



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Scientific project, Sciences Po | LIEPP
laboratoire interdisciplinaire d'évaluation
des politiques publiques or in english,
interdisciplinary research center for the
evaluation of public policies**

Wasmer, Etienne and Woll, Cornelia

Sciences Po

11 June 2011

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/31434/>

MPRA Paper No. 31434, posted 11 Jun 2011 15:41 UTC

Scientific Project

Sciences Po | LIEPP

Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire
d'Evaluation des Politiques Publiques

Interdisciplinary Research Center
for the Evaluation of Public Policies

Coordinated by

Etienne Wasmer¹ and Cornelia Woll²

June 2011

ABSTRACT

Sciences Po develops an interdisciplinary research program for the evaluation of public policies (in French: *Laboratoire interdisciplinaire d'évaluation des politiques publiques*, **LIEPP**), based on four founding units: *Department of Economics*, *Centre de Sociologie des Organisations*, *Centre d'Etudes Européennes* and *Observatoire Sociologique du Changement*. Its aim is to be (1) independent and non-partisan to ensure its credibility, (2) international to learn from experiences in other countries, and finally (3) multidisciplinary in order to achieve thorough and comprehensive knowledge of our environment and its institutional, social, political, legal and economic mechanisms. The project is financed as a through the Excellency Initiative of the French Government (Investissements d'Avenir: LABEX) with a budget of 10 million euros between 2011 to 2020.

1

Sciences Po, Department of Economics, 28 rue des Saint Pères, 75007 Paris, etienne.wasmer@sciences-po.fr

2

Sciences Po, Department of Political Science, 28 rue des Saint Pères, 75007 Paris, cornelia.woll@sciences-po.fr

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of public policies is both a democratic requirement and a necessity when it comes to national competitiveness and equity between citizens. Growth, fiscal constraints, social and environmental sustainability and regulatory competition require the most efficient public intervention, which nonetheless needs to respond to complex demands from citizens. Yet France has not advanced as much in the field of policy evaluation as countries such as Sweden, Canada, or the United Kingdom.

Sciences Po's Interdisciplinary Research Center for the Evaluation of Public Policies (in French: Laboratoire interdisciplinaire d'évaluation des politiques publiques, LIEPP) aims to be independent and non-partisan to ensure its credibility, international to compare the experiences of different countries, and multidisciplinary in order to draw from fundamental research about social, political, legal and economic mechanisms and environments of public policies. This multidisciplinary will translate into the mobilization of a variety of tools from econometrics, legal expertise, organizational studies, to public policy analysis, with the aim of enriching and renewing the methods of evaluation themselves.

The ambition of LIEPP is three-fold: First, we intend to evaluate French public policies and foreign experiences, by analyzing public choices before a decision is made (ex ante evaluation), by evaluating and guiding the implementation of public policies and contributing to the improvement of existing public policies through the identification of particularly inefficient ones (ex post evaluation), and by comparing current policies with past or international experiences. Our second mission will be to study the existing methods of evaluation – to this day insufficiently known in France - in order to develop new evaluation tools and help position our institute as a world leader in this field. Finally, LIEPP will pass this knowledge onto public administrations, private firms, and international organizations, through education programs and executive training of present and future generation of leaders. By reinforcing the methodological training and giving international exposure to future leaders, the program will have a side effect of improving the voice of France and Europe in international debates.

LIEPP's funding will be dedicated to the development of high standard research, with a strong emphasis on international recruitment procedures which are still much needed in the social sciences in France. Faculty hiring will take the form of tenure-track positions comparable to international standards. Our objective is to select the best candidates with international backgrounds, both French or foreign, by offering them salary and research conditions comparable to the level of the top universities we intend to compete with.

More generally, the project presents both a direct and indirect societal interest. First, it will allow a better evaluation of the public policies implemented in France. Second, by facilitating the import and development of evaluation methods, it will respond to the need for evaluation expressed by both public and private institutions. Moreover, individual research projects can have a large economic impact, especially those that respond to public call for tenders from institutions wishing to evaluate the performance of their policies. The creation of the LIEPP could thus be the catalyst of a virtuous cycle helping to reinforce and maintain a public service of policy evaluation.

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

STATE OF THE ART

THE IMPORTANCE OF POLICY EVALUATION

Policy evaluation is a democratic necessity. Efficient public policies improve both economic performance and equity between citizens. European integration and regulatory competition increase pressures for fiscal harmonization and raise the need of well-designed public policies. Policy evaluation has therefore become increasingly important in the policy

process in France and elsewhere in the world. Education, fiscal policies, environmental regulations, competition policies, justice and all other departments of public policies are now subject to various types of impact assessment. The ultimate objective of evaluation is to replace ideological debates with scientifically grounded arguments, based on state-of-the-art methods and international comparison of public policy. However, despite this noble ambition, policy evaluation is not a neutral activity. In many cases, assessments are used to shift policy objectives, to reduce the role of certain stakeholders, to blame its originators in the course of electoral campaigns or search for culprits responsible for ill-designed policies.

Understanding the context of policy evaluation therefore requires studying the relationship between scientific inquiry and politics, reviewing the theoretical contributions made within different policy-relevant academic disciplines and situating the project in its political setting.

THE DIFFERENT PARADIGMS OF EVALUATION

Experts of public policy evaluation have long been aware of the tension between scientific inquiry and politics, but there is little agreement on how to cope with it. For some, the apolitical quantitative assessments of policies aim to facilitate optimal decision-making. In essence, this amounts to defining evaluation criteria, delimiting the parameter of investigation and choosing the adequate evaluation period to provide recommendations. In the recent decades, economists and econometricians have made progress in the way they identify causal effects of public policies, in part thanks to the spreading methods based on controlled experiments, in particular in development policies, in part thanks to the use of general equilibrium models.

However, they have hardly thought beyond this paradigm: discussion focus on internal consistency issues, rarely on external consistency. As early as the 1960's, opponents criticized the first approach for their positivist stance, which postulated a clear division of labor between science and politics. Without an understanding of the links between science and politics, they argue, policy evaluation can quickly turn into the continuation of politics by other means.

Cautioning against the normative aspects, a new generation of analysts sought to acknowledge the political dimensions of evaluation (Nelson, 1977, Fischer, 1980). As it became apparent that science could neither separate the evaluation process completely from the political context nor provide authoritative elements to inform optimal policy design, the "positivist approach" was even considered to undergo "an identity crisis" (Palumbo and Nachmias, 1983: 1). In the field of economics, the response was initially to move away from structural models to identifying problem-specific parameters and treatment effects, using experiments or quasi-experiments, in a large part inspired by early contributions, such as the logic of the Coleman report on education in the 1960's. The micro-economic contribution to policy evaluation culminated in the Nobel prize attributed to James Heckman (see Heckman, 2001). Others, in turn, acknowledged the fundamentally political nature of scientific inquiry and began to study how evaluation is carried out. In this strand, where policy evaluation has turned into an object of study, the focus is on the institutional, social and psychological context of evaluation. Still, a common question concerns the logic of evaluation, i.e. what type of measure is most appropriate from a scientific perspective, but also from a social and political one (Scriven, 2007).

Today, we can identify two traditions grouping the diversity of evaluation approaches: a rationalist tradition with a strong emphasis on value neutrality and objective assessment of performance and an argumentative tradition, which sees its role as a contribution to an informed debate and which concentrates on the production of locally situated knowledge (cf. Bovens et al., 2008).

Both approaches suffer from weaknesses, but unfortunately there is very little dialogue between the promoters of either one. In France, government agencies and many evaluators in the fragmented landscape of each policy sector have recourse to "a-political" model-based approaches, so called "rationalists". These approaches are rooted in the field of economics. However, no independent academic institution has so far attempted to develop complementarities with the latest innovations to the study of public policy analysis. The argumentative approach has a long tradition in French academia in fields such as sociology, law, political science or history, but the study of normative content in large-scale evaluation and sometimes also the lack of methodological skills led to an unease with quantitative techniques and evaluation approaches developed elsewhere, in particular the United Kingdom, Canada or Sweden.

The objective of LIEPP is to fill a gap: what is critically missing in France is a scientific and independent research institute that employs the latest methodological innovations in economics and quantitative social science research, and which combines these with insights from argumentative tradition and their insistence on qualitative methods, context-specificity and the need to challenge the ethical and epistemological base of evaluation techniques. We propose to bridge the existing gap in approaches to evaluation, which have marked the division of labor between public evaluation instances and academia in France. This can only be done by setting up a resolutely independent, multidisciplinary scientific evaluation institute, which creates a dialogue between the two competing traditions in order to overcome both sides' weaknesses through organized reflexivity.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

To clarify the scientific innovation of such an enterprise, we will divide policy analysis into three types of inquiry which produce distinct types of information: (1) **monitoring** public policies, (2) **ex-post approaches** evaluating policy impact, and (3) **ex-ante approaches** discussing or forecasting policy outcomes. All three types of analysis are preceded by the identification and definition of a "social problem" requiring political intervention, which informs the various stages and/or approaches.

Monitoring existing policies over time or across countries helps to gather information about the current evolution of policy implementation, its complexity and the whole political process from the design of policies to the democratic decision process, within which it can create a series of effects. Ex-post evaluation of policy performance requires specifying criteria on which to measure policy output and assign a value to discrepancy between expected and actual results. Ex-ante evaluation finally entails arguments about expected outcomes of policies that are not yet implemented or only beginning to produce results (for further discussion see Dunn 2008; Shadish, Cook, Levinton 1991).

Each type of inquiry has its own history of scientific debates and competing methods. Moreover, policy relevant academic disciplines have divided their attention unequally between the three. To be sure, all disciplines have to some degree ventured into performance evaluation. Yet political scientists, sociologists, historians and legal scholars most often combine evaluation with the monitoring of current public policies to understand how they were implemented, how they operate and what kind of effects they produce over time and in different countries. Economists, in turn, are the most dominant in the field of forecasting, in particular by with highly abstract economic models.

In the following, we will review the contributions and weaknesses in each field in order to show that the three methods of inquiry need to be carried out in combination in order to counterbalance each of their individual shortcomings. Since the epistemological and ontological gaps between the three types of analysis are real and profound, we will argue that such a triangulation can only be achieved through a well-organized governance structure where interdisciplinary dialogue constitutes the heart of each evaluation project.

Monitoring public policies. The rationale behind the study of existing public policies is that evaluation is not possible without understanding how public policies evolve in a complex environment and drawing lessons from experiences *from the past and other countries*. Historical and cross-country studies have thus developed a series of qualitative and quantitative tools to compare policy experiences and provide information about their implementation, about compliance and about observed undesired or secondary effects.

To begin with, research has focused on agenda-setting (Baumgartner and Jones 2005) and the conflicts around the definition of problems: which competing definitions exist and which finally succeed, who is considered to be responsible and which public agency will be charged with the resolution of a public problem? These questions are crucial because such early decision processes impact the choice and acceptance of the adopted solutions (Gusfield, 1982), lead to the institutionalization of public and private actors, instruments and organizations in charge of the implementation. Once put into place, such initial decisions and the commitments made translate into policy paths that are then difficult to escape (Pierson 2000).

Electoral and interest group studies have highlighted that policies have very different chances of being implemented depending on the constituency support that politicians can expect, independent of the public usefulness of the measure. The basic tenant of institutionalist and political economy perspectives is therefore that one needs to understand the political system and the landscape of societal actors in order to know whether a policy

proposal is feasible or not (Olson, 1965, Tsebelis, 2002). In response, policy analysis has focused not just on the instruments implemented, but also the appropriate level where authority should be allocated. Studies have underlined the need for independent central banks in the pursuit of price stability, for example, or for an organized system of side payments between different tiers of government in fiscal policy (e.g. Oates, 1999). Concerning social policies, cross-country studies have debated whether the inclusion of social partners in the policy-making process helps or hinders welfare objectives (Hall and Soskice, 2001). Rather than blocking reform and insisting on their members' interests, unions and trade associations which were included in political decision-making in small countries turned out to facilitate the flexibility of socio-economic governance and to help to explain the success of small countries in open economies (Katzenstein, 1985).

Organizational studies have broken down the implementation process to study the organizations that manage policy instruments. Selznick's (1949) famous study of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) created by Franklin D. Roosevelt showed how the cooptation of local elites in the implementation process can lead to unforeseen "goal shifting": in the end, the TVA opposed federal programs such as the New Deal agriculture programs, despite being created to support such initiatives. In this tradition, an extensive literature has focused on incentives and disincentives that will be created in the implementation process of a particular policy, most often through the ways in which organizations adopts the new tools. Moreover, scholars from all disciplines have focused on perverse and unforeseen effects of policies, for example the black markets arising from prohibitions of product such as alcohol, the introduction of new species used for pest control for the bio-diversity of a given area or the effects of rent controls on housing markets. Beyond simply explaining the reasons for perverse effects, policy analysts have highlighted that much of these difficulties are linked to the evolution of the policy agenda, i.e. why what kind of problem is tackled by a political system at one particular point in time (Kingdon, 2003). Moreover, the effectiveness of a policy crucially hinges on how it is perceived by the public and whether the intervention is considered as legitimate or appropriate. It is thus necessary to study the unfolding of a policy process from the agenda setting stage to its implementation to fully understand the effects a policy will produce in a complex environment.

Although the contributions of this literature are significant, they often result in macro-negative findings, especially when they are based on a series of case-studies: they explain why a given policy does not work. For effective evaluation, these insights are important, but only to the extent to which they help to develop micro-positive results: what kind of instrument will produce the desired effect X under what conditions? Unfortunately, this last step is often omitted by scholars monitoring policies. Their contributions will thus inform disciplinary debates about the nature of the policy process, they are politically astute and they produce locally situated knowledge that often most accurately describe what actually happens when a policy unfolds. Since they study policies as complex phenomenon, however, they do not break down a policy into constitutive parts and study their effects based on value criteria that are relevant to policy-makers. In short, they often do not make the transition to performance evaluation and are therefore of reduced relevance for the discussion of individual policy tools.

Performance evaluation: ex-post approaches. Performance evaluation – sometimes referred to as retrospective evaluation or ex-post evaluation – also studies policies that are already implemented, but with a concrete value criterion in mind against which performance is measured. In some cases, the value criterion is defined by the policy-maker, for example when a policy is declared to solve a clear goal such as employment, increased literacy or reduced child mortality. In other instances, researchers develop their own criteria and adjust the indicators assumed to reveal policy performance. In all cases, however, evaluation entails collecting data from contrasting cases chosen because of the absence or presence of the policy instrument, so that their study can be taken as a natural experiment.

For instance, the impact of a pro-immigration policy removing or alleviating restrictions to the entry of foreign migrants has been studied in several contexts with innovative historical data : David Card (1990) has investigated the impact of immigration based on the Mariel Boatlift experience, a sudden rise in the number of refugees from Cuba in Florida between April and October 1980 ; Jennifer Hunt (1992) has studied the wave of returning French expatriates in Algeria in 1962 on Southern France labor markets. The typical approach is to use a difference-in-difference estimate of the causal impact before and after the exogenous event and in comparison with a control group (e.g. a region or state similar to Florida or the Northern France labor markets). The approach, extensively used by prominent economists at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (e.g. Esther Duflo for development policies or Joshua Angrist for labor and education policies) consists of two steps. First, find a natural experiment, or design an experiment with randomized groups, some receiving a “treatment” and others being a “placebo group”. Second, estimate a parameter of interest, e.g. the impact of the “treatment” on the average of a variable X of the treated group. Another example of this logic is the very rich set of evaluations of the Self-Sufficiency Project in New Brunswick and in British Columbia to estimate the impact of employment subsidies to poor workers.

The contribution of recent ex-post evaluation has been much greater precision and accuracy in the identified effects. Rather than making broad generalizations about the usefulness of a policy in general, they are able to specify the conditions under which any given policy can or cannot produce the desired effects. This scientific precision has been groundbreaking in the field of development economics, for example, where policy responses have moved away from macro-policy recommendations such as structural adjustment promoted by the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank in the 1980s and 1990s to support poverty reduction by adjusting micro-level policies (Deaton et al., 2010). However, evaluation studies are parsimonious in terms of the theory used: economic theory has traditionally only been invoked to describe the context and with simple demand and supply concepts, generally without complex intertemporal optimization behaviour. With respect to the political and social context, research may build on intuitive insights that arise from more in-depth studies of comparable policies, but the discussion is most often thin and focused only on the current study at hand. From the standpoint of theory about social and political behaviour and about the policy-making process, the contributions of this literature are therefore often underdeveloped. In the following, they are termed as “*reduced-form approaches*” even though this is obviously somewhat simplified.

Forecasting: ex-ante approaches. A third field of study relevant to policy analysis is ex-ante evaluation, where scholars model the potential effect of a policy change that is not yet implemented. Based on theoretical knowledge about the political process and decision-making behaviour, analysts, in particular economists, build so-called structural models, where agents make optimal choices under some constraints. These agents are consumers, workers, firms, families, or even government bodies. The equilibrium of the model is then computed and calibrated, that is, some key parameters are estimated or guessed from statistics or from estimates from other works.

