage 0.889):

M1: ~DPROF*~DPOL + TRAIN*RULE*DPOL + (TRAIN*~DSOC) → COMP

M2: ~DPROF*~DPOL + TRAIN*RULE*DPOL + (~RULE*~DSOC) → COMP

Table A6: Easy, tenable, simplifying counterfactual assumptions made for ESA (COMP)

	TRAIN	RULE	DPROF	DSOC	DPOL
9	0	1	0	0	0
18	1	0	0	0	1
21	1	0	1	0	0
26	1	1	0	0	1
29	1	1	1	0	0
30	1	1	1	0	1

The enhanced parsimonious solution is equivalent to the enhanced intermediate solution reported in the paper.

A3: Analysis of sufficiency for ~COMP, dataset 2

Truth table see Table A5.

Conservative solution (solution consistency 1.0, PRI 1.0, solution coverage 0.900):

~TRAIN*~RULE*DPROF*DSOC + ~TRAIN*RULE*DPROF*DPOL + TRAIN*~RULE*~DPROF*DSOC*DPOL + TRAIN*RULE*DPROF*DSOC*~DPOL → ~COMP

Parsimonious solution models (consistency 1.0, PRI 1.0, coverage 0.900):

M1: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPROF → ~COMP

M2: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPOL) → ~COMP

Table A7: Easy, tenable, simplifying counterfactual assumptions made for ESA (~COMP)

	TRAIN	RULE	DPROF	DSOC	DPOL
4	0	0	0	1	1
6	0	0	1	0	1
15	0	1	1	1	0
23	1	0	1	1	0

Enhanced parsimonious solution models (consistency 1.0, PRI 1.0, coverage 0.900):

M1: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPROF) → ~COMP

M2: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPOL) → ~COMP

A4: Robustness test and formal set-theoretic theory evaluation

Table A8: Replication of necessity and sufficiency analyses on dataset 1

	Dataset 1			*Dataset 2*		
Result	*Consistency*	*Coverage*	*RoN (nec)/ PRI (suf)*	*Consistency*	*Coverage*	*RoN (nec)/ PRI (suf)*
Necessary conditions for COMP						
TRAIN + ~DPROF	0.925	0.491	0.406	1	0,7	0,75
TRAIN + ~DSOC	0.921	0.492	0.412	1	0,6	0,69
TRAIN + ~DPOL	0.939	0.481	0.367	1	0,6	0,69
Necessary condition for ~COMP						
DPROF + DPOL	0.774	0.824	0.811	1	0,56	0,71
Sufficient conditions for COMP						
TRAIN*~DPROF*~DPOL	0.716	0.469	0.551	1	0.44	1
TRAIN*~DSOC	0.704	0.484	0.537	1	0.333	1
~DPROF*~DSOC*~DPOL	0.699	0.714	0.496	1	0.333	1
TRAIN*RULE*DPOL	0.940	0.120	0.639	1	0.222	1
Intermediate solution	0.673	0.777	0.476	1	0.889	1
Sufficient conditions for ~COMP						
~TRAIN*DPROF*DPOL	0.913	0.321	0.868	1	0.6	1
DPROF*DSOC*~DPOL	0.896	0.347	0.730	1	0.2	1
~RULE*~DPROF*DSOC*DPOL	0.931	0.280	0.756	1	0.1	1
Intermediate solution	0.884	0.561	0.8			

White = condition passes consistency test and has empirical relevance
Light grey = condition passes consistency test, but lacks empirical relevance
Dark grey = condition fails consistency test (not replicable)
Thresholds necessity: consistency 0.9, coverage and RoN 0.5
Thresholds sufficiency: consistency 0.75, coverage > 0

