BSSn4495: Qualitative research in security studies

The logic of process tracing

March 22, 2022 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 C causes E

$$C \rightarrow S1 \rightarrow S2 \rightarrow S3 \rightarrow S4 \dots \rightarrow E$$

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 which one 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

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow increased frequency of rebel groups taking over or looting resources to finance and arm themselves \rightarrow stronger rebel groups \rightarrow decreased ability of state to quickly crush them \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

Precious natural resources?

Causal logic(s):

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

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow increased frequency of rebel groups taking over or looting resources to finance and arm themselves \rightarrow stronger rebel groups \rightarrow decreased ability of state to quickly crush them \rightarrow occurrence of civil war

Precious natural resources?

Causal logic(s):

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

Presence of natural resources \rightarrow increased frequency of rebel groups taking over or looting resources to finance and arm themselves \rightarrow stronger rebel groups \rightarrow decreased ability of state to quickly crush them \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

Presence of natural resources → increased frequency of rebel groups taking over or looting resources to finance and arm themselves → stronger rebel groups → decreased ability of state to quickly crush them → 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

Presence of natural resources → increased frequency of rebel groups taking over or looting resources to finance and arm themselves → stronger rebel groups → decreased ability of state to quickly crush them → occurrence of civil war

• Ethnic tensions?

Causal logic(s):

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

• Ethnic tensions?

Causal logic(s):

Historical ethnic hatreds → desire by each group to dominate or extinguish the other → increase in violence by each side designed to dominate/extinguish other group → 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 greatly 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