This approach, initially developed to build macroeconomic models by Nobel prize laureates Ed Prescott or Finn Kydland and subsequently by the so-called Minnesota school (the dynamic stochastic general equilibrium approach), has then been generalized in order to study the impact of all types of policies. Among the various fields covered by these techniques, labor policies are well-represented. A typical example of the gains from having a structural approach is the estimate of the impact of employment protection on labor markets efficiency (Hopenhayn and Rogerson, 1993): given that employment protection has a general equilibrium impact, a traditional difference-in-difference estimate mixes up the partial equilibrium effects on firm demand and general equilibrium effects. Other pioneering works (e.g. Keane and Wolpin, 1997) are based on structural estimations of the models, such as the models of labor markets and the decisions of young workers.

The most recent forecasting techniques are thus highly abstract. They make the choice to not simply extrapolate current or historical trends into the future, another method of forecasting that fails when the future turns out to be markedly different from the past, for example in response to external shocks or unforeseen new information (Taleb, 2007). However, modelling policy effects requires making a series of parsimonious assumptions and the value of the prediction stands and falls with the accuracy of these starting assumptions. Moreover, the accelerating complexity inherent in policy issues such as health, technology, welfare or the environment quickly overtax modelling attempts or lead to very partial insights only.

Arguably, for all social scientists, ex-ante analyses are the most difficult of all, since they require to anticipate not only the various effects including general equilibrium ones, but also the way the political process and the perception of policies by actors in charge of the policy will affect policy implementation. The challenges of evaluation in the context of highly complex social phenomena – such as the interactions between public policies, market forces and political processes – requires a novel approach, that we call hereafter, for simplicity, a “triangular” approach.

The need for a “triangular” approach. The challenge of accurate, useful and scientifically

robust policy evaluation is to bring together the contributions of all three fields in order to counterbalance the weakness of each when taken in isolation.

Monitoring existing public policies alone is insufficient to evaluating the performance of a policy tool when it is not combined with a rigorous case selection for testing the effects in cases which have been exposed and not been exposed to it. Methodologically, inquiry needs to combine large scale quantitative studies with probing case studies: once we know the distribution of an effect, we can identify extreme and average cases that can help us to probe the validity of competing causal explanations.

From an economics standpoint, it is important to reconcile ex-post and ex-ante evaluation. Several recent papers have attempted to go in this direction: for instance, the evaluation of the efficiency of the employment subsidies of the Self-Sufficiency project has been studied within a general equilibrium model by Jeffrey Smith and Jeremy Lise (Lise et al., 2009). The well known Progresa program in Mexico has been studied by Attanasio, Meghir and co-authors (Attanasio et al., 2003, Attanasio et al., 2009): they argue that in the absence of a structural model it is impossible to estimate the effect of the program and of variants in its application and argue for the use of combined approaches using data from the randomized experiment and structural economic model. Finally, the most recent issue of the Journal of Economic Literature (June 2010) gathers papers from different approaches and in particular of Guido Imbens on the one hand on “local average treatment effects in the ex-post literature, and James Heckman on the other hand. The title of his article “*Building Bridges between Structural and Program Evaluation Approaches to Evaluating Policy*” provides the direction for future research in policy evaluation within economics. In the absence of a sound theoretical understanding, reduced-form approaches are typically unable to estimate general equilibrium effects. For example, an ex-post evaluation may isolate positive effects of a job training program on employment. However, the extra jobs may be obtained at the expense of the surrounding individuals. Generalizing this program on a national scale may not deliver the same results, if for example the total quantity of jobs is determined at a national level. Moreover, reduced-form approaches are unable to deliver “counterfactual” experiments, i.e. what the outcomes could have been, had the reform been slightly different. Generally speaking, data analysis without explicit theorizing, will always remain partial (Cook 2000).

Likewise, structural models alone are not always able to deliver comprehensive answers raised by the need of policy evaluation, in particular due to a number of arbitrary choices. Models are often based on non-testable assumptions, and sometimes untransparent calibration exercises. The informed choice of starting assumption thus needs to incorporate knowledge from studies of existing policies. Unfortunately, analysts devising structural models have only limited access to findings from historical and cross-country policy studies. Even within the field of economics, ex-ante evaluation estimates are rarely compared to ex-post estimates, even when such an exercise could validate the model. Ex-ante and ex-post approaches rely on the existence of accessible and reliable datasets. However, the constriction of data, the implicit theory they sometimes incorporate, the constructed character of the categories they rely on is not neutral. Bringing the three approaches together could lead to improvement in data collection, to suggestions about the development of new data basis, or to a better articulation between data basis and data that cannot be quantified.

In sum, all three approaches inform each other: they help to identify policy problems more accurately, develop more robust theories about causality observed and to be tested and measure the impact of a policy instrument with greater precision. In particular, knowledge from monitoring allows to develop more astute evaluation criteria and to formulate more realistic modelling assumptions, while structural models help to specify cases of interest for empirical studies and generate hypothesis about policy alternatives. Evaluation undertaken without these two insights risks being of only limited use to policy-makers, even if they are scientifically coherent.

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF EVALUATION

Theoretical debates about evaluation have not taken place in a political vacuum, quite on the contrary. It is therefore helpful to briefly recall the history of policy evaluation, with a special emphasis on the most recent trends and the political landscape in France, in order to situate the scientific project we propose.

Evidence-based policy making. Although policy evaluation is as old as policy-making itself, one can argue that there has been an additional rise in the pressure for scientific assessment of new proposals in the 1990s and the 2000s (OECD, 2001). In the United Kingdom in

particular, the call for “evidenced-based policy-making” became an integral part of Tony Blair’s agenda for modernizing government and reforming intervention in areas such as health, social policies and development assistance. The ambition was to import into the policy process the concept of evidence-based medicine, which implies the use of extensive impact assessments, often by selecting randomized trial groups. Criticisms quickly arose in response. First, opponents argued that impact assessments do not service well all areas of public problems. Second, they pointed out that governments may commission evaluations for policies that are already decided on in order to legitimate them afterwards, a phenomenon which has been referred to as “policy-based evidence making” (House of Commons, 2006: 47).

Despite these criticisms, the language and philosophy of evidence-based policy making has informed policy debates in the United States, Australia and the European Union. In several countries, there are even advocacy groups insisting on the need of impact studies to avoid arbitrary decision-making, such as The Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy (<http://coalition4evidence.org>) in the United States or the Association France Qualité Publique (<http://www.qualite-publique.org>), for example.

The insistence of evidence rather than ideology has created a momentum for approaches developed over time in countries such as Canada, which is often cited as one of the pioneers of policy evaluation (Jacob, 2006). As a matter of fact, most countries have developed specific tools and procedures to reinforce evaluation in the policy-making process, which are sometimes markedly different from one country to another. At the occasion of an evaluation of the evaluation process in France, Pierre Lascoumes and Michel Setbon have underlined the country’s specificity: French evaluation is marked by a high degree of pluralism, where the method adopted depends in great part on the choice of the evaluation instance (Kessler et al., 1998). Despite this particularity, evidence-based policy-making has been inscribed in French discourse with a new finance law in 2001, the *Loi organique relative aux lois de finances* (LOLF). By obliging public administrations to determine the objectives and define indicators in order to attribute the appropriate budgets, the LOLF give a constitutional status to policy evaluation and opens up the possibility of performance-based budgeting, which has been promoted by international organizations such as the World Bank.

The pressures for policy evaluation have thus become more marked in recent decades, but the way in which this has been applied and the role attributed to scientific innovation depends very strongly on the existing landscape of policy evaluation (Leca, 1993), which turns out to be particularly fragmented in France.

Existing landscape of policy evaluation research. Several observers have regretted the relative lack of sustained interest in policy evaluation in France, compared to countries such as the United Kingdom or Canada. To be sure, the policy evaluation field in France is quite crowded. Since 22 January 1990, the Conseil national d’évaluation oversees public evaluation and proposes an annual evaluation program to the Prime Minister (cf. Conseil scientifique de l’évaluation, 1996). In addition, the Parliament has created the Mission d’évaluation et de contrôle at the National Assembly and the Comité d’évaluation des politiques publiques at the Senate. The Cour des Comptes has added policy evaluation to its portfolio and produced over thirty “rapports publics particuliers”. It has inspired the Révision Générale des Politiques Publiques in pioneering ex-ante evaluations in France. At the regional and local level, the Délégation à l’aménagement du territoire et à l’action régionale (DATAR), the Comité national d’évaluation de la politique de la ville or the Comité de coordination des programmes régionaux d’apprentissage et de formation professionnelle continue (CCPRA) propose policy evaluation to accompany decision-makers. These organizations produce insights that are very valuable and often complementary to the reports and analysis written by the numerous audit and evaluation units attached to different ministries. However, they all suffer from their dependence on political will to maintain their activities. Without the capacity to pursue evaluation independent of government imperatives, policy analysis continuously runs into the wall of interested indifference, at best, and the partial obstruction of inquiries, at worst (Gaxie and Laborier, 2003, Eliadis et al., 2010).

Conscious of these risks, policy analysis in other countries is sometimes attributed to independent research centers, often with explicit scientific rather than political objectives. To begin with, important contributions to policy evaluation have been produced in the proximity of universities or programs focusing on training in public policy and public administration. Among the most important centers, one may cite the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, the Harris School at the University of Chicago, the Hoover Institution at Stanford University or academically oriented think tanks such as Brookings, the Peterson Institute of

International Economics in the United States or Bruegel in Europe. In France, the Ecole nationale d'administration has recently founded the Centre d'expertise et de recherche administrative (CERA), acknowledging the importance of research in the field. This research group has concentrated so far mainly on administrative science rather than evaluation research but will surely investigate new fields and LIEPP will be happy to collaborate if there is reciprocal interest. In sum, while all of these institutions focus on the analysis of public policy, in many cases with the goal of making explicit research-based policy recommendation, they do not concentrate their efforts on furthering the methods and objectives of policy evaluation.

Independent research institutes focusing on policy evaluation are still relatively rare. Professional associations such as the American Evaluation Association or the Société Française d'Evaluation regroup many activities, bring together specialists from different fields and edit specialized journals such as the *American Journal of Evaluation* or the *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*. But not all of these institutes have been recognized as outstanding centers of academic excellence within their academic disciplines. One of the most notable exceptions to the rule is Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) at the University College London founded in 1970, which has developed into one of the leading centers for evaluation research and an authoritative commentator on Britain's public policies in a great variety of sector. Unlike research institutes that focus on just one policy domain, such as the existing centers for social policy evaluation or educational policy evaluation, the IFS is able to use and apply insights from one policy sector to another and thus greatly advances our understanding of policy dynamics. However the IFS exclusively works from a perspective of micro-economics and econometrics and only engages occasionally in interdisciplinary cooperation.

An academic research center that is independent of the policy cycle, that covers a great variety of policy sectors and that systematically applies an interdisciplinary perspectives to policy evaluation projects would therefore be a great innovation in at the international and the national level and would help to build on the existing strength of research in France to make it a major center of gravity for evaluation research. This is the project we would like to develop in the following section.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The need for interdisciplinary perspective in public policy evaluation has been expressed at numerous occasions and some significant advances have been made in certain policy sectors. However, no interdisciplinary evaluation research center exists that covers a variety of policy sectors and is thus able to transfer lessons from one field to another. To lay out the innovation and ambition of our project, we will begin by discussing how we will tackle these challenges and develop our work program, first, by discussing our methodological innovation and, second, by illustrating the application of our methodology to different policy sectors in order to demonstrate the insights we will contribute. We will then develop our governance structure and lay out our method for interdisciplinary coordination. A final section highlights how this program builds and moves beyond existing research at Sciences Po, how it will extend our existing cooperation within the PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité and within our research networks in France, and show how it will put France at the center of public policy evaluation internationally.

CURRENT IMPEDIMENTS

As the state-of-the-art section has highlighted, two major obstacles have impeded the development of an ambitious scientific research institute focused on policy evaluation in France: First, the evaluation landscape is already crowded, with the majority of evaluation undertaken by specialized agencies that work in relative proximity to public decision-makers. Second, scientific evaluation divides into competing fields, with decreasing communication between different perspectives due to disciplinary and sub-disciplinary specialization.

The first impediment is mainly of practical nature and follows from the discussion of the fragmented and highly politicized landscaped. If policy assessment is produced in proximity to policy-makers and if the launch and maintenance of studies depends on political will, evaluation continuously risks being used as justification for prior decisions or as symbolic tools in political battles. Moreover, individual analysis may be discarded or discredited and it will be difficult to ensure that studies are used in a cumulative scientific manner.

Simply "entrusting" policy evaluation to academia, however, has not necessarily led to satisfactory results in the past either, because the dynamics proper to scientific production

have impeded comprehensive evaluation techniques. The second impediment is thus of linked to the production of scientific innovation. In particular, the specialization along disciplinary lines provides strong incentives against interdisciplinary evaluation, despite the recognizable benefits for policy-makers.

To be sure, specialization in scientific progress is an important step: there are clear economies of scale in production: joint research efforts of specialized researchers within a field have generalized over time and led to significant progress. There is indeed an upward trend in co-authorship in every field in economics and in particular among departments. But specialization may lead to limitations, even within a discipline. One may indeed consider that, beyond a certain point, the process of increasing sub-specialization as potentially dangerous for the discipline as a whole: researchers specializing in structural models have progressively decided to ignore top field journals such as the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* which in turn publishes a lot of reduced-form, randomized or generally ex-post evaluation papers. In turn, journals such as *International Economic Review* or *Review of Economic Dynamics* have focused on structural macroeconomic models. In political science, the decline of qualitative research in journals such as the *American Journal of Political Sciences* or the *American Political Science Review* has led to the so-called “perestroika movement” and the creation of counter-journals, with very little exchange between the authors from both camps (Bennett, 2002). Similar processes are observable in all fields and are even more pronounced across disciplines. Indeed, references to work outside of the primary discipline are rare in scientific publications, especially in fields that give a high premium to methodological advances.

The increased division of labor can lead to improved methods within each subfield but it is less useful when it comes to policy evaluation. In fact, it may actually decrease the validity of policy recommendations, as Philip Tetlock (2005) has highlighted in a much noted book on the accuracy of policy expertise. In a twenty year study where he examined over 20 000 forecasts by 278 policy experts, Tetlock shows that the most accurate predictions came from policy experts who combined insights from a variety of sources. By contrast, he argued that inaccurate forecasts are common when analysts employ a single parsimonious approach and rely upon extensive abstraction. Parsimonious frameworks, he argues, confer the benefits of closure – one can actually find a definite answer – but desensitize the analyst to the nuance and complexity of the real world, and to the possibility that the underlying theory is wrong. This points to the fundamental tension between science and politics mentioned in the beginning: in some cases, what is elegant on paper may be irrelevant – or worse: misleading – to policy-makers.

However, abstaining from scientific inquiry or parsimonious frameworks would be the inverse fallacy. With the wealth of data available on the effects and contexts of new and traditional public instruments, ceding to constant relativism is equivalent to throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The complexity of social settings does not impede finding partial answers that are extremely valuable for evidence-based policy making and that can help to advance and defend the public interest.

The objective of LIEPP is thus to maintain and develop the most promising scientific techniques for evaluation, while insisting on the necessary dialogue with competing and complementary methods. Bringing together approaches with different methods and disciplinary perspectives while maintaining a high standard of scientific excellence is thus a formidable challenge which can only be solved through well-structured coordination that respects existing differences and facilitates the necessary synergies.

However, in order to do so, one needs to be aware of common misunderstandings that may undermine interdisciplinary work in the social sciences, in particular those linked to normative perspectives, implicit assumptions about rational behavior and the understanding of the political process. Let us consider each of these in turn.

The dialectic of “policy problems” and of “optimal policies”. A frequent source of misunderstanding between the two traditions is worth discussing at this stage. A starting point for mainstream economists interested in public intervention is often the identification of a “market failure”: an imperfection or a deviation from the competitive framework that leads to some economic inefficiency, hence requiring a policy solution. For instance, the existence of pollution externalities requires either an appropriate Pigovian taxation of polluting firms or the creation of a new market for pollution permits that could be exchanged between economic agents and restore a first best efficient outcome in a Pareto sense. The subtle issue here is that, if they cannot name or identify a **market failure**, economists would be reluctant to call a phenomenon a “problem” as such. Policy analysts from other social sciences deal with “social

problems” differently. They do not need to link a “policy problem” with a theoretical market failure and an adapted normative solution. To cite just one example, sociologists may begin with diagnoses such as “generational inequality has increased”. Rather than focusing on economic inefficiency, some will consider that the phenomenon is relevant to study because of some equity concern, or even simply because it is a large scale social fact, and as such worth documenting. Some will furthermore look at how generational inequality has become a social category, asking which groups of actors (media, interests groups, or academic) have pushed for the recognition of generational gaps as an inequality and which opposed this conception, what solutions are pushed by the first and criticized by the second, or how these conflict affect the policy design and the implementation process. Economists, by contrast, may even refuse calling “increased generational inequality” a problem, at least in efficiency terms. They may argue that there is no specific intergenerational problem per se. If young households, for instance, pay higher rents and mortgages, this is because supply of dwellings is insufficient and demand in excess. If they receive low wages, this may be because their human capital is less valuable, or because firms’ demand for younger workers is too low.


