BSSn4495: Qualitative research in security studies

The logic of process tracing

April 11, 2024 Miriam Matejova, PhD





Agenda

• Process-tracing: logic and use

Moving beyond correlation: process tracing

- Process Tracing is a method for assessing whether C is a cause of E that moves beyond the logic of covariation.
- Instead, it is based on looking for clues within a single case to determine whether the facts are consistent with the process through which <u>C causes E</u>

 $\mathsf{C} \rightarrow \mathsf{s1} \rightarrow \mathsf{s2} \rightarrow \mathsf{s3} \rightarrow \mathsf{s4} \dots \rightarrow \mathsf{E}$

How to process trace?

Examining a <u>single</u> instance in which the outcome did or did not occur and trying to explain why.

- 1. We wonder: Does C cause E?
- 2. We see that E is present and that C is present in a case.
 - But this doesn't tell us that C caused E in that case.
 How could we figure that out?
- 3. Think about the causal logic through which C *would* have caused E *if* C did cause E.
- 4. Now investigate the case to see whether that causal logic in fact unfolded within the case.

What causes civil war?

- Ethnic tensions?
- Poverty?
- Natural resources (diamonds, oil)?
- Weak state?

The problem: Often all 3 are present \rightarrow correlations won't tell you <u>which one</u> is the cause.

- Precious natural resources?
- Causal logic(s):

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow rising tensions over disposition of profits and grievances against those who control the resources \rightarrow motivates uprising by dispossessed groups who seek to take the resources \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

- Precious natural resources?
- Causal logic(s):

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow rising tensions over disposition of profits and grievances against those who control the resources \rightarrow motivates uprising by dispossessed groups who seek to take the resources \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

- Precious natural resources?
- Causal logic(s):

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow rising tensions over disposition of profits and rising grievances against those who control the resources \rightarrow motivates uprising by dispossessed groups who seek to take the resources \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

- Precious natural resources?
- Causal logic(s):

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow rising tensions over disposition of profits and rising grievances against those who control the resources \rightarrow motivates uprising by dispossessed groups who seek to take the resources \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

- Precious natural resources?
- Causal logic(s):

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow rising tensions over disposition of profits and rising grievances against those who control the resources \rightarrow motivates uprising by dispossessed groups who seek to take the resources \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

- Ethnic tensions?
- Causal logic(s):

Historical ethnic hatreds \rightarrow desire by each group to dominate or extinguish the other \rightarrow increase in violence by each side designed to dominate/extinguish other group \rightarrow spirals into all-out war

- Ethnic tensions?
- Causal logic(s):

Historical ethnic hatreds \rightarrow desire by each group to dominate or extinguish the other \rightarrow increase in violence by each side designed to dominate/extinguish other group \rightarrow spirals into all-out war

Process tracing tests

Hoop test

- A test that a hypothesis has to pass for us to believe it (a "hoop" the theory has to jump through)
 - If hoop test failed: the hypothesis is greatly weakened
 - If hoop test passed: the hypothesis survives, but doesn't mean it's true

Smoking gun test

- A test that can point strongly to the correctness of a hypothesis
 - If smoking gun test failed: the hypothesis survives
 - If smoking gun test passed: the hypothesis is very likely true

What happens when tests are passed or failed?

Asymmetric outcomes

	H fails	H passes
Hoop test	H <u>greatly</u> weakened	H slightly strengthened
Smoking gun test	H slightly weakened	H <u>greatly</u> strengthened

Process tracing tests (cont.)

- Straw in the wind test
 - Passing = hypothesis is relevant but not confirmed
 - Failing = hypothesis is not eliminated but slightly weakened
- Doubly decisive test
 - Passing = hypothesis is confirmed and others are eliminated
 - Failing = hypothesis is eliminated

- A. Because he didn't want to alienate rich Wall
 Street donors
- B. Because Republican opposition made it impossible

What clues could we look for?

1. Did Obama get a lot of campaign money from Wall Street?

Hoop test for A

If no, A is probably wrong

If yes, A survives (but still could be wrong)

- A. Because he didn't want to alienate rich Wall
 Street donors
- B. Because Republican opposition made it impossible
- What clues could we look for?

2. Were Republicans against breaking up the banks? *Hoop test for B*

If no, B is probably wrong

If yes, B survives (but still could be wrong)

- A. Because he didn't want to alienate rich Wall Street donors
- B. Because Republican opposition made it impossible
- What clues could we look for?

3. Did the White House propose breakup and lobby the Senate Finance committee to get it to happen?

Smoking gun test for B

If no, B could still be right (maybe he didn't bother proposing because he knew it wouldn't pass)

If yes, B is very likely right (hard to explain without B)

- A. Because he didn't want to alienate rich Wall Street donors
- B. Because Republican opposition made it impossible

What clues could we look for?

4. Did the White House decide against proposing a breakup shortly after meeting with Wall Street donors?

Smoking gun test for A

If no, A could still be right.

If yes, A is very likely right (hard to explain without A).

Process tracing: advantages

- Yields in-depth knowledge of context
- Opportunity for discovery
 - Immersion in a case often suggests causal claims we hadn't thought of before
 - Not just *testing* theories, but *developing* new theories
- Avoids troubles with correlation
 - Studying causal processes → less chance to be fooled by spuriousness, reverse causation, randomness

Process-tracing: practice

- Choose a causal question
- Think of a cause that produces a somewhat lengthy causal chain to the effect
- Think of a causal logic/causal story that connects the cause to the effect

- Causal logic:
$$X \rightarrow p \rightarrow q \rightarrow r \rightarrow Y$$

• What **evidence** would a researcher look for to support this causal logic in your case?

Practice

 High degree of economic deprivation → fewer economic opportunities → higher unemployment → lower income → economic grievances by some groups → more influential role of extremist groups → high degree of radicalization