Discussion: From table A8, we see that the results of necessity for compliance (COMP) from dataset 2 are replicable and can travel to the underlying population (dataset 1), even though the differently distributed sets (see Table A4) render the conditions empirically trivial in the population. The necessary condition for non-compliance (~COMP) cannot be replicated in the population, indicating a limited scope of the finding. The sufficient conditions for compliance (COMP) cannot be replicated in the population regarding the "well-trained unconflicted" and "conflict-free" configurations, meaning that the scope of these results is limited to dataset 2. Conversely, the "compliance trumps politics path also leads to compliance in the population. The results of sufficiency for non-compliance (~COMP) are fully generalizable to the underlying population. Overall, the results of necessity for compliance and the results of sufficiency for non-compliance are highly generalizable. Conversely, the results of necessity for non-compliance are fully non-generalizable, and the results of sufficiency for compliance are partly non-generalizable to the population. We now compare the results of sufficiency for COMP using truth table analysis (rather than mere replication):

Table A9: Parsimonious solution for COMP, dataset 1

	inclS	**PRI**	**covS**	**covU**
RULE	0.932	0.809	0.297	0.090
TRAIN* ~ DPROF* DSOC	0.781	0.365	0.244	0.031
TRAIN* DPROF* **~ DSOC**	0.796	0.325	0.226	0.018
~ DPROF* ~ DSOC* DPOL	0.830	0.341	0.360	0.099
Solution	0.781	0.489	0.536	

Raw consistency threshold 0.8, frequency threshold 1. Bold: configuration also found in dataset 2 (see table 5).
Discussion: compared to dataset 2 (table 5), in dataset 1 we also find some evidence for well-trained unconflicted and conflict free lecturers complying with Prevent Duty, even though these lecturers still display one accountability dilemma. Thus, the picture is similar, but less clear-cut regarding the role of accountability dilemmas. Conversely, reference to rule pressure appears as an explanation for compliance in itself in dataset 1, while only plays a

prominent role in dataset 2 in the "compliance trumps politics" path. Overall, the results from dataset 1 are entirely consistent with the main substantive interpretations of the results from dataset 2: that the absence of multiple accountability dilemmas tends to trigger compliance, but intermediaries' prioritization of formal rules and providing training to intermediaries mediates these effects.

Box A1: Robustness test (fit-oriented and case-oriented robustness)

Robustness tests are meaningfully applied only for analytic decisions that have plausible alternatives regarding a) calibration thresholds, b) raw consistency, and/or c) frequency threshold. Plausible alternatives neither exist for calibration (given that we use qualitatively coded crisp sets) nor for frequency thresholds (given the small-N character of the analyses). We test robustness against an alternative raw consistency threshold that includes the only uncovered, inconsistent row 24 of the truth table (see table A5).

Sensitivity range for raw consistency

For consistency = 1, steps of 0.01, 80 runs

COMP and ~COMP

Raw Consistency T.: Lower bound 0.51 Threshold 1 Upper bound 1

The results are highly robust to changes in the raw consistency threshold: it only changes when lowered below 0.51, which is way below the usually accepted threshold for sufficiency.

Fit-oriented and case-oriented robustness

For testing fit-oriented and case-oriented robustness, truth table row 24 was coded as sufficient for both COMP and ~COMP (which is not good QCA practice and not actually plausible, since its consistency (0.5) is too low and this produces contradictory results). We calculate fit-oriented and case-oriented robustness using parsimonious models, compared to the intermediate models reported in the paper.

COMP

Initial solution: TRAIN*RULE*DPOL + TRAIN*~DPROF*~DPOL + ~DPROF*~DSOC*~DPOL + (TRAIN*~RULE*~DSOC) -> COMP

Test set: Parsimonious solutions for COMP (consistency 0.9, PRI 0.9, Coverage 1.0)

M1: ~DPROF*~DPOL + (RULE*~DPROF + TRAIN*DPROF*DPOL) <-> COMP

M2: ~DPROF*~DPOL + (TRAIN*~RULE*DPROF + TRAIN*RULE*DPOL) <-> COMP

M3: ~DPROF*~DPOL + (TRAIN*RULE*DPOL + TRAIN*DPROF*DPOL) <-> COMP~COMP

Fit-oriented robustness COMP:

	RF_cov	RF_cons	RF_SC_minTS	RF_SC_maxTS
Robustness_Fit	1	1	0.8	0.8

The results are highly robust in terms of coverage and consistency measures. There is a reasonable degree of set coincidence between the intermediate solution for COMP reported in the paper, and the parsimonious solution that includes the inconsistent row 24.