We could multiply the number of examples: the key insight here is that economists will be very parsimonious in identifying problems and will search for normative solutions (policy recommendations) only when market failures have been identified. Non-economists would in turn call “problem” any relevant large-scale phenomena worth investigating, sometimes pointed out by policy-makers or the general public. In any event, both economists and non-economists would have a similar normative vocabulary: they begin by identifying a **problem**, and then turn to providing a solution or a **policy recommendation**. However, misunderstandings may start from different values attached to this vocabulary.

Rethinking rational behaviour by bringing in culture and social attitudes. Secondly, economists and other social scientists traditionally differed on how they thought about rational behavior: what are the goals individuals pursue and how do they chose to obtain their objectives? In order to facilitate interdisciplinary dialogue and move beyond the sterile debates of the past, this project pays particular attention to the links between socio-cultural attitudes and rational behavior, with an emphasis on moral sentiments and cooperation. Economists have long neglected the interplay between cultural attitudes and economics. They traditionally neglect heterogeneity and endogeneity of beliefs as epitomized by the traditional Stigler-Becker (1977) dictum *de gustibus non est disputandum*. Next, the traditional modeling tools in economics are based on selfish and materialistic *homo economicus* only interested in the maximization of his/her own utility. Yet other social sciences such as anthropology and sociology have long stressed that human beings are conditional co-operators. Humans invest in cooperation as long as the effort is shared and rewarded equally; in lines with kantian universal principle of ethics (see Gintis et al., 2005). This culture of cooperation is often referred as social capital in political science, following Putnam (2000). Trust and public-spiritedness are thus fundamental elements for providing incentives to individuals to invest in economic cooperation. Our ambition is therefore to contribute to a empirical assessment of the links between culture, cooperation and economics, with causality running in both directions. Thus extending the notion of rational behavior to include trust and social capital will facilitate more fine-grained analyses of the ways in which public policies affect human behavior. Our goal is to bring these insights into quantitative analysis of policy effects.

The political economy of the design and implementation of public policy. Finally, even in their analysis of the policy process, there are differences in approaches between economists and non-economists. Assuming that, after a first round of discussions, economists and non-economists agree on some optimal policy (call it X0) or policy recommendation (derived from X0, call it X1). A policy recommendation, for an economist, is generally speaking the same object as the optimal policy. This may not be so for the non-economist, who foresees that the optimal policy X0 will not be implementable, or not even understood by policy makers, and in turn make a slightly different policy recommendation, or even totally disconnected from the ideal “first best solution X0” of the economist. Nobel laureate Peter Diamond explained, in an early contribution (Diamond, 1980) that optimal policies, taking into account the transitional path towards the final (post-reform) stage, might also differ from the optimal policy in the steady-state where the path to the final stage is neglected in the analysis. The dynamics of transition, if it entails substantial transition costs, will lead to preference for a less painful path towards a less “optimal final stage or at the extreme, a preference for the status quo. In other words, forgetting the initial condition is always misleading, both for economists and non-economists.

Social scientists further distinguish intermediate steps. For instance, from some X0 policy (say, free trade is desirable), they would observe that they need to make a recommendation that is slightly more elaborate (say X1: remove barriers to trade but re-train adversely affected workers). From this recommendation, policy platforms designed by politicians may emerge, that translate X1 to something appropriated by a party. The platform would be debated, and discussion with stakeholders and interest groups, would become some new object say X2 (remove barriers to trade but exclude textile). The adapted proposal would then be transformed in the course of further negotiations (X3: also include culture and services in the exclusion list) and finally voted (X4: ok for textile, but barriers will disappear in 10 years and subsidies to reconversion will be voted). Because of organizational challenges independent from the intentions of the voted law, the actually implemented policy might again be sensible different (X5: lack of compliance in sectors that were able to exploit regulatory loopholes). A simple chart in figure 1 will allow us to summarize the various steps to clarify potential problems with multi-disciplinary approaches.

Figure 1: The phases of policy development



To avoid confusion in collaborative research, it is important to clarify whether ex-ante evaluation is about the theoretical and putative effect of X0 on some economic outcome, or on X1 (the policy recommendation of social scientists), or any of the other steps through which the initial policy is modified up to the final process. Ex-post evaluation, instead, is conceptually rather easy to identify with X5. Political, sociological and historical analysis of the translation of proposed policy into an actually implemented policy, in turn, needs to highlight whether they focus on policy proposals, policies adapted to respond to political imperatives or actually


implemented policies, because the lessons than can bring to an evaluation exercise will be sensibly different.

CONTRIBUTION: ARTICULATING EXISTING APPROACHES

The scientific innovation of LIEPP is to systematically combine state-of-the-art research in the field of monitoring, ex-post evaluation and ex-ante evaluation. It is to start from the prior that successful interdisciplinary work requires first to identify the best scholars *within* each discipline and organize an exchange between different perspectives that allows for some degree of specialization but also enables exchanges on research designs, methods and findings. It does not, however, preclude disciplinary research, in particular on qualitative and quantitative methodologies and econometric methods.

With respect to the different phases of policy development, only a triangulation of existing approaches can lead to a complete analysis of the performance and of the secondary effects of individual policies. As figure 2 clarifies, monitoring, ex-post and ex-ante approaches focus on different steps of policy development and are thus necessary to inform and check each others' research specifications, hypotheses or results.

Figure 2: A triangular perspective on policy evaluation



The triangular approach we propose allows to using the insights from comparative, historical and sectoral analysis of policy processes to feed into evaluation, while at the same time maintaining the highest standard of quantitative evaluation methods, most notably developed in the field of economics. Without these techniques and innovations, policy process tracing will remain too partial to serve as the basis for comprehensive evaluation. Moreover, structural modelling helps to generate hypotheses about potential or latent political conflict that is valuable to policy analysts (for example when a suggested policy is found to create considerable income distribution) and ex post evaluation provides details about policy success or failure that can prove valuable to understanding the nature of the political battles that have shaped the policy development. Inversely, the process tracing proper to monitoring approaches provides information about the nature and direction of causality imputed in ex-post and ex-ante evaluation. Moreover, it helps to define and probe the policy problem at hand and gives information about the most relevant evaluation criteria.

Within the field of economics, the project is inspired by the worldwide convergence of research directions for both reduced form econometrics and structural models, which aim to reconcile ex-ante and ex-post approaches, by combining their particular strengths: strong internal validity (with few theoretical assumptions at the cost of low external validity) of the reduced-form approaches, and strong external validity (with a strong theoretical framework at

the cost of numerous assumptions) of the structural form approach. In addition, counterfactual experiments can then be performed, with added confidence in the underlying model, as it was able to predict what reduced-form approaches estimated.

In the methodological part, we aim at developing techniques of calibration or structural estimation where results from reduced form approaches are used. This can be done at four different levels:

- a) use the results of reduced-form approach and of the study of implementation to determine the size and magnitude of different effects and develop a model where only the first order effects are kept, neglecting second and third order effects;
- b) use the results of the reduced-form approach to improve the calibration of the model, in setting some key parameters of the model to the value reproducing the impact of the difference-in-difference estimates;
- c) use the results of close monitoring of policy implementation to understand the reasons behind the success or the failure of policies as identified from ex-post evaluation methods
- d) use the results of close monitoring of policy implementation to better forecast (or become more modest about forecasts) the outcome of policies in the ex-ante evaluation process.

As already argued, the outcome of the first four interactive processes of scientific process is to improve on the most difficult one, the last one: the project is to portray and develop a set of methods where feedbacks between data from randomized experiments, structural models and qualitative methods, in static or dynamic setups, and allows for a full account of the interaction between the micro level, the macro level and the space of actor's representation including the political space.

In the following two sections, we will lay out how this method can be applied to different policy sectors, with examples taken from both past and present research of LIEPPs members, and we will explain the method we will apply in practice to obtain interdisciplinary cooperation.

INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON INDIVIDUAL POLICY SECTORS

The first major innovation of LIEPP is to provide a sound intellectual structure to think and implement interdisciplinary work, as laid out in our "triangulation method". The second one is to produce a governance structure, detailed in Section 5.2.5, which will serve the purpose of this objective. Interdisciplinary research is often invoked, rarely effective. We aim at proving the contrary.

In order to illustrate the value-added of interdisciplinary research we propose to apply our framework to a series of policy sectors to highlight its concrete benefits. In what follows, we will show that: i) our team has already gathered great experience and credibility in policy evaluation with an interdisciplinary perspective in several policy sectors; ii) that the interdisciplinary method has produced significant insights; iii) that interdisciplinary work strengthens rather than weakens the quality of the scientific publications (for which the reader may also consult the publications listed in the individual CVs in appendix 7.2); iv) that interdisciplinary perspective is not inconsistent with methodological advances within a discipline.

We will discuss three different types of public policies: distributive policies, where the state employs resources to provide fundamental services such as education or health; regulatory policies, where governments intervene in markets such as housing or labour markets to obtain more desirable outcomes; and constitutive policies (*politiques régaliennes*), such as national security and penal systems. A common denominator of these policies is that they are in departments and ministers of French government where budgets are large (especially health, social affairs and education) and where policy choices are commonly justified with an argument about efficient intervention. Thorough evaluation of the policies (in order to improve quality at equal spending, to spend less and keep quality constant, or to find the best paths to reforms) is likely to have greater multiplier effects and gains in terms of potential growth.

All the policy packages described below correspond to existing or ongoing research financed by ANR or ERC grants. The aim is to demonstrate our ability to evaluate policies in a coherent and rigorous interdisciplinary way. LIEPP's application to the Labex program consists in building a larger and visible group of international researchers to cover more fields of policy evaluation, in a more systematic and unified way. This is why most of the budget described below covers personnel costs, as well as research budgets and the dissemination of scientific results to policy-makers and the general public.

Due to the lack of space, the following list of policy sectors is not exhaustive and represents only a small portion of our expertise. Several other important sectors, such as urban or regional policies, agricultural policies, transportation policies, policies aiming at fighting terrorism and its financial streams or financial regulation could have been detailed as well, and recognized experts belong to our group of scholars. We therefore briefly discuss some of them in a final sub-section. Finally, we also develop some methodological aspects in the collection of new data through the cyberspace.

Policy sector 1: Research and higher education. Combining approaches in management, sociology and economics to study the reform of the status of French academics

The French higher education and research system has experienced major transformations in the recent years: the creation of new agencies (the AERES, an evaluation agency, and the ANR, a research council), an increased autonomy for universities since the 2007 LRU act, the modification in the status and management of academics, the association of higher education institutions into meta-structures (PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité) or mergers reconfiguring the French academic landscape and increasing the vertical differentiation.

A shift in the principles driving public intervention also occurred: public policies are no more expected to guarantee equivalence between institutions, faculty staff, or degrees. As a result, the share of performance-based budgets has increased and highly competitive procedures (Plan campus, Investissement d'Avenir) have expanded. The expected impacts of these reforms are to bring universities back at the center of system and allow France to be one of the leading research and innovation systems around the world.

Comprehensive policy-tracing and ex-post approaches should be simultaneously developed in order to assess the efficiency of the recent measures, their achievement and their impact. The former will explain the process through which decisions have been made, which ideas were incorporated in the policy design and how, and who are the actors contributing/resisting to the reforms. Then surveys and qualitative studies will highlight how the public decisions have been implemented, how new objectives emerged, how new actors are involved and affect the policy. Comparison between the recent and past reforms will be possible thanks to the ANR project "Go Science" led by Jérôme Aust. The second approach will measure the impact of the reforms by comparing what was achieved with what would have been achieved, would the reforms not have been led. This could concern the impact of the new recruitment or budgeting procedures, the effects on the scientific productivity of individuals, teams and institutions, or the place of French universities in the global competition. International comparison with reforms of higher education and research system in other countries will provide further insights on the French public policies in this sector.

To illustrate, let us cite the example of an earlier investigation, the TRAJUNI project, which was financed by the ANR between 2007 and 2010. This project assembled a pluridisciplinary team: Christine Musselin, senior researcher in sociology, Frédérique Pigeyre, professor of management, and Mareva Sabatier, an econometrician and economist. It deals with academic careers in France and their transformation from 1976 to now and also addresses the consequences of public decisions on academic careers, i.e. recurrent decisions (such as the yearly numbers of positions opened for hiring) and reforms such as changes in the legislation

3

with the new decree of 1984 on academic status and careers).

The authors used four cohorts (1976-77, 1986-1987, 1996-1997, 2006-2007) in three academic fields (history, physics and management) and matched several databases: a personnel database from the Ministry of Higher Education in France, SUDOC database on Phd dissertations, Scopus and Publish or perish, and additional databases built for the project. Eighty face-to-face interviews were led. Several results were obtained. First, the profiles of newly recruited academics remain rather stable overtime: young (age), early (age of PhD) and rapid (time between first position and PhD) candidates prevail. Second, qualitative data based on face-to-face interviews shows that behind the stability of these profiles very different forces

3

Few works have been carried out, exceptions being the works of Godechot and Mariot (2004) and Combes, Linnemer and Visser (2008).

were acting on each cohort. Ways of access to the academic profession and socialization processes are thus clearly different for the two first cohorts and for the two others, i.e. before and after the implementation of the 1984 decree on academic status. Third, the impact on the profiles of a decrease in the number of positions opened by the ministry is also different between the two first and two last cohorts, perhaps due to changes in the status of candidates to academic careers after the mid 1980s.

In conclusion, the recourse to econometric treatment of exhaustive cohorts of academics allows identifying overtime the profiles of newly recruited staff and the determinants of academic careers. This statistical analysis informed the construction of the sample and served as guideline for the interviews. The sociological approach revealed and explained the differences persisting behind the apparent stability of the profiles of new entrants. It also explains the unobserved factors in econometric regressions, in the absence of data on teaching, administrative information or family constraints while new econometric treatments were suggested by the exploitation of the interviews.

Policy sector 2: Education. Grade repetition: combining econometric models with qualitative analysis to understand the effects on academic performance

The objective of a first study (The effect of repeating grades and of class size on academic performances of middle school pupils: A dynamic factor model), conducted by Robert Gary-Bobo, Badrane Mahjoub et Jean-Marc Robin in the context of the contract ANR-07-BLAN-0362-01 « GRADEREPETITION » and handed in 2010, was to measure the effect of repeating a grade during middle school (the French “collège”) using a structural parametric approach.

We had followed pupils from the French equivalent of 6th to 9th grade, thanks to the panel database for middle schools provided by the French Ministry of Education. The econometric model described the sequence of results to five successive tests: the score obtained at the standardized evaluation given to sixth-graders, the decisions taken at the end of each year (move up to the next year, repeat grade, or oriented towards a short vocational education), and finally the grades obtained at the “brevet”, an exam to be taken at the end of 9th grade.

The result of each of these tests was supposed to be a reflection of the level of human capital accumulated up to that point. The growth of human capital each year depends on the grade, on whether the pupil is repeating a grade, on class size, as well as on different observed variables such as the enrolment of pupils in the school, the public or private status of the school, etc. An unobserved factor, that we will call the “talent” of the pupil, determines the initial level of human capital (measured with error by the 6th grade test) and the increase in human capital at the end of the year.

Class size is one of the explanatory variables of academic outcome. It may however be endogenous in our econometric model. Class size could indeed actually depend on the unobserved talent of the pupil. We therefore model, additionally, class size as a function of observed variables such as the theoretical size of the class given the enrolment in this particular grade and the maximum of 30 pupils per class imposed by law, of the unobserved talent of the pupil, as well as of another unobserved factor and of a measurement error. This factor model is very similar in its spirit to the factor models introduced by Heckman and co-authors in various recent contributions.

We find the following results: repeating 6th grade is highly significantly profitable (around 10 more points out of the 20 obtainable, i.e the difference between scores of 12/20 and 2/20 at the 9th grade graduation exam); repeating 7th grade is a lot less profitable (5 points out of 20); repeating 8th grade as close to no benefit.

Repeating a grade in middle school is therefore useful if it happens early. This makes sense since the environment of a middle school (where classes change professors for each subject) can turn out to be unsettling for a pupil accustomed to a unique class during all of primary schools. As these results contradict those of a large number of previous studies conducted both in France and in other countries (Cosnefroy & Rocher 2005, Holmes 2005) more research would lead to useful in order to at least understand, if not resolve, the diverging

conclusions. These studies could explore the impact of various variables such as level (many of the studies have been conducted in primary schools, it would be thus useful to compare the effects of repeating a grade in primary or in middle schools), pedagogy (especially to what extent curriculum content and organization as well as teacher practices in middle schools allow for individualization of the teaching and learning of “repeaters”) and students’ norms (although this seems particularly counter-intuitive, to what extent are middle school “repeaters” less stigmatized by their peers than primary school “repeaters”?). This implies conducting not only studies using econometric methods but also qualitative studies by sociologists and education specialists to construct a more powerful explanatory model.

Public policy sector 3: Health Policies. Installing a debate between evidence-based medicine and a sociological perspective on health policy

In coordination with another LABEX project (LABEX Global Health), we will elaborate a joint governance method, in case both projects are accepted. The evaluation of health policies is particularly important for our project.

It indeed appears that the gap existing between the quantitative/positivist approach and the politically situated knowledge in social sciences discussed earlier can be found in a quite similar manner in the study of health policies. Health economic, epidemiology and clinical research contribute to the assessment of health interventions, treatments, medicines and policies and to the identification of evidence-based practices and approaches. These researches draw on quantitative assessment methods and probabilistic models, that are parts of the cognitive building blocks of evidence based medicine and comparative effectiveness research. The other side, based on the sociological and political science approaches (in particular on sociology of organization and on sociology of public policy and action) may better understand the socio-political processes by which health issues are constructed as social problems and set on the public agenda and the complexities in and the determinants of the implementation of health policies.

Our view is that our methodologies of inter-disciplinary dialogue would work particularly well. Take a single and simple example. Recently in France, both the SRAS and the H1-N1 generated expensive prevention policies: vaccine to immunize a large part of the population; various levels of involvement of doctors, administration, hospitals and even armed forces. An epidemic modelling of the spread of the disease – comparable, to a certain extent, to an ex-ante evaluation -, solely based on epidemiologic studies and quantitative scenario, would have failed to take into account what appear to have seriously complicated the task of the government: citizens were very reluctant to accept the vaccination campaign; further, the implementation was itself difficult, due to the way those in charge of applying it perceived the vaccination campaign. Finally, this example would be extremely similar to that of ex-ante evaluations of a reform of national public agencies (Pôle Emploi). On paper, that is, ex-ante, this may look like a good reform, but ex-ante modelling would fail to predict that the reform's ambition failed due to the difficulties associated with the reorganization of the public agency.

While economic assessment methods gain influence, sociological methods tend to develop along with them in different European countries. These methods are now experimented or implemented close to public decision makers. In France, these approaches are used in a practical way by new public institutions in charge of technology assessment, such as the Higher Authority for Health (Haute Autorité de santé). Guidelines have therein been elaborated by academic social scientists in order to make sociological assessment systematic, practical and complementary to economic assessment methods. Some scholars involved in the Labex have been directly part of the process, which defined six crucial “sociological aspects” for the assessment process: institutional aspects, organisational aspects, professional aspects, inequalities in health care, innovation and, last but not least, the role of patients from both subjective and collective viewpoints (patient organisations involved). In health policies, these complex aspects involve normative considerations, which demand reflexivity and, at times, further legal or ethical considerations as well. These considerations can be provided by philosophers and lawyers along with sociologists and economists. At the crossroads between such approaches, sociological methods can provide comprehensive, and often decisive, elements to decision makers.

Policy sector 4: Discrimination in housing markets. Disentangling the ethnic and social determinants, combining qualitative surveys and econometric regression analysis

In the context of ANR (projet Blanc) on Discrimination and Unequal Outcomes, a team associating two economists (Etienne Wasmer, scientific coordinator of the ANR, and Etienne Lalé, a PhD candidate in economics at Sciences Po) and two sociologists (Mirna Safi, a sociologist at the OSC, Sciences Po, working on immigration, and François Bonnet, now an assistant professor of sociology at the University of Amsterdam, working on urban issues with qualitative methods) studied discrimination in the rental housing market in France. .

The objective of the project was to find out whether access to housing displays patterns of social or ethnic discrimination. Since each type of discrimination requires different types of policy responses, the study used an experimental design in order to separate the effects of social and ethnic backgrounds. The first phase of the research was focused on the preparation and the carrying out of this experimental design (pair audit testing): brain storming on methodology and research questions, hiring and training of interviewers, follow up of the experiment, etc. The team decided to investigate the role of foreign names (from Maghreb and North Africa) and of residence (deprived suburbs vs. richer neighbourhoods) on the likelihood of a positive contact with a real estate agency after a telephone conversation. Although part of the assessment of the interest from the agency was a qualitative one, the team managed to code a large number of observations in a quantitative way, based on randomized visits and experiences in different Parisian neighbourhoods and in different cities in Greater Paris (Ile de France). The quantitative analysis of the data led to relatively unexpected results. In particular, the team found that each dimension (for simplicity, ethnicity and location) mattered considerably in the success rate of the rental application procedure: names with foreign origin and or those associated with deprived suburbs had lower success rates in contacts. Furthermore, one dimension seemed to dominate the other: it seemed from the regression analysis that ethnicity had a much lower effect after controlling for location.

This result was however hard to interpret and even harder to use for policy recommendation. In fact, the quantitative assessment suffered from two weaknesses. First, the database was too small to allow putting as many controls as needed. The estimation of a local average treatment effect led to the typical criticism that a large number of underlying factors was behind. Second, the process of renting an apartment goes beyond the simple phone interview: there are visits during which the personal contact is established, and the process of a complete application in which many official documents such as payroll forms are provided to the agency. Our phone survey was by definition only focused on the first phase, and we missed important aspects of the selection process, during which discrimination may or may not occur.

We decided to organize 30 qualitative interviews of real estate agents from several areas in Paris and around, in order to understand better the mechanisms behind discrimination; to investigate not only patterns of action (presumed discrimination), but also the subjective meaning of these actions. The preliminary results obtained so far suggest the following. Ethnic discrimination seems to be widespread, but real estate agents blame owners. One owner out of ten would explicitly ask the agency to discriminate against minority applicants; perhaps a larger fraction would discriminate when reviewing the applications. Real estate agents often claim that minority tenants are not the only ones to default on their rent payment. They therefore screen according to other dimensions that remain obscure. In particular, discrimination based on the area of residence does not consciously appear in the discussions with interviewees, but some details suggest that residing in deprived areas may act as a stigma.

At this stage, it is early to provide definitive conclusions on these research findings. An important aspect lies nonetheless in the complementarity and the effectiveness of the multidisciplinary approach while studying discrimination. Discussions and exchanges between economists and sociologists enriched research questions and expanded the range of methodological tools used. This kind of collaboration could be very fruitful when research is used to guide policy orientations especially when the topics at stake are related to social and economic inequalities. Confronting the two approaches suggests that no complete and definitive answer could be drawn from only one of them, at least in the present study. Future work will attempt to understand further the stigma effect from living in a poor neighbourhood and possibly elaborate policy conclusions.

Policy sector 5: Social and labour market policies. Subsistence income: combining ex-post differences-in-differences approaches and ex-ante structural modelling approaches with a discussion of sociological factors such as social exclusion

In this project, we want to study the possible disincentive impact of the guaranteed minimum income that was introduced in France in 1989. This transfer amounted to 2025 French Francs per month, that is, approximately 40% of the minimum wage at that time. The minimum income pre-existed in three French *départements* in Alsace-Moselle, a specificity due to German laws before 1918, which has never been totally abolished since then. Using these conventional difference-in-difference estimates of the post-1989 impact of the RMI (a typical ex-post methodology), Etienne Wasmer and Matthieu Chemin (2008, 2009) found relatively large increases of RMI on long-term unemployment rates. This result was however hard to read as, since several interpretations are possible. The first one is that there are indeed large disincentive effects of RMI. A second interpretation is rather due to the statistical uncertainty surrounding unemployment statistics. In particular, a recurrent research question is whether unemployment and 'out-of-the-labor force' states are distinct states. It could well be the case that by receiving a minimum income that was supposed to be accompanied with an activation program and job-search advices, the interviewees in labor force surveys felt that they had to declare a job-search activity that they would not have declared in the absence of the program. In the absence of a structural model, we are unable to disentangle between the two explanations.

Therefore, the triangulation approach can be of great relevance here. First, combining the difference-in-difference estimates to develop a theoretical model of job search and statistical measurement of unemployment would allow a model calibration and some coefficients would be structurally estimated using the ex-ante approach. In addition, RMI is a specific issue. Sociological factors, such as the perception of respondents about their situation, or the way excluded individuals respond to surveys, are difficult questions for economists, whereas several researchers at OSC (Observatoire Sociologique du Changement) have an expertise on data interpretation and would be of a great added value to this project. Our interdisciplinary methodology (early discussions, intermediate presentations of the results, final discussion) is here particularly suitable.

Policy sector 6: Homeland security policies. Surveillance cameras: using the joint expertise of law scholars and econometricians to evaluate security policies

Dany Cohen, professor of law has relied on interdisciplinary cooperation to understand the effects of recent security policies. In the past years, several countries have partially oriented their policies in matters of security towards the installation of systems of electronic surveillance. Whether the objective is to analyze the functioning of these systems, or to evaluate their outcomes, legal scholars cannot do without statistical tools and a rigorous work of economic analysis. On the other hand, economists face the risk, if they do not work closely with jurists, of introducing methodological biases susceptible of impacting the final results.

There exists so far no scientific study of the effect of surveillance cameras on the level of crime, even though the presence of those devices was recently multiplied in the public space. This covers two distinct questions about their both repressive and/or preventive possible effects, due to the supposed increase in the offense clarification rate. One study only was conducted in Great Britain; its conclusions are negative on both points, but the methodology it used has been highly contested.

This question is of importance, not least because of the high cost of these devices (according to recent proposals made by the French government in the context of its project for the French suburbs, 29 million Euros out of the total 37 million of the project should go to video-surveillance), but even more importantly also because of their incidence in terms of public liberties.

The contribution made by legal scholars should mainly focus on the understanding of the nomenclature of offenses, which are necessary to anyone willing to estimate the evolution of petty crime. We observe in particular instability of the categories for these offenses, since classifications are frequently modified. Some other phenomena have added to the confusion: apart from modifications of the counting methods (often irrational, like for example in the case of torched cars), the introduction of new aggravating circumstances led to moving similar behaviour from one offense category to another one. For instance, the decision taken by the

police in the beginning of the 2000, to make cell phone thefts appear together with violent thefts has caused an abrupt increase (of about 20.000) from one year to the other of the number of violent thefts reported in Paris.

Along the same line, the apprehension of judicial statistics (still very scarce in France) is a delicate matter, for several reasons we will sum up in two examples. First, the verdicts by repressive tribunals apply in the same manner to offenses that were committed in year n , $n-1$, $n-2$, $n-3$, ..., $n-10$, without any way for the statistician to differentiate them. Moreover, the migrations of offenses from one category to the other complicate tremendously any comparison or statistical work. Only a meticulous discussion between researchers from different backgrounds can help to improve such data gathering.

Policy sector 7: Justice and penal systems. Deterrence effects of expected sentence and effects of detention on recidivism: using the expertise of econometrics modelling to understand recidivism (ex-post analysis) and the effects of laws

Understanding criminal behaviour is a typical interdisciplinary enterprise that lawyers, social scientist and economist need to conduct together. Each discipline has its peculiar advantages and can inform the others in a field of studies that is crucial for people wellbeing. Economist can bring their expertise both in the theoretical interpretation of the facts and in the empirical understanding of crime by elaborating econometric models. In this sense recently a significant number of recent contributions allowed us to deepen our understanding and apprehension of the economic analysis of criminality. Researchers proposed different rigorous empirical tests intended to verify the deterrence hypothesis (Becker, 1968). From this basis on, it became possible to analyze the impact of numerous factors on criminal behavior. Despite the fact that these works are now systematically taken into account in Northern American debates, contributions of European researchers remain isolated. In this respect, the work of Roberto Galbiati (CNRS Economix and Sciences Po) and his co-authors is relevant, along two main lines:

First, understanding the effects of incarcerations on the behaviour of potential criminals. According to legal scholars incarceration has three main objectives: Deterrence (i.e. reducing the propensity to commit criminal acts by raising the expected sentences/costs of crime); rehabilitation (i.e. changing the preferences of potential criminals by re-educating them while they are in prison); incapacitation (the lock-in effect: criminals into prisons cannot commit crimes). In a series of papers, Galbiati and co-authors have looked at the first two aspects of incarceration by exploiting a large dataset on criminal histories of former Italian inmates. These studies are based on a dataset provided by the Italian prison administration, that includes full criminal history of up to 20.000 former prisoners. The use of similar econometric models and detailed data on the behaviour of criminals and former prisoners in France would allow us to better understand the impact of security policies, in particular in terms of costs and benefits. Galbiati, Drago and Vertova (2009) identify and estimate the deterrent effects of an increase in the length of prison sentences. To identify the impact of an increase in prison sentences the authors exploit a particular feature of a recent prison collective clemency approved by the Italian parliament in 2006. This institutional feature approximates randomization in future criminal sentences. The authors find that an increase in expected prison sentences of one month on average reduces the recidivism of former Italian inmates by 1.3 percent. In a second paper Galbiati Draoo and Vertova (2010) collect a large dataset on prison conditions in Italy including the rate of overcrowding, the number of deaths and volunteers in Italian prison facilities. By using this data and criminal histories of former Italian prison inmates, they are able to build a model that allows them to estimate the rehabilitative effect of prison experience. Interesting enough, the authors find that bad prison conditions far from reducing recidivism induce people to recommit more crime. These results are in line with those found recently in US (e.g. Chen and Shapiro, 2007).

Second, understanding the impact of social and economic variables on the crime rates. In a recent paper by Buonanno, Drago, Galbiati and Zanella (2010), the authors document the trends in crime rates in Europe and US in the last 30 years. The authors collected data on property, violent and total crime recoded by the police in US, France, Italy, Germany, UK, Nederland and Austria as well as data on population, GDP, immigration, unemployment, abortion and prison population for the same counties form the 1970 to the 2008. Contrary to the common wisdom, the authors find that while in the eighties US were a more unsecure society today crime rates in Europe are higher than in the US. In the work the authors try to understand the role played by unemployment, demographic structure, immigration,

incarceration and abortion on crime rates, trends. The authors find again that much of the reversal of trends can be explained by the fast growth of incarceration in the US.

These two lines of research are very important to understand what are the costs and benefit of criminal policies both in the long and in the first round. In particular understanding if and how incarceration works is important to understand how crime rates may evolve in the long run since a high incarceration rate today implies that a large share of citizens in the future will have made by former inmates. Understanding the impact of incarceration on recidivism is thus crucial to correctly estimate the present and future cost and benefits from incarceration. Moreover, incarceration is neither the only nor necessarily the best security policy. Understanding the impact of other criminal policies but also social and economic policies on criminal behaviour is crucial to correctly design optimal policies. The North American traditions and the recent works by European scholars help in this sense but a lot of work still remains to be done.

Further policy expertise

As argues above, our group will also work on a variety of other public policies. In particular, we have built considerable expertise in the following domains:

A first field is **urban planning and regional policies**, with work from Patrick Le Galès (CEE), Michael Storper (CSO), Marco Oberti (CSO) and Tommaso Vitale (CEE). This field is structured and stimulated by the global dynamics of urbanization and the growing importance of cities in the creation of value, as well as riots and poverty, mobility, technology accumulation, inequalities and governance. How can we conceive the development of cities rooted in their territory but simultaneously at the heart of a more and more globalized mobility? Existing theories and the frontier of social sciences are enriched and redefined rather by exchange of perspectives of general research on cities and the study of more precise urban phenomena. It is difficult not to evoke the problems of sustainability of urban development, linked among other to the stricter regulation of energy consumption and the effect of this regulation on mobility and transport. Three domains mark our program: first; the local dynamics of economic, social, educational and ethnic inequalities and its effects on relationships between social groups. Second, government, democracies and urban politics – conflicts, group mobilization – social order and urban politics. Third, socio-economics of the cities, institutions and economic development. These three axes allow us to renew the approaches in urban research domain by mixing sociological, geographical and economic perspective on social control, security, surveillance technology, public spaces, mobility, immigration, risks and technologies.

A second field is **international economic governance**, with work in economics from Philippe Martin and Thierry Mayer and in political science from Cornelia Woll and Emiliano Grossman. Most economic policies have an international dimension, not only because of their nature (trade or exchange rate policies for example) but also because of their spillovers on other countries (monetary, fiscal, financial regulation and competition policies for example). A better understanding of the nature of these international spillovers is crucial but cannot be transformed into proper initiatives without integrating the political constraints on regional and global governance. In international finance, for example, one cannot study the recent crisis without studying financial flows, but it is useful to combine this with an analysis of the political evolution of US housing market finance or changes in the political principles underlying accounting standards. Most issues at stake in current global governance display similar characteristics. Regulating tax havens requires understanding fiscal policy, but also the motivations for local economies to provide special conditions, the psychology of tax payers and possibly even criminal patterns such as money laundering. The list of transversal issues could go on. For all these policy stakes, one needs rigorous techniques for identifying the problem and analyzing global patterns, but also for studying local institutional and political conditions. An interdisciplinary perspective can provide this most comprehensively. Moreover, we have the ability to build on the forces of regional experts assembled in the Labex Globex, which Sciences Po also supports.