Case-oriented robustness:

Case parameters

	RCR_typ	RCR_dev	RCC_Rank
Robustness_Case_Ratio	0.889	0	2

88.9 per cent of typical cases are robust to the change in the raw consistency threshold. None of the deviant consistency case is robust. There are two "possible cases", one typical and one deviant, which become newly covered once we change the consistency threshold. Thus, the vast majority of cases remain robust to changes in the raw consistency threshold.

~COMP

Initial solution: ~TRAIN*DPROF*DPOL + DPROF*DSOC*~DPOL + ~RULE*~DPROF*DSOC*DPOL -> ~COMP

Test set: Parsimonious solutions for ~COMP (consistency 0.909, PRI 0.909, Coverage 1.0)

M1: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*DSOC*DPOL + (~TRAIN*RULE) <-> ~COMP

M2: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*DSOC*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPROF) <-> ~COMP

M3: DPROF*~DPOL + ~RULE*DSOC*DPOL + (~TRAIN*DPOL) <-> ~COMP

Fit-oriented robustness ~COMP:

RF_cov RF_cons RF_SC_minTS RF_SC_maxTS

Robustness_Fit 1 1 0.818 0.818

The results are highly robust in terms of coverage and consistency measures. There is a reasonable degree of set coincidence between the intermediate solution for COMP reported in the paper, and the parsimonious solution that includes the inconsistent row 24.

Case-oriented robustness:

Case parameters

RCR_typ RCR_dev RCC_Rank

Robustness_Case_Ratio 0.9 0 2

90 per cent of typical cases are robust to the change in the raw consistency threshold. None of the deviant consistency case is robust. There are two "possible cases", one typical and one deviant, which become newly covered once we change the consistency threshold. Thus, the vast majority of cases remain robust to changes in the raw consistency threshold.

Overall robustness assessment

The results are highly robust against the only alternative raw consistency thresholds, both in terms of parameters of fit and of cases. There are no plausible alternative calibration, frequency, or raw consistency thresholds.

Table A10: Formal set-theoretic theory evaluation

Theory		Empirical cases: *Covered by solution*	Empirical cases: *Not covered by solution*
Expression 1 (COMP)	Expected	~DSOC*TRAIN + ~DPOL*~DPROF*~DSOC + ~DPOL*~DPROF*TRAIN + DPOL*RULE*TRAIN *8 cases with COMP*	POL*RULE*~TRAIN + DPROF*RULE*~TRAIN + DSOC*RULE*~TRAIN + ~DPOL*DPROF*DSOC*TRAIN + DPOL*DSOC*~RULE*TRAIN *1 case with COMP (I11)*
	Not expected	No configurations *No empirical cases*	DPOL*~RULE*~TRAIN + DPROF*~RULE*~TRAIN + DSOC*~RULE*~TRAIN *No empirical cases*
Expression 2 (~COMP)	Expected	~DPOL*DPROF*DSOC + DPOL*DPROF*~TRAIN + DPOL*~DPROF*DSOC*~RULE *9 cases with ~COMP*	~DPOL*~DPROF*~RULE + ~DPOL*~DPROF*~TRAIN + ~DPOL*~DSOC*~TRAIN + DPOL*DPROF*TRAIN + ~DPROF*~DSOC*~TRAIN + ~DSOC*~RULE*TRAIN + DPOL*~DPROF*DSOC*RULE *1 case with ~COMP (I2)*
	Not expected	No configurations *No empirical cases*	~DPOL*~DPROF*RULE*TRAIN + ~DPOL*~DSOC*RULE*TRAIN + ~DPROF*~DSOC*RULE*TRAIN *No empirical cases*

[1] Configurations not covered by the solution mostly describe logical remainder rows, plus 1 deviant case coverage per outcome.

Expression 1: TRAIN + RULE + ~DPROF *~DSOC*~DPOL → COMP

Expression 2: ~TRAIN + ~RULE + (DPROF* DSOC + DPOL* DSOC + DPROF*DPOL) → ~COMP