A third topic, following the recent launch of the Chair X-ENSAE-Sciences Po is that of **securing professional careers**. The Chair “Sécurisation des Parcours Professionnels” is co-

directed by Yann Algan and its relevant activities in Sciences Po and on public policy evaluation will be under the umbrella of LIEPP. This objective has become one of the main topics of job market reforms, in France and in several other European countries. In modern economies, structural change is a fundamental ingredient of economic growth. This process of creative destruction often leads to a number of job reallocations, whose social cost is even higher given the lack of adequate institutions in these economies. It is associated with professional mobility, either between firms thanks to the perspectives of promotion, or externally through the opening of new opportunities. This favours the part of the work force most qualified and best prepared for a successful mobility. Inversely, unskilled and those leaving further away from jobs may be the losers of these structural transformation. To fulfill this objective of 'securitization', it must be acknowledged that practical details about its implementation are less consensual. Access to high quality on-the-job training is one of the main issues here, but its efficiency in the current system hasn't been demonstrated; counselling the unemployed individuals in their job search is a key factor as well, but the quality of the resources engaged and the optimal organization of a system split between public and private actors are questionable; assisting return to work and firm creation can be highly useful, but it can also sometimes curb mobility. The burden of flexibility lays on the most fragile categories. The objective for this research axis is therefore to identify the conditions for the different policies and norms contributing to the simultaneous liberation and securitization of careers to be efficient, and to analyze their interactions by following a multidisciplinary approach bringing together economists, jurists and sociologists. Economic, legal and sociological analyses, as well as the frequent recourse to experiments, will play a fundamental role in completing this objective. Analysing the political economy of reforms will also allow us to highlight the conditions for success or for failure gathered by some specific reforms in France or in Europe, in terms of professional training, public service of employment, or again employment protection.

Transversal issues applying to all policy sectors

Finally, evaluating public policies necessitates going beyond the study of individual policy sectors, and asking fundamental questions about the potential for policy reform and moving towards innovate research methodology. The researchers involved in LIEPP have already engaged in work on public reform capacity and new ways of data collection and we would briefly like to mention these in this final section.

Reforms capacity and trust. Following the work of Yann Algan, LIEPP will investigate the link between public policies, social attitudes and economics. What is the role of social attitudes in economics? How can beliefs and values of cooperation explain the economic development of countries and the happiness of their citizens? To what extent does social capital matter for the design of public goods, economic institutions and welfare state regimes? Studying these mechanisms will help understand how pro-social economic policies could help build up cooperative values. In particular, we propose a trans-disciplinary approach of the relationships between cooperative culture, economics and public policies, combining the results of different social sciences from economy to sociology, history and psychology.

Political scientists and sociologists have long recognized the potential role of the culture of cooperation in economic outcomes and public policies. They have even created a concept of social capital to capture this dimension, defined by Putnam (2000) as "the collective values of all social networks and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other". Paradoxically, economists have been much more silent on the role of cooperative attitudes. Some authors have suggested the potential role of trust on economic development, like Kenneth Arrow: "Virtually every commercial transaction has within itself an element of trust, certainly any transaction conducted over a period of time. It can be plausibly argued that much of the economic backwardness in the world can be explained by the lack of mutual confidence."

But the key issue is to provide a rigorous study isolating the specific role of culture of cooperation from institutions and economic variables. Most of the time, the economic literature has only stressed the existence of a cross-country correlation, instead of a causal relationship, between economics and social attitudes (Knack and Keefer 1997).

We will fill this gap by developing a new class of models and estimations linking cooperative attitudes with the support for economic policies. This line of research can provide new clues to understand the cross-country heterogeneity in welfare state systems and

government policies. It is also promising to understand the evolution of political regimes and institutions by linking the extent of cooperative attitudes in a society with the spirit of reforms and social dialogue. Our claim is that cooperation in pre-industrial and agricultural activities societies only required trust in relatives such as family members sharing the lands. Cooperation in industrial societies required a deepening of trust relationships since workers were supposed to interact outside the traditional family relationships. But industrial relationships, such as the fordist system, were mainly based on vertical relationship and specific routines for the workers which were easily checked by supervisors. The last phase of post-industrial societies, based on knowledge and innovation, is therefore only sustainable in countries with fairly high interpersonal trust. This is linked to the complexity of information and relationships with anonymous others and disembodied institutions raising more important moral hazard issues. Part of our project will be to propose a new tool for evaluating the causal impact of social capital on growth, and trust is a way to overcome economic frictions hindering innovations, such as imperfect information and incomplete contracts.

New quantitative and qualitative methods relevant for evaluation research.

Improvements in methodologies sometimes result from cross-breeding between different disciplines. For instance, a specific econometric issue encountered by Jean-Marc Robin in the Policy Sector 2 on grade repetition required finding an orthogonal matrix that is a best approximation for another large-scale non-orthogonal matrix. This so called "orthogonal Procrustes problem" was actually solved in another field, by a professor in a department of psychological sciences, P.H. Shönemann in a 1966 article in *Psychometrika* (Shönemann 1966).

Beyond such examples of quantitative methods at the frontier, our team of researchers also proposes a new methodology to quantify the interplay between our team of researchers proposes a new methodology to quantify the interplay between social and economic attitudes by using a Medialab focused on the web. In this example led by Yann Algan, we acknowledge that part of the reason why economists have neglected the role of social attitudes is due to data limitation, hampering the possibility to provide rigorous estimate of the specific role of culture, economics and institutions. One has to rely so far on quali-quant surveys which, despite some of their advantages in terms of harmonized questions and sample selection, run into major difficulties: i) their periodicity is too scarce to track the evolution of social and economic attitudes in continuous times, offering most of the times a picture of the past society, ii) the data and the sample are by nature limited, and with few overlap between economic and social attitudes, iii) the information are too dispersed and require from the researcher to reconstruct the hypothetical link of causality between social and economic outcomes.

Sciences Po and the PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité have participated in the submission of an Equipex DIME-SHS, coordinated by Laurent Lesnard, also a member of LIEPP. Part of this project is a plan to create a social research center of a new form based on a Medialab to overcome part of these flaws. The development of new information and communications technologies can operate a real revolution in measurement in social sciences. This revolution lies in social traceability in the web, i.e in identifying the 'traces' that citizens leave simply by using digital technologies. The available data reservoirs on the web, or what we call the datascares, are colossal, and largely unexploited. The datascares offer a living picture of social and economic attitudes by looking simply on the queries in research engines or by zooming on blogs and forums. Besides the datascares are considerable and detailed enough to identify variation in social and economic attitudes at the level of a city, a region or a country, allowing interpreting potential relation of causality in time or in space. A key aspect of our methodological example will be to provide a mapping between the infra-individual data on the web and quali-quant indicators which can be compared across individuals and across countries. This implies to provide a mapping or geography of social and economic attitudes on the cyberspace. We will use the new cyber techniques such as lexicographic algorithms which are currently developing very rapidly by research engines like Google and their firm Google trend based on IP address. Conversely, this requires exporting traditional statistical tools in the analysis of datascares to control for the representativity of the samples of internet suffers. LIEPP will not only provide new tools to the scientific society but also offer to the civil society a new instrument of reflexivity on the state of social and economic cooperation between citizens. This research is joint with the MIT Medialab and the Harvard Medialab. Although the scope of this specific project is broader than the evaluation of public policies, it is especially well suited to collect the qualitative and quantitative data we need to proceed to evaluations. For instance, this method provides a precise assessment of public attitudes with respect to reforms; in

specific policy sectors such as health or social policies, to evaluate the feelings with respects to the evolution of unemployment, of the diffusion of a disease, of a vaccination policy.

Finally, an important lesson from the research *on* evaluation is that tools and criteria are never neutral and need to be examined carefully over time. We wish to encourage this meta-reflection on evaluation by setting up an internal methodology working group which surveys the experiences of our past evaluation with the aim of tracking our interdisciplinary methods and discussing required innovation whenever needed. Building on the experience we have already gathered by studying evaluation done elsewhere (e.g. Benamouzig 2010), such an internal monitoring will help us to improve methods and reflect on our own scientific production.

Summary. LIEPP intends to investigate, upon demand from institutions or at the initiative of its researchers the fields of education, research, health, international and local governance, in particular urban governance, environmental issues, housing policies, labour market and social policies, discrimination, security policies, justice and criminality. It therefore plans to hire enough new researchers to be able to cover those fields more systematically and investigate new fields.

The goal of our project is to provide, whenever possible, integrated policy analysis that brings together politically situated knowledge about past experiences, a rigorous empirical evaluation of policy performance and innovate techniques for forecasting alternative results. In line with the SNRI, we thus insist on the need for fundamental research and multidisciplinary, to put France in a leading position of evaluation research at the European and international level. Without an investment into scientific evaluation research, policy evaluation will remain secondary in French public sector reform. In the end, this implies that important economic gains will be foregone.

INTERDISCIPLINARITY AT WORK: A KEY ELEMENT OF THE PROJECT

The task of interdisciplinary coordination crucially hinges on a viable work method that will bring together experts from different backgrounds. LIEPP will rely on a series of incentives and rewards to encourage such cooperation and work consistently to accept projects in light of their scientific contribution only. Moreover, we will implement an interdisciplinary work method, which will be applied to all individual evaluation projects.

A system of multidisciplinary coordination will be applied to each evaluation project. This coordination will consist of three main steps: (1) establishing a multidisciplinary project committee, (2) running the analysis, in an integrated or parallel way, by researchers of different disciplines, and (3) pooling all results in a joint report.

Project committee. According to the policies that are to be evaluated, the direction of the LIEPP defines the composition of a board in charge of the follow-through of the project, with representatives of different research units of Sciences Po. This committee has to include representatives of all the different disciplines that may appear as pertinent for this particular project. On the basis of its expertise, the committee defines the perimeter to be covered by the analysis, the investigation methods to be used and execution guidelines. Each representative of a discipline will be free to build up his own team according to his needs for the project. These teams can naturally include researchers from outside of Sciences Po, in particular from the PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité or any other international research network.

Analysis. According to the kind of evaluation requested (*ex-ante*, implementation, or *ex post*), to the methods employed, and to the questions asked, the work to be carried out by the different teams involved can be either integrated or divided. For example, if we had to evaluate the impact of a policy intended to reduce the inequalities in school access, we could imagine executing first an empirical work including many schools, and then completing it by a series of targeted interviews only in the schools that appeared most remarkable after the quantitative study. The variables the interviews shed a new light on could then in a next step help us refine the treatment of all quantitative data. In the case of an *ex-ante* evaluation, one would additionally have to undertake a comparative and historical study of the past and current comparable experiences of other countries. This could then facilitate the specification of a model applicable to the evaluation of a specific measure in France or in other contexts. Alternatively, a model could be presented together with a study of the reasons why former implemented measures had failed. In the rare cases in which the teams decide not to work in

an integrated manner in running the analysis, they will have to organize mid-way meetings to inform themselves and discuss the progress made by the others.

Pooling of results. The project committee is in charge of the joint publication of all multidisciplinary results in a final report. The publication of results in internationally recognized scientific reviews can be decided separately, and on only partial aspects of the study as to be in line with each discipline's particular standards.

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

As has been demonstrated, the project builds on existing strengths by uniting them in a single scientific undertaking. Parts of the project have already received scientific recognition and financial support, most notably through the ANR grant EVALPOLPUB or the ANR GO-SCIENCE on science policies in France and the UK. It is nonetheless crucial for us to move beyond our existing confines, which necessitates our application as a Labex. Let us outline why this change of scale is essential for our project.

First, and most importantly, the reason for an extension is a scientific one: interdisciplinary dialogue will lead to additional insights on how to improve ex post, monitoring and ex ante evaluation methods. In contrast, the ANR grants were mono-disciplinary and aimed at financing research.

The second reason is related to the need to raise the international visibility of public policy evaluation, by a relevant hiring policy. Indeed, the main use of ANR grants is for post-doc recruitments, on a short period of time (maximum three years of funding). It is simply impossible to build an excellence center with this kind of funding, which is instead very useful to support existing teams. If we are to change the dimension of our research activities and reach a new threshold in visibility and international recognition, we need to hire tenure-track professors on international markets. Each hire will be for 5 to 6 years, much beyond the time horizon of ANR grants, and requires the possibility of tenure evaluation and promotion. Hence, the duration of the Labex funding (ten years) and the possibility to transform the tenure-track contracts into permanent ones is a unique opportunity to reinforce the ambitions and the dynamics of the groups currently in place. As a result of a recent agreement signed by the social partners in Sciences Po, we already have an innovative legal framework for such a procedure, which we wish to build on and develop to make social science faculty recruitment in France meet international standards.

Our ambition is thus to become recognized as one of the major centers for interdisciplinary research on policy evaluation, with the goal of maintaining strong roots in our respective disciplines. Our high level multidisciplinary evaluation research program should resemble the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago. Proposing a evaluation center that covers all relevant academic disciplines and all policy sectors at the highest academic levels thus helps to avoid relegating evaluation research into a minor field.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING STRENGTHS IN LI EPP

PRESENTATION OF SCIENCES PO

The Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques (Sciences Po) is a fully-fledged, self-governing research university specialized in the social-economic sciences and the humanities which enrolls some 9,000 students per year, including 40% of foreign students from more than 50 countries. Sciences Po is the leading research university in the social sciences in France with 69 full-time professors, 131 researchers, 80 foreign professors invited each year and 300 academic partnerships with universities around the world. Sciences Po is home to a doctoral school offering graduate programs in five disciplines. Based on a multi-disciplinary approach, it associates and combines skills and know-how from the different social sciences – in particular economy, history, law, political science, sociology and the humanities.

With a million-volume collection the library is the richest in humanities and social sciences in continental Europe. The active publishing house with more than 1000 titles in its catalogue and six academic journals, Les Presses de Sciences Po, focuses on disseminating research results of the nine research centers, five of which are closely linked to the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS). Sciences Po actively supports collaborative research

projects in France, the European Research Area and at the international level. Sciences Po research teams have coordinated or participated in 21 projects financed by the ANR between 2005 and 2010. 17 of the research teams of Sciences Po have been involved in FP6, and 18 in FP7. Finally, Sciences Po is a signatory of The European Charter for Researchers and The Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and fully supports all the principles set out in this recommendation including the elements encouraging and protecting the independence of young researchers.

A complete description of the founding research units can be found below. In summary, here is the number of researchers and staff of each center. Overall, a large subset of 53 of the full faculty members will participate in LIEPP's activities.

<i>Partner</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>	<i>Staff according to category</i>
Department of Economics	Sciences Po	14 full faculty members (10 senior, 4 junior); 34 doctoral students; 2 administrative staff
Center for European Studies	Sciences Po CNRS	23 full faculty members (15 senior; 8 junior); 50 doctoral students; 6 administrative staff
Centre de Sociologie des Organisations	Sciences Po CNRS	18 full faculty members (8 senior; 10 junior); 28 doctoral students; 6 administrative staff
Observatoire sociologique du changement	Sciences Po CNRS	11 full faculty members (9 senior; 2 junior); 31 doctoral students; 7 administrative staff

THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Created in 2009, Sciences Po's Department of Economics has 14 full time faculty and plans to recruit actively on the international market and expand to around 25-30 full time permanent faculty. The department research covers all main fields in economics but is especially strong in labor economics, public policy, political economy and international economics. The department's website is: <http://econ.sciences-po.fr/>.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Several indicators show that the department has, in a record time, become one of the top 3 academic departments in economics in France. Note that given its recent official creation (September 2009), it has not yet been evaluated by the AERES.

A [report](#) to the Ministry of Higher Education and Research shows that the scientific output per individual faculty member of the department of economics at Sciences Po ranks first in France for publications weighted by quality, and second for publications not weighted by quality (Bosquet, Combes and Linnemer, 2010). The report was written based on faculty present in 2008. According to RePec, the main database for citations for economists, Sciences Po is now ranked 5th in France (as CREST) after Toulouse School of Economics, Paris School of Economics, OECD and Insee. Hence, as an academic institution in France, Sciences Po is ranked third in France.

Among the faculty, several have received important distinctions and grants and have excellent publishing records.

- [Yann ALGAN](#), (PhD, University of Paris) professor, has received one of the starting grants of the European Research Council (ERC) in 2009. He was the only French researcher to receive a starting grant in social sciences in that year which (in the words of the ERC) goes to «the very best, truly creative scientists and scholars» in Europe. His research focuses on macroeconomics and political economy.
- [Nicolas COEURDACIER](#), (PhD Paris School of Economics), associate professor, (formerly assistant professor at the London Business School who joined the department in September 2010), has received in 2010 a "Chair of Excellence" grant from the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche). In the words of the ANR, this type of grant is for young researchers who have a strong international reputation by their publication record. His research is on international macroeconomics and finance.
- [Hervé CRES](#), (PhD, University of Geneva) professor, works in the field of the theory of general equilibrium and the theory of social choice. He has published in the Journal of

Economic Theory and the International Economic Review among others. He is currently associate editor of the Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, of Mathematical Social Sciences and is a former associate editor of Economic Theory.

- [Ruben DURANTE](#), (PhD, Brown University) assistant professor, works in the fields of political economy, economic growth & development, public economics and experimental economics.

- [Roberto GALBIATI](#), researcher at CNRS, will join the department as associate professor in 2011. His research interests are in the fields of law and economics, experimental economics and applied microeconomics and in particular the effects of institutions (obligations and sanctions) on individual behavior, illegal behavior (deterrence, effects of prison, social interactions and crime, tax-evasion) and optimal law enforcement.

- [Emeric HENRY](#), (PhD, Stanford University), associate professor, (formerly assistant professor at the London Business School), has received in 2009 a "Chair of Excellence" grant from the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche). As in the case of Nicolas Coeurdacier, Emeric Henry's project was the only one in social sciences in 2009. His work focuses on the economics of research, public economics and industrial organization.

- [Elise HUILLERY](#), (PhD, Paris School of Economics), assistant professor, works on applied microeconomics and development economics. She has done research on colonial history, inequality and development in West Africa. She joined J-PAL in 2008 and is currently conducting field experiments in health, education and micro-entrepreneurship in Niger, Morocco, Cameroun and France.

- [Guy LAROQUE](#), professor of economics at University College London, will join the department as professor in 2011. He is a former editor of Econometrica and former President-elect of the Econometric Society. He has worked on most public policy issues, in particular minimum wages, social security, optimal taxation.

- [Philippe MARTIN](#), (PhD, Georgetown University), professor and chairman of the department, is a member of the Institut Universitaire de France. He received an ANR grant for the period 2007-2010. His work focuses on international macroeconomics, trade and economic geography.

- [Thierry MAYER](#), (PhD, University of Paris), professor, is a member of the Institut Universitaire de France and received the Bronze medal of CNRS (2006). He is scientific advisor at CEPII, the leading French research center in international economics. He received an ANR grant for the period 2007-2010. He works in the fields of international trade and economic geography.

- [Jean-Marc ROBIN](#), (PhD, University of Paris), professor, is a Fellow of the Econometric Society and an Elected member of the council of the Econometric Society. He is, since 2007, a co-investigator and research programme director of the ESRC Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, "Cemmap" and received an ANR grant on Grade repetition in 2007. His research interests are in microeconometrics, labour microeconomics, and search and matching.

- [Etienne WASMER](#), (PhD, London School of Economics), professor, has received an ANR grant (2010) on the evaluation of public policies. His expertise is in labor economics, search theory, discrimination and human capital.

- [Philippe WEIL](#), (PhD, Harvard University), professor, director of doctoral studies at Sciences Po, has published extensively in the field of macroeconomics.

Four of the faculty members, more than in any other French institution, have received the price of the best young French economist (under 40): Yann Algan in 2009, Thierry Mayer and Etienne Wasmer in 2006, Philippe Martin in 2002. Two are members of the Institut Universitaire de France: Philippe Martin and Thierry Mayer. Jean-Marc Robin was awarded the prestigious Frisch Medal in 2006. Moreover, eight are either research fellows or research affiliates at the Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) in London, the most important and most prestigious network of economists in Europe.

In addition, three external researchers have accepted to participate to the project.

- [Fabien POSTEL-VINAY](#), professor of economics at Bristol University, will regularly visit the department of economics in 2011. He is a CEPR research fellow and associate editor of Journal of Labor Economics, Journal of the European Economic Association, Labour

Economics, among others. He has worked on firm's dynamics, wage determination, unemployment.

•Ioana MARINESCU, assistant professor at the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago, has interests in the areas of labor and public economics. Her work focuses on the effect of institutions and policies on economic outcomes. She studies labor market regulations and firms' human resources management and discrimination. From 2004-2006, she visited the economics department at Harvard University and the National Bureau of Economic Research. She also holds a master's degree in philosophy from the Sorbonne.

•Jérôme ADDA is a professor of Economics at the European University Institute (Florence). He has been a visiting Associate Professor at the economics department at Berkeley in 2006-07. He is a member of the board for the *Review of Economic Studies*, an associate editor for the *American Economic Journal-Applied Economics*, and is on the panel of *Economic Policy*. His research interests include Health Economics, Labor Economics and Macroeconomics.

Finally, Benoît COEURÉ (Chief Economist, French Treasury and professor in the Economics and Public Policy Master), author of a textbook in macroeconomic policy (De Boeck, in French, and forthcoming in English at Oxford University Press) will join the department in 2011 as Adjunct Professor. The department of economics has another Adjunct Professor, Jean-Philippe COTIS (head of the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies) and several other affiliates, such as Alain QUINET (Inspection des Finances), Jean-Pierre LANDAU (Banque de France), Jean-Pierre HANSEN (GDF-Suez and former CEO of Electrabel and author of a textbook on the Economics of Energy published by De Boeck), or Vivien LEVY-GARBOUA (BNP-Paribas, a specialist of financial regulation).

EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

Exploitation of results in the field of social sciences still mainly concentrates on the circulation of findings among three types of publics: the scientific community, public decision-makers and the general public.

The faculty of the Department of economics holds editorial activities in important scientific journals. In particular, Jean-Marc Robin is editor of *Econometrica*, Philippe Martin of *Economic Policy*, and Etienne Wasmer of *Labour Economics*. Several are associate editors in other academic journals. As recent rankings indicate, a high priority is given to the publication of research findings in the top journal of the discipline at the international level.

In addition, the faculty contributes regularly to policy debates, either in the form of commissioned reports or in advisory councils.

The Department is equally involved in the animation of events aimed at sharing research findings with the general public. Among one of the most recent events, one may cite the imaginary court case against the financial sector, which was enacted as an academic performance in Sciences Po's largest lecture hall, to discuss the implication of the financial crisis with practitioners and academics in front of a large audience.

HIGHER EDUCATION

The master **Economics and Public Policy** (EPP), designed to prepare the next generation of leaders to the economic policy-making and to the evaluation of public policies, gathers three outstanding international institutions: [Ecole Polytechnique \(X\)](#), [Ecole Nationale de la Statistique et de l'Administration Economique \(ENSAE\)](#) and Sciences Po.

The master Economics and Public Policy is an economics-centered, multidisciplinary program, designed to equip talented students with knowledge and professional skills to elaborate and evaluate public policies in a wide range of contexts. The program focuses on the economic analytical and quantitative tools to design and evaluate public policies, with core courses in microeconomics, macroeconomics, economic policies and econometrics. But it also provides the necessary multidisciplinary approaches to deal with public policy problems with core courses in governance, law, management and political sciences. Finally, the master EPP offers professional expertise through case workshops, elective coursework in specific fields of public economic policies and summer internships.

The **PhD program** is based on an intensive 2-year coursework program (compulsory courses and electives, some in partnership with the master program EPP), and a 3-year component with a strong research orientation, in particular with an access to research seminars by field-leading researchers. We provide funding and office space to a few, highly selected students within the Department or in research centers, with formal and informal interactions with experienced researchers and visitors. Several courses and seminars are organized, often jointly with the master Economics and Public Policy. Recent invitations (sept 2009 to oct 2010) include: for PhD and master courses, Cyril Monnet (Philadelphia Fed), Yves Zenou (Berkeley and Stockholm University), Marc Melitz (Harvard University); seminars: Gitah Gopinath (Harvard University); Matthew Gentkow (U. Chicago Booth School of Business), Victor Rios-Rull (U. Minnesota), John van Reenen (London School of Economics); Roland Benabou (Princeton University); Jacques Thisse (U. Catholique de Louvain); Guido Lorenzoni (MIT).

ORGANISATION

The Department of Economics is directed by Philippe Martin with the help of a small administrative staff. Departmental meetings including all full professors take place weekly during the semester and serve to coordinate on all questions related to teaching, research and faculty hiring.

CENTER FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES

The Center for European Studies (Centre d'études européennes, CEE) at Sciences Po was created in 2005 and recently benefited from the addition of several high-level researchers who conduct research projects both in France and at the international scale. The research team at the CEE is composed of 23 statutory researchers, who came from different scientific backgrounds: public policy analysis, political sociology, international relations, history and law. Internationally recognized, they developed particular skills in policy areas (environment, urban policies, economic policies, etc.), specific actors (political actors, associations, ethnic groups, civil servants, etc.) and/or levels of analysis (local, national, European, international levels). Its website can be found under www.cee.sciences-po.fr.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The CEE has reached an outstanding place within the French research landscape in the field of political science. Since it has recently been created, the CEE has not been evaluated yet by the national research agency AERES. However, a recent study by Martial Foucault shows that the CEE is in top position in the ranking established by the Social Science Citations Index, both in terms of quotations and numbers of articles according to the number of researchers: the CEE is the first French laboratory in terms of publications per researcher (Foucault 2009).

The CEE is recognized for its expertise in comparative public policy and several researchers have obtained individual distinctions for their work. The ones involved in LIEPP are the following:

- Renaud DEHOUSSE, (PhD European University Institute), full professor and Jean Monet Chair in European law, directs the CEE. He frequently coordinates European research projects within the 6 and 7PCRD and has participated in many working groups studying the reform of European Institutions set up by the European Commission and the French government.
- Florence FAUCHER, (PhD IEP Aix en Provence), research professor, specializes on environmental politics and policies in a comparative perspective. From 2005-2007, she has directed the Max Kade Center for European and German Studies at Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
- Emiliano GROSSMAN, (PhD Sciences Po, MA Cambridge University), associate research professor, conducts research on political institutions and financial regulation. He is the coordinator of an ANR project on agenda-setting in France (2008-2012), which is part of an international research network comparing seven countries on over 200 policy issues since WW2.

- Virginie GUIRAUDON, (PhD Harvard), research professor (CNRS) recently joined Sciences Po after positions at the IEP Lille and the European University Institute. For her work on immigration, non-discrimination, international human rights law and European politics, she has received a CNRS Bronze medal, the Descartes-Huygens Prize and the Philippe Habert Prize among others.
- Zaki LAÏDI, research professor, specializes on international economic governance and regulation. A former special advisor to Pascal Lamy, then European trade commissioner, Laidi has written or edited twenty books on American, European and French foreign policies, international relations and trade.
- Pierre LASCOUMES, (PhD Bordeaux, law), research professor CNRS, has worked extensively in legal sociology on issues such as penal systems, political corruption and contemporary forms of crime (money laundering, transnational criminality). Other interests include environmental policies and technological risk regulation. He has chaired the section 40 of the CNRS from 2004-2008 and worked on evaluation for the Conseil scientifique de l'évaluation (Commissariat général du Plan).
- Patrick LE GALES, (PhD Sciences Po and Oxford University), research professor (CNRS) and part time visiting chair at King's College London, studies urban and regional policies. Laureate of the CNRS Bronze medal and the Stein Rokkan Prize of the European Consortium for Political Research, he was the first recipient of the Mattei Dogan award given to the best French political scientists by the Association Française de Sciences Politiques in 2007.
- Bruno PALIER, (PhD Sciences Po), research professor (CNRS), is an expert on welfare reforms in Europe currently conducting projects on social investment policies, dualisation, and the effect of the EU on welfare reforms. He also directs a European excellence network, RECOWE, involving 190 researchers from 19 universities. He has held numerous visiting professorships in Europe and the US and is an Honorary Professor of Welfare State Research at Odense University (Denmark).
- Paul André ROSENTAL, (PhD EHESS), full professor in history at Sciences Po and fellow at the Institut national d'études démographiques (INED), directs the research group ESOPP (Études Sociales et Politiques sur la Population, la protection sociale et la santé). He specializes in population policies, migration and occupational health in a transnational and historical perspective. He has directed three ANR projects on vulnerable populations (2008-2012), occupational health (2006-2010) and family policies (2005-2009).
- Nicolas SAUGER, (PhD Sciences Po), associate professor, works on political competition and electoral politics. With a strong interest in social science methodology, in particular laboratory experiments and comparative repeated surveys, he acts as the national coordinator for the European Social Survey and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems.
- Vincent TIBERJ, (PhD Sciences Po), associate professor, specializes in comparative electoral behavior, social inequalities and immigration. He has been a visiting scholar at Stanford University and Oxford and coordinates the methodology training in the political science and sociology PhD programs at Sciences Po.
- Tommaso VITALE, (PhD Milan), associate professor, specializes in urban sociology in particular spatial segregation and social service planning. He joined Sciences Po recently after teaching in Milan-Bicocca and Central European University and directs the master "Governing the Large Metropolis".

From 2005-2010, the CEE has been able to obtain research funding from the ANR for seven projects, ranging from the analysis of the agenda-setting process (Emiliano Grossman), legislative procedures (Olivier Rozenberg) or public administration (Pierre Lascoumes) to qualitative methodology (Sophie Duchesne). The CEE frequently participates in collaborative European research projects, in particular the excellence networks EU-CONNEX "Connecting Excellence on European Governance" coordinated by Renaud Dehousse and RECOWE "Reconciling Work and Welfare" coordinated by Bruno Palier (FP6) and the collaborative project "Identities and Modernities in Europe" coordinated by Sophie Duchesne (FP7).

The study of public policies has been a central research area of the CEE from the very beginning: comparatively at the national level, horizontally from the international or European level to member states to the local level, and historically. The diversity of profiles within the CEE is thus an important contribution for the evaluation of public policies. In particular, political scientists, sociologists and historians have demonstrated a real interest in the methodological aspects of the evaluation process. In addition, the CEE has a long tradition of studying the

politics of evaluation itself: Pierre Lascoumes has published extensively on the topic and conducted with the professor emeritus Jean Leca a research project on the questions raised by the conception and the implementation of evaluations. Jean Leca was practically involved in evaluation in France, as the president of the Conseil scientifique d'évaluation (later Conseil national d'évaluation) from 1991-1996.

EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

The members of CEE are regularly called upon by national and international newspapers for their expert opinion in their field of research (social policy, immigration, discrimination, corruption, environment, political orientations, etc.). Moreover, the CEE contributes to the European network TEPSA ("Transeuropean Policy Studies Association") which aims at improving bottom-up knowledge transfers between practitioners of the European Union and researchers of this topic. Within this framework, CEE researchers often participate in different conferences and seminars with European civil servants or European associations.

Furthermore, CEE members are also individually solicited by further education programs of Sciences Po. These exchanges with executives of public policy (housing, health, security...) allow both researchers and practitioners to discuss their points of view.

Moreover, European research projects consider dissemination as an important part of the research process. For example, the European Network of Excellence RECOWE conducted by Bruno Palier organizes several activities aimed at transferring academic knowledge and policy evaluation to the policy communities. Every three months, RECOWE organizes one seminar in Brussels where research on social policies is presented to the relevant audience (more than 100 participants in the last conference on "Employment and poverty: the role of social partners in the fight against poverty and social exclusion" 15 national exchange meetings have been organized, and executive seminars are regularly organized. In January 2010, RECOWE organized in Sciences Po a specific seminar on the analysis and evaluation of pension reforms, gathering some of the most renowned international experts on pension policies. Dedicated to European high-level civil-servants, unionists and politicians, this executive seminar gathered 32 participants from 14 countries.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Researchers from the CEE are actively involved in different teaching programs specializing on public affairs at Sciences Po from the under-graduate to the post-graduate level. Whenever indicated, they may even serve as scientific coordinator of a particular track.

- Master in European Affairs (directed by Renaud Dehousse and Emiliano Grossman)

- Master of Public Affairs

- Master Governing the Large Metropolis (directed by Tommaso Vitale)

- Master in Regional and Urban Strategies (directed by Patrick Le Galès)

- Within the PhD program in political science, the specialization in sociology and public policy (directed by Florence Haegel).

Moreover, the researchers also take an active part in the methods training (Advanced Course in Methods for Social Sciences, PaMSS) organized at Sciences Po by Vincent Tiberj.

Several of these programs propose joint degrees with partner universities:

- Joint Master degree in European affairs between the London School of Economic and Political Sciences and Sciences Po, directed by Cornelia Woll

- Joint Master degree in Urban Policies between the London School of Economic and Political Sciences and Sciences Po, directed by Patrick Le Galès

- Joint Master degree between Bocconi University, Milan, and Sciences Po, directed by Patrick Le Galès

In addition, the CEE participates in two education programs offered in international cooperative networks:

- It is a full partner within the Initial Training Network (Marie-Curie actions) “INCOOP – dynamics of INstitutional COOPeration in the European Union” coordinated by Maastricht University
- The CEE takes part on the behalf of Science Po to the consortium Euromaster and TransAtlantic Master (9 universities), which graduates international students in European studies

ORGANIZATION

The CEE is directed by Renaud Dehousse. Its board is called together every month: it counts one elected member for every category of employees of the laboratory (administrative team, researchers from FNSP and CNRS, PhD candidates and assistant researchers), as well as the secretary general. An “enlarged board” moreover brings together all the researchers of the center and four external members. The enlarged board meets once a year as a general assembly to which all members of the laboratory are invited.

The research is organized around three axes: the first analyses the link between politics and policies. The second focuses on the development of the European Union and its impact. The third finally, comprises research about methodology in investigation and surveys. Every axis assembles several research projects of researchers, PhD candidates, post-PhD and assistant researchers. Every research program organizes its scientific events (work meeting, seminars, workshops). Two seminars shared by all CEE members allow for discussion and exchange between the axes: there is on the one hand a “general seminar” that invites researchers and guests to present their research, and on the other hand a seminar that especially focuses on young researchers and their training for research.

CENTRE DE SOCIOLOGIE DES ORGANISATIONS

Founded in 1960 by Michel Crozier, the Centre de Sociologie des Organisations (CSO) was known initially for its work on the French state and public administration, but it quickly broadened its research to include all public and private sectors. In 2001, it became a joint program of Sciences Po and the CNRS (Unité mixte, UMR 7116). Today, it is a social sciences laboratory, a place where original ideas are born concerning public/private regulation of market and non-market activities, based on research about organizations, markets, and professional groups. The CSO’s website can be found here: www.cso.edu.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The primary focus of the CSO is on the sociology of organizations, which examines agents and their behavior to understand how different forms of cooperation are established. In addition, research explores questions in economic sociology and the sociology of public actions. Currently, the CSO organizes its research into five thematic poles that address essential issues such as risk governance, higher education and research policies, healthcare and practices, sustainable development, the evolution of firms, or changes in the government. Every pole is involved in comparative studies and international networks.

Bringing together 18 full-time researchers and professors, from various disciplines (sociology, political science and history), most of them widely renowned for their work, and some thirty PhD students, the CSO has been graded A+ by the AERES in 2008. Three of the eleven CNRS researchers of the CSO have been awarded a “prime d’excellence du CNRS”.

The analysis and evaluation of public policy has always been at the heart of CSO’s activity with the groundbreaking work of Michel Crozier, Erhard Friedberg, Catherine Grémion, Pierre Grémion, Jean-Claude Thoenig and Jean-Pierre Worms. The researchers who will be contributing to the LIEPP have been recognized for their research in their respective topics:

- Jérôme AUST, associate research professor (FNSP), works on public policy for higher education and research. In 2010, he has been awarded a grant for young researchers by ANR for his project « Go Science ».
- Daniel BENAMOUZIG, associate research professor (CNRS), is a health expert and particularly interested in economics of health and institutional governance. He is a member of the Department of Political Sciences of the University of Oxford within the framework of the OXPO project (Oxford-Sciences Po). Scientific expert for the health

sector, he is a member of the commission for economic evaluation of public health for the Haute Autorité de Sante (HAS).

•Henri BERGERON, chargé de recherche CNRS, has been the deputy scientific coordinator of the European Observatory for Drugs and Drug Addiction, which is a EU agency. He pursues currently his research on health policy and the transformations of medical practices through the study of different topics : illegal drug use, alcohol, obesity, medical research, public health.

•Patrick CASTEL, associate research professor (FNRS), works on the rationalization of medical work and public action in the health sector. He studies especially the policies about cancer and obesity prevention, financed by institutions like the ANR for his project « Policies for the prevention of obesity » (2008-2012)

•Dider DEMAZIERE, research professor (CNRS), works on unemployment, through the study of direct experience and individual biographies, on the transformations of worklife and on the dynamics of workers of a same field. In 2010, he received a grant from ANR for his project called PRELAT.

•Sophie DUBUISSON-QUELLIER, research professor (CNRS), specialist in economic sociology, works on the development of potential for common action of consumers and how firms, professionals, but also social movements and the state contribute to this potential. She has coordinated an ANR project on agriculture and sustainable development (2005-2008) and consumption behavior (2009-2012) and participated in several studies for institutions like the Ministry of Agriculture or France Télécom.

•Pierre FRANCOIS, research professor (CNRS) at Sciences Po and professor at Ecole Polytechnique, specializes in economic sociology, with a particular interest in culture and art markets.

•Jean-Noël JOUZEL, associate research professor (CNRS), works on environment and health, especially on the control of toxic substances circulating in the environment and the recognition of diseases they can provoke. He has worked on pesticides and nanoparticles and participates in the project "Index, the independence of experts and its problems", financed by the ANR (2010-2013).

•Claire LEMERCIER, associate research professor (CNRS), studies the history of economic institutions, in particular the participation of civil society and the rules of economic conflict resolution. She participates in the ANR project PAECE-CEPEL on ecological analysis of voter behavior (2009-2010) and the ANR project IRENE on international peace professionals starting in 2011. In 2008, she has been awarded the bronze medal of the CNRS.

•Emmanuelle MARCHAL, associate research professor (CNRS), develops a sociology of employment markets with a special focus on the analysis of recruitment processes. Her work, quantitative as well as qualitative, emphasizes the aspects that ensure the stability, trust and equipment necessary for this market's functioning. She has participated in several projects of public policy evaluation, among others on the modernization of public administration (for the Commissariat Général au Plan) and on the methodology of competence evaluation (for Pôle Emploi).

•Christine MUSSELIN, research professor (CNRS) and director of the CSO, is part of an international research program on higher education and research systems. She particularly focuses on university governance, on higher education and research policies, on the relationship between universities and public authorities and on the academic job market. She coordinates a research program financed by the ANR on the transformation of academic careers in France. She regularly works for French and German public authorities, for example as a member of the Wissenschaftsrat (scientific board) of the Exzellenzinitiative. She benefited from a mobility grant from the DAAD and has been Fulbright and Harvard fellow.

•Michael STORPER (PhD, Economic Geography, University of California, Berkeley), is professor at Sciences Po, UCLA and London School of Economics, and currently serves as academic director of the Master of Public Affairs at Sciences Po. He is the author of more than 65 peer-reviewed academic articles and ten books on regional development, urban policies, globalization and economic governance. Doctor *Honoris Causa* at the University of Utrecht since 2008, he has been called "one of the two most influential economic geographers in the world today" in a recent article published in *Papers in Regional Science* and for a ten-year period he was the most cited faculty member of all departments of planning and urbanism in the United States.

EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

Exploring contemporary social developments, the CSO is intimately linked to the social world that surrounds it. Its research poles are driven by intellectual enquiry, but are always expressed in a way that resonates with the reality of its social environment (food security, corporate governance in the context of globalization, corporate social responsibility, university governance, or new medical practices).

Relying strongly on empirical research, the CSO is concerned with the dissemination of its research not only in the international scientific community, but also for the interested social actors such as practitioners, students, journalists or political decision-makers. As a result, the CSO frequently answers calls for projects from diverse public and private institutions: the European Union, the French Research Agency (ANR), ministries, local governments, private companies, foundations and associations.

Over time, the researchers of the CSO have been able to develop strong and stable relationships with the stakeholders of sectors concerned with their research. These interactions have proven the practical use of sociological knowledge and made it possible to transfer that knowledge into concrete policy proposals.

The concern for such interaction is at the heart of most of the research conducted in the research center. It leads to a progressive development of linkages between research activity and policy evaluation, between education and intervention. The CSO benefits of synergies between these facets of their activity: studies conducted for a "client" can lead to longer research, a course given to professionals can give birth to studies, research can be used for expert advice and consulting. Just to name a few, we could cite following examples over the last years:

- The research on mobile phone transmission antennas has provoked interventions at the World Health Organization and the Joint Research Center of the European Commission.
- A study on the establishment of the « licence/master/doctorat » system in three French universities, financed by the ESEN (Ecole Supérieure de l'Education Nationale) and Sciences Po has led to several courses given by CSO researchers at the ESEN.
- Research on the modalities of consumption decision-making have provoked a close cooperation between the CSO and the Centre technique interprofessionnel des fruits et légumes, as well as the participation in an exceptional seminar organized by the Ministry of Agriculture.

In this sense, the promotion of the scientific knowledge is also an essential part of the researchers at CSO.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Researchers from the CSO are actively involved in teaching programs of the post-graduate level, mostly in Sciences Po. Their activity is especially strong in the two first years (M1 and M2) of Sciences Po's PhD program.

The CSO supervises the work of some thirty PhD candidates who benefit of a very exceptional framework: only PhD candidates with a scholarship or other grant for three years are accepted and all of them obtain a personal working space at the CSO in order to be as closely as possible integrated into the everyday life of the researchers. The PhD candidates therefore participate actively in the laboratory's research which often provides them with key advantages in their further academic or non-academic career.

For further information on courses taught by individual researchers, please refer to the CVs in the annex.

ORGANIZATION

The laboratory is headed by Christine Musselin, since 2007, who holds regular meetings with the laboratory council. The general assembly of the laboratory is brought together twice per year.

Moreover, the CSO follows a matrix organization. There are five broad research programs. Every one of them develops its research activity in coordination with the others. These activities mobilize researchers, PhD candidates and post-doctorates and are financed by research contracts (ANR, PCRD...).

Parallel to this program structure, the CSO makes sure to support common space for discussion, exchange and transversal reflection of all research programs. The most important device to ensure this exchange is the weekly PhD seminar where CSO's members discuss their

work with each other (researchers, professors, PhD candidates, post-PhD), as well as with other French and international colleagues.

OBSERVATOIRE SOCIOLOGIQUE DU CHANGEMENT

Founded in 1988 by Henri Mendras, the Observatoire sociologique du changement (OSC) is a mixed research unit between Sciences Po and the CNRS (UMR 7049). The center assembles a team of 11 permanent researchers (of which two emeritus professors), 14 associate researchers, 31 PhD candidates and 7 research support employees.

The OSC builds numerous partnerships with French and foreign institutions as part of the international development of doctoral programs in sociology. It is part of the European Consortium for Sociological Research (ECSR). Over the past twenty years, it has accumulated considerable expertise in the conception and execution of large quantitative research projects and surveys, and participates in the organization of international investigation programs through various international research networks. Among the indicators the OSC has helped to develop, one may cite the following:

- poverty and social exclusion (Survey on Income and Living conditions, EU-SILC)
- social cohesion, values (European Value Survey, European Social Survey, International Survey Programme)
- performance of students (OECD Programme for International Student Assessment, PISA).

The OSC's website can be found here: <http://osc.sciences-po.fr/index.htm>

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

In 2008, the OSC has been graded A+ by the AERES. Under the direction of Alain Chenu, the OSC currently studies dynamics of contemporary societies from a comparative point of view around following four axes:

- Social stratification and intergenerational relations
- Spatial aspects of social inequalities
- Lifestyles, socialization and deviant behavior
- Educational politics and dynamics

The quantitative and qualitative methods used focus on different scales of observation: local, regional, national and international. Within each of the four axes cited above, research at OSC is organized as follows:

1. Social stratification and intergenerational relations

This research axis, directed by Louis Chauvel, full professor in sociology, is a central part of the development project of the OSC. There are two main topics: One topic is the stratification of society. This part describes and examines the reasons of transformations in social hierarchy. The work of the OSC on social stratification focuses especially on multidimensional transformations of the hierarchies (salaries, revenues, prestige, activity, education, wealth, etc.) linked to changes in employment relationships and more generally models of social welfare state since the 1960's. The second topic focuses on the perception and experience of age cohorts. It analyses transformations of the typical lifetime-cycle and the resulting changes in intergenerational equilibria. The research on intergenerational relations covers, on the one hand, relationships between generations of a family and, on the other hand, relationships between demographic generations, i.e. age groups born in the same year. Recent international comparisons raise questions about the French specificity which is the social relegation of new adult generations. Obviously, this axis is linked to the others, as urban, educational or lifestyle issues have a strong impact on social stratification and intergenerational relations.

2. Spatial translation of inequalities

Directed by Marco Oberti, full professor, this research axis focuses on spatial dynamics, on class issues and inequalities in urban environment. The different research strands of this axis all concentrate on both, the spatial, especially urban, consequences of all forms of social stratification and inequality as well as the impact of spatial configurations on social relations. Several programs directly treat this matter:

- social, ethnic and educational segregation in France,
- socialization of young residents of poor districts,
- riots and protests in popular districts,
- urban upper-class: local affiliation, identity, mobility,
- living together in heterogeneous middle class districts,
- segregation, inequalities and discrimination: urban and educational experience of young residents of the suburbs.

It is characteristic for OSC to treat these questions with respect to three fundamental aspects: considering all different urban configurations, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches on different territorial scales, and using international comparisons.

3. Lifestyles, socialization and deviant behavior

Directed by Hugues Lagrange, research professor, this axis of research takes interest in the diversity of lifestyles in a modern society and the effect of rules and norms on this differentiation. A special interest is taken in the socialization and the integration of immigrant families.

To name just one of the research projects pursued in this axes, there has been the

European project CRIMPREV assessing deviance, crime and prevention in Europe (6th PCRD 2006-2009) that aimed at comparing perceptions of crime and deviant behavior as well as studying the consequences on crime prevention policies.

4. Educational politics and dynamics

This axis is directed by Agnes van Zanten, research professor. The researchers of this axis are interested in the current transformations of the education system and educational policy. They study the growing influence of agents who were formerly exterior to the educational system, the growing use of scientific knowledge and of new means of mobilization and evaluation. They also take interest in dynamics that could be triggered by national or local educational policies between schools as well as within schools between directors, teachers and students. A third orientation focuses on individual and collective effects of organizational aspects of schools and educational policy, both from an instrumental perspective – the performance of diploma in terms of job chances and social mobility – as well as from a social perspective, i.e. the impact on social cohesion.

Several research programs are linked to this axis:

- The European project (6^e PCRD, 2006-2011) “Know&Pol” on “the place of knowledge in the formulation and regulation of health and education policy in Europe : convergence and sectoral/national specificity” (A. van Zanten)
- The ANR project (programme Blanc, 2006-2009) “Educ-élites”: “Education and the formation of elites in secondary and university education in France: continuity and new forms of social and international openness” (A. van Zanten)
- The ANR project “Education and social cohesion” (M. Duru-Bellat)
- Studies on effects of the French « carte scolaire » (current model of granting school places to French pupils) for the Ministry of Education (M. Oberti, A. van Zanten)

The OSC researchers involved in LIEPP are the following:

- Louis CHAUVEL, full professor and director of the Ph.D. program in sociology, work on the consequences of age cohorts on economic growth and welfare regimes. His work has been crucial for understanding how instruments such as job training or employment policies allow responding to or worsen intergenerational inequalities. He is a member of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) and general secretary of the European Sociology Association.
- Alain CHENU, full professor of sociology, is the director of the OSC. He has studied the changes in the division of domestic and paid work, and in gender roles. His current research project focuses on the agenda setting function of mass media. He has served as president of the sociology and demography section of the French university council (1995-1999) and as president of the evaluation commission of the Institut national d'études démographiques, INED (2001-2005).
- Philippe COULANGEON, associate research professor (CNRS), works on cultural participation as a form of social inequalities and on the job market of cultural and artistic professions. He has participated in the 2008 national survey on cultural participation for

the French Ministry of Culture. He is currently exploring a new research area relating to the sociology of carbon footprints of lifestyles, in the domains of transport, food and housing.

•Marie DURU-BELLAT, full professor and a sociologist of education, has published 10 books and about 75 peer-reviewed articles. She has been a member of the Haut Conseil pour l'évaluation de l'école, and has participated in numerous consulting activities on educational issues and reforms. She has been elected as a "Consultant Fellow" of the IIPE (International Institute for Educational Planning, Unesco).

•Hugues LAGRANGE, research professor (CNRS), works on the sociology of morals in fields such as sexual behavior in the context of HIV, youth criminality and drug use. Recent research focuses on adolescents from immigration backgrounds and he has participated in the project TeO (*Trajectoires et Origines*), a large survey on immigration and discrimination in France, and CRIMPREV, a comparative study of crime perception.

•Laurent LESNARD, associate research professor (CNRS), directs the Center for Socio-Political Data (CDSP). Specializing in quantitative research methods, sociology of time, family and employment issues, he is an affiliate at CREST (INSEE) and the Center for Time Use Research at Oxford University. He is a member of the Quality Label Committee, in charge of assessing the statistical quality of questionnaire surveys, of the French National Council for Statistical Information.

•Marco OBERTI, full professor and head of the sociology department, studies urban policies and their impact on the relation between social groups. The analysis of territorial inequalities is central to his study of urban politics and the production of segregation.

•Mirna SAFI, associate research professor, works on immigration, immigrants' integration and ethnic and racial inequalities. She is member of TeO (*Trajectoires et Origines*), recently participated in the "Comité pour la mesure de la diversité et l'évaluation des discriminations" (COMEDD) and thus contributed to the debate on the improvement of public statistics and discrimination research in France.

•Agnès VAN ZANTEN, research professor (CNRS), focuses on inequalities, segregation and positive discrimination in education, school choice and organization and educational policies. She is frequently consulted by political bodies (Ministry of education, General inspectorate, *Cour des comptes*, *Sénat*, *Assemblée nationale*, regional assemblies, municipalities) and by teacher unions and parents' associations.

EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

The work of OSC's researchers contributes clarity to public debates on questions of education, culture, society and urban environment. They are largely picked up in the media: an annual press review presents a selection of articles published by OSC researchers in national and international newsletters.

To name just a few recent works that have influence public debates in France:

Louis Chauvel: *Les classes moyennes à la dérive* (2006)

Philippe Coulangeon: *Sociologie des pratiques culturelles* (2005)

Marie Duru-Bellat: *Les sociétés et leur école* (avec F. Dubet et A. Véréttout) 2010; *Le mérite contre la justice* (2010); *Sociologie du système éducatif. Les inégalités scolaires*, dir. avec Agnès van Zanten (2009).

Nicolas Herpin: *Sociologie de la consommation* (2005)

Hugues Lagrange: *Le déni des cultures* (2010) ; *L'épreuve des inégalités* (2006)

Laurent Lesnard: *la famille désarticulée : les contraintes de l'emploi du temps* (2009)

Marco Oberti: *L'école dans la ville. Ségrégation, mixité, carte scolaire* (2007) ; avec Hugues Lagrange (dir.): *Emeutes urbaines et protestations. Une singularité française* (2006)

Agnès van Zanten: *Choisir son école. Stratégies familiales et médiations locales* (2009); *Dictionnaire de l'éducation* (2008); *La carte scolaire* (second edition 2010).

HIGHER EDUCATION

The OSC is strongly involved in education activities and supervision of PhD candidates at Sciences Po, especially within the PhD program in sociology directed by Louis Chauvel, full professor. The professors and researchers affiliated to OSC provide advanced courses (sociology of culture, of education, of lifestyles, of social stratification, of the city) as well as methodological courses and general courses (introduction to sociology, contemporary sociology). M. Oberti and E. Préteceille participate in the master Territorial and urban

strategies (urban planning), M. Duru-Bellat contributes to the courses about gender studies of the Presage program.

The PhD students are closely linked to all work of the OSC: actively involved in the debates inside the center, they are trained for research through practical research. All of them are financed and benefit from a close supervision.

ORGANISATION

A team of seven employees is responsible for logistic and administrative support of the researchers. They ensure the communication and circulation of the research and participate in many projects thanks to their technical knowledge and their capacities of data analysis and statistics. The annual allocation of budgets stemming from own resources are managed by the laboratory, in collaboration with the financial services of Sciences Po and the CNRS.

EXISTING COLLABORATIONS

Since all four research units belong to Sciences Po Paris, cooperation has been frequent, but has traditionally taken the form sporadic of joint projects initiated by individual researchers, most often from similar disciplines, and some parallel teaching efforts. Systematic attempts to undertake research and structure educational programs beyond the limits of disciplines and research centres has only begun recently at Sciences Po, most notably in 2008 with the curriculum reform initiated by the dean of studies (Hervé Crès), and with the research reform launched by the dean of research (Bruno Latour). LIEPP is a logical extension of these two initiatives, as it starts from the premise that comprehensive education and research has to go beyond disciplinary boundaries, while at the same time providing space for excellence within each speciality. This implies investing heavily in human resources, most notably by attracting the most excellent candidates for faculty positions in each field, but also structuring joint research efforts around the most relevant questions of our times.

The cooperation within LIEPP would thus provide a very novel approach to policy analysis, as it forces experts from each field to constantly confront findings in related fields. This has not been achieved in the past in France, even in an interdisciplinary environment such as Sciences Po. It is also quite rare at the European and international level, which means that LIEPP could quickly become a reference in policy evaluation.

By bringing together units which are all excellent in their individual fields, LIEPP will furthermore become a bridge for research networks that have not been tied together in the past as a result of disciplinary specialization. The Department of Economics' existing partnership with the Ecole Polytechnique and ENSAE, most notably around the Master Economics of Public Policy, but also its ties with Paris 1 and the Institute for Fiscal Studies, which has become the major reference for policy evaluation in the UK, can be exploited fully for the association of economists who wish to participate in individual evaluation projects.

In political science and sociology, the CEE and the CSO have extensive ties with public policy specialists at universities such as Harvard, Northwestern, Columbia, Oxford or the Max Planck Society in Germany. In the field of economic sociology and political economy, these institutions have even founded a joint summer school and regularly exchange researchers and doctoral studies on policy-related socio-economic issues. Joint Ph.D. programs exist between Sciences Po and Northwestern, Columbia and the International Max Planck Research School in Cologne. The regular and frequent exchanges with researchers within these networks will necessarily inform the policy analysis undertaken in LIEPP and will make the exchange or affiliation with American, British and German scholars very easy. Within LIEPP, this could be done directly in exchange with economists, which have so far been underrepresented in these international networks, even on crucial topics such as financial regulation. The interdisciplinary cooperation within Sciences Po would thus help to make even existing arrangements all the more attractive in the international landscape.

Several of our sociologists and economists are affiliated with the Centre de recherche en économie et statistique (CREST/INSEE) and a number of others maintain strong ties with the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS). Paul-André Rosental, historian at the CEE, in particular maintains close links through the direction of the interdisciplinary research group "Études Sociales et Politiques des Populations, de la protection sociale et de la santé" (ESOPP) at the EHESS. Public policy experts working within these research networks could thus easily be affiliated with the work of LIEPP to make the best possible use of existing expertise in our partner universities and research networks. Facilitating the exchange and integration of

researchers from very different disciplinary backgrounds, but at the highest level of academic excellence, would thus make LIEPP a pivotal point in the international research on policy evaluation.

At the national level, we plan to extend existing interdisciplinary cooperation with partner institutions, both inside the PRES Sorbonne Paris Cité – most notably around health-related issues – and beyond. In particular, some contacts have been taken with Didier Tabuteau, in charge of the Labex Health Policies, as well as with Françoise Benhamou, in charge of the cultural policies (acronym CHECK).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Algan, Y. and Cahuc, P., Inherited Trust and Growth, *American Economic Review*, Forthcoming *American Economic Review* 2010.
- Arnaud, F., M. Cochard, B. Junod-Mesqui and S. Vermare (2008), "Les effets incitatifs de la prime pour l'emploi : une évaluation difficile", *Economie et Statistique*, Octobre 2008, n°412.
- Arrow (1962), "Economic welfare and the allocation of resources to invention" In Nelson (Ed), *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*, 609-625
- Arrow, K., 1972, Gifts and Exchanges, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, (1), 343-362.
- Attanasio, Orazio, Costas Meghir and Ana Santiago, Education Choices in Mexico: Using a Structural Model and a Randomized Experiment to evaluate Progres, mimeo UCL, first version 2001, last version 2009.
- Attanasio, Orazio, Costas Meghir and Miguel Skelezy. Using randomized experiments and structural models for 'scaling up'. Evidence from PROGRESA evaluation, mimeo UCL, 2003.
- Aubert, P. (2009), "Allongement de la durée requise pour le taux plein et âge de départ en retraite des salariés du secteur privé : Une évaluation de l'impact de la réforme des retraites de 19932, document de travail DREES-CREST.
- Baumgartner, F.R., and B.D. Jones (2005), *The Politics of Attention. How government prioritizes problems*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Benamouzig, D. (2010) L'évaluation des aspects sociaux en santé. La formation d'une expertise sociologique à la Haute autorité de santé. *Revue française des affaires sociales*, 2010.
- Blanchet, D. and Mahieu, R. (2004), « Estimating models of retirement behaviour on French data », in *Social Security Programs and Retirement around the world*, J. Gruber and D.A. Wise, Eds, NBER/The University of Chicago Press: 235-284.
- Blau, D. (1994), "Labor Force Dynamics of Older Men", *Econometrica*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 117-156.
- Blundell, R. and H. Hoynes (2004): "Has "In-Work" Benefit Reform Helped the Labor Market?" in *Seeking a Premier Economy: The Economic Effects of British Economic Reforms, 1980-2000*, ed. by R. Blundell, D. Card, and R. B. Freeman, Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 411-459.
- Bourguignon et al. (2009). Rapport intermédiaire sur le Revenu de Solidarité Active, coordonné par François Bourguignon.
- Bovens, M., Hart, P. T. & Kuipers, S. (2008) The Politics of Policy Evaluation. IN Moran, M., Rein, M. & Goodin, R. E. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Buonanno P., Drago F., Galbiati R., Zanella G. 2010. Crime in US and Europe. Dessecting the Reversal of Misfortunes. Paper presented at the 56 Economic Policy Panel
- Card, David. The Impact of the Mariel boatlift on the Miami Labor Market. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 1990 43(2): 245-257
- Chen, Keith M., and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2007. "Do Harsher Prison Conditions Reduce Recidivism? A Discontinuity-Based Approach." *American Law and Econ. Rev.* 9 (June): 1-29
- Chemin, M and Wasmer, E. (2009). 'The employment effects of 35-hour workweek regulation in France: using Alsace-Moselle local laws to build a diff-in-diff', *Journal of Labor Economics* October 2009, Vol. 27, No. 4: 487-524
- Chemin, Matthieu and Etienne Wasmer. (2008). 'Regional difference-in-differences in France using the German annexation of Alsace-Moselle in 1870-1918', NBER International Macro Annuals, eds. Frankel and Pissarides, University of Chicago Press.
- Coile, C. (2004), "Health Shocks and Couples' Labor Supply Decisions", NBER Working Paper W10810.
- Conseil scientifique de l'évaluation (1996) *Petit guide de l'évaluation des politiques publiques*, Paris, La documentation française.
- Combes, P.P., Linnemer, L., Visser, M. (2008) "Publish or Peer-rich ? The Role of Skills and Networks in Hiring Economics Professors", *Labour Economics*, 15, 423-441 (2008).
- Cook, T. D. 2000. The False Choice between Theory-Based Evaluation and Experimentation. *New Directions in Evaluation: Challenges and Opportunities in Program Theory Evaluation* 87:27-34.

- Cosnefroy O., Rocher T. "Le redoublement au cours de la scolarité obligatoire : nouvelles analyses, meme constats", *Les Dossiers Education et formations*, n° 166, 2005.
- David, P., B. Hall and A. Toole (2000), "Is public R&D a complement or a substitute for private R&D? A review of the econometric evidence", *Research Policy*, 29, p497-529
- Deaton, A., Acemoglu, D., Rodrik, D., Ray, D., V., B. A., Duflo, E. & Rosenzweig, M. R. (2010) Symposium: The Agenda for Development Economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24, 3-96.
- Diamond, Peter. (1980). "An Alternative to Steady State Comparisons," *Economic Letters* 5, 1980, 7-9.
- Drago, F. Galbiati. R, Vertova, P. 2009 The Deterrent Effects of Prison: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Journal of Political Economy*. Vol.117 April 2009
- Drago, F. Galbiati. R, Vertova, P. 2010. Prison Conditions and Recidivism *American Law and Economics Review*. *Forthcoming*
- Dunn, W. N. (2008) *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*, New Jersey, Pearson.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of the welfare state*, New York, Free Press.
- Flinn, Christopher J & Heckman, James J, 1983. "Are Unemployment and Out of the Labor Force Behaviorally Distinct Labor Force States?," *Journal of Labor Economics*, University of Chicago Press, vol. 1(1), pages 28-42, January.
- Fischer, F. (1980) *Politics, Values, and Public Policy: The Problem of Methodology*, Boulder, CO, Westview.
- Garibaldi, P. and Wasmer, E. (2005). 'Labor Market Flows and Equilibrium Search Unemployment', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol 3(2), June, pp. 851-882.
- Gintis, H., Bowles, S., Boyd, R., Fehr, E., *Moral sentiments and material interests*, MIT Press.
- Godechot Olivier, Mariot Nicolas, 2004, « Les deux formes du capital social. Structure relationnelle des jurys de thèse et recrutement en science politique », *Revue française de sociologie*, vol. 45, n°2, p. 243-282.
- Gourinchas P.O. and H. Rey (2005), "From World Banker to World Venture Capitalist: US External Adjustment and the Exorbitant Privilege," NBER Working Paper No. 11563, August.
- Gradus, R. (2001): "Comparing Different European Tax's Policies Making Work Pay," *ifo Studien*, 3, 311–326.
- Gusfield, J.R. (1981) *The culture of public problems: drinking-driving and symbolic order*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1981 (version française *La culture des problèmes publics, l'alcool au volant. La construction d'un ordre symbolique*, Paris, Economica, 2009, préface Daniel Cefaï)
- Hall, P. A. & Soskice, D. (2001) *Varieties of Capitalism: Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Heckman, J. J. (2001) Micro Data, Heterogeneity, and the Evaluation of Public Policy: Nobel Lecture. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 109, 673-748.
- Head K., and T. Mayer (2004), Market Potential and the Location of Japanese Firms in the European Union, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(4): 959-972 ; Crozet, M., T. Mayer, and J.-L. Mucchielli (2004), How do firms agglomerate? A study of FDI in France, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 34(1), 27-54.
- Holmes C. "Grade level retention effects: a meta-analysis of research studies" in S.L. Shepard & M.L. Smith (eds.) *Flunking grades. Research and Policies on Retention*, Bristol, Falmer Press, 1990, p. 16-33.
- Hotz, V. and J. K. Scholz (2003): "The Earned Income Tax Credit," in *Means-Tested Transfer Programs in the U.S.*, ed. by R. Moffitt, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 141–198 ;
- Hunt, Jennifer, "The Impact of the 1962 Repatriates from Algeria on the French Labor Market". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* April 1992
- Hopenhayn, Hugo & Rogerson, Richard, 1993. "Job Turnover and Policy Evaluation: A General Equilibrium Analysis," *Journal of Political Economy*, University of Chicago Press, vol. 101(5), pages 915-38, October.
- Jaffe, A. (2002) "Building program evaluation into the design of public research support programs", working paper
- Jones, Stephen R. G., and W. Craig Riddell. *The Measurement of Unemployment: An Empirical Approach* Author(s): Source: *Econometrica*, Vol. 67, No. 1 (Jan., 1999), pp. 147-161 ;
- Katzenstein, P. J. (1985) *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

- Keane, Michael P & Wolpin, Kenneth I, 1997. "The Career Decisions of Young Men," *Journal of Political Economy*, University of Chicago Press, vol. 105(3), pages 473-522, June.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, New York, Longman.
- Klette, T., Moen J., Griliches (2000), "Do subsidies to commercial R&D reduce market failures? Microeconomic evaluation studies", *Research policy*
- Knack, S. and Keefer, P., 1997, Does social capital have a economic payoff, A cross-country comparison, *Quarterly economic journal*, (112), 1251-1288.
- Leca, J. (1993) Sur le rôle de la connaissance dans la modernisation de l'État et le statut de l'évaluation. *Revue française d'administration publique*, 66.
- Lise, Jeremy, Shannon Seitz and Jeffrey Smith. 2009. "Evaluating Search and Matching Models Using Experimental Data." *Review of Economic Dynamics*.
- Lise, Jeremy, Shannon Seitz and Jeffrey Smith. 2005. "Equilibrium Policy Experiments and the Evaluation of Social Programs." *Journal of the European Economic Association*.
- Mortensen, D.T. (2000): "Equilibrium unemployment with wage posting: Burdett-Mortensen meets Pissarides," in *Data and Structural Labor Market Models*, ed. by H. Bunzel, B. J. Christiansen, P. Jensen, N. M. Kiefer, and D. T. Mortensen, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Pierson, P. (2000) "Increasing returns, Path dependence, and the study of Politics", *APSR*, juin 2000, 94 (2), pp. 251-267.
- Nelson, R. R. (1977) *The Moon and the Ghetto: An Essay in Public Policy Analysis*, New York, Norton.
- Oates, W., E. (1999) An Essay on Fiscal Federalism. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37, 1120-1149.
- Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*, Cambridge, M.A., Harvard University Press.
- Palumbo, D. & Nachmias, D. (1983) The Pre-conditions for Successful Evaluation: Is There an Ideal Paradigm? *Policy Studies*, 16, 67-79.
- Putnam, R., 2000, *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rust, J. and C Phelan, (1997), "How Social Security and Medicare Affect Retirement Behavior in a World of Incomplete Markets", *Econometrica*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 781-831.
- Schonemann, P.H. (1966), "A generalized solution of the orthogonal Procrustes problem", *Psychometrika* 31, pp. 1-10
- Schwartz, H.M. (2008) *Subprime Nation: American Power, Global Capital and the Housing Bubble*. Cornell University Press.
- Scriven, M. (2007) *The Logic of Evaluation*. IN Hansen, H. V. (Ed.) *Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground*. Windsor, ON, OSSA.
- Selznick, P. (1949) *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization*, Berkeley, C.A., University of California Press.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). *Foundations of Program Evaluation: Theories of Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications
- Stigler, G. and Becker, G. (1977). *De gustibus non est disputandum*. *American Economic Review* 67, 76-90.
- Taleb, N. (2007) *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*, New York, Random House.
- Tsebelis, G. (2002) *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.