

Process Tracing for the Institutional Researcher

Haroon Atcha

About the Author

Haroon Atcha is a visiting scholar in the political science department at Arizona State University.

Abstract

Institutional researchers are often tasked with assessing why college-wide initiatives succeed or fail. This can be a difficult task: researchers need to discriminate between multiple feasible explanations, work with limited data, and produce compelling narratives. Process tracing is a qualitative methodology that enables researchers to make valid inferences in such circumstances. Process tracing focuses the researcher's attention on the sequence connecting cause and effect. It involves articulating a working theory, generating hypotheses, collecting data, assessing competing hypotheses, revising theory, and producing a narrative connecting cause and effect. This paper describes how to use process tracing for institutional research. It begins by summarizing key concepts, uses a simulated case study to give a brief overview of process tracing, discusses the importance of evidence and transparency in implementing the method, and concludes with a summary of the benefits of process tracing.

Keywords: qualitative methods, process tracing, causal inference, institutional research, institutional effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

Institutional researchers are often tasked with assessing why college-wide initiatives succeed or fail (Inkelas, 2017). It can be difficult to answer “why” questions in a methodologically sound manner. Standard quantitative methods, for instance, estimate the magnitude and direction of causal effects but rarely illuminate *why* or *how* treatments cause a given outcome. Moreover, it is difficult to implement those methods when working with few and incomparable observations. Process tracing—a qualitative methodology that emphasizes the sequential links between cause and effect—can be a helpful tool in addressing these issues and assessing the success of college-wide initiatives.

I begin by summarizing key concepts: process tracing, causal process observations, diagnostic quality, and evaluating hypotheses. Next, I use a simulated case study to show how a researcher would implement process tracing in a higher education context.¹ This case study strategy includes theory generation, hypothesis generation, gathering causal process observations, assessing evidence, alternative hypotheses, and revision and completion. Following my discussion of the case study, I discuss issues of evidence and transparency. Finally, I conclude with a summary of the benefits of process tracing and stress the importance of developing a robust qualitative toolkit.

SUMMARY OF KEY CONCEPTS

Process tracing is an “analytical tool for drawing descriptive and causal inferences from diagnostic pieces of evidence—often understood as part of a temporal sequence of events or phenomena” (Collier, 2011: 824). It involves careful examination of the sequence of events that connect putative cause and subsequent effect. Process tracing involves organizing case knowledge into a cogent narrative. To organize knowledge in that way, researchers generate theory, gather evidence, test hypotheses, and reformulate theory in an iterative manner. Unlike quantitative methods, which take dataset observations as their primary form of evidence, the evidence used in process tracing is instead conceptualized as causal process observations (CPOs).

Causal process observations (CPOs) are “an insight or piece of data that provides information about context, process or mechanism, and *that contributes distinctive leverage in causal inference*” (Collier & Brady, 2004: 252). They are diagnostic pieces of evidence that allow the researcher to assess the validity of a hypothesis. Unlike dataset observations, CPOs are usually incomparable. They provide inferential value by measuring *different* variables across observations. By contrast, dataset observations provide inferential value by measuring the *same* variable across observations. CPOs provide unique insights in the assessment of causal hypotheses.

1. Given that process tracing is often used to study institutional failure (e.g., Why did our marketing campaign fail to attract more applicants?), I elect to present a simulated study rather than dive into the unflattering and personally identifying details that would be associated with a completed study. Nevertheless, I take pains to construct the case study such that key elements—data quality, availability, assessment, context, and motivating question—are representative of the experiences I have had in applying the method.

For example, we might observe that a car has been sitting outside for several months, that its paint is reddish brown, and that the paint is flaking off. These are single observations of multiple variables that are directly incomparable. Taken together, though, they provide good evidence that the car has rusted. In institutional research, CPOs may be drawn from varying units of aggregation, take different forms (e.g., documents, interview transcripts, summary statistics), or speak to different parts of a hypothesis.

Diagnostic quality refers to the distinct information a CPO brings to bear on a working hypothesis. One way of assessing the diagnostic quality of a CPO is through the framework of sufficiency and necessity. In this approach, a CPO is diagnostic to the extent that it is necessary or sufficient for the confirmation of the working hypothesis and/or disconfirmation of alternative hypotheses (Mahoney, 2012).² In this paper, I use a newer Bayesian framework for evaluating the diagnostic value of CPOs (Bennett, 2008; Fairfield & Charman, 2017).

Evaluating hypotheses in a Bayesian framework entails updating prior beliefs about the probability of a hypothesis being true given our CPOs. As noted by Fairfield and Charman, “We gain confidence in a given hypothesis to the extent that it makes the evidence we observe more plausible in comparison to rivals” (Fairfield & Charman, 2017: 159). To evaluate hypotheses, the researcher first articulates

a prior belief about the probability of a hypothesis being true. Then the researcher can update that belief in proportion to the diagnostic value of given CPOs. In Bayesian approaches to process tracing, CPOs condition the researcher’s belief in the likelihood of the working hypothesis vis-à-vis alternative hypotheses.

Process tracing is well suited for within-case analysis. This quality situates process tracing firmly within the case study tradition in higher education and institutional research.³ Whereas regression, experimental, and quasi-experimental methods generally attempt to estimate the direction and magnitude of a causal quantity, process tracing is primarily concerned with *how* and *why* a causal effect came to be in a particular context. To assess how and why the causal effect came to be, the method uses evidence particular to that case to draw inferences about cause or lack thereof.

Process tracing is particularly useful when researchers need to diagnose initiative failure: *Why* didn’t our marketing campaign increase the number of applicants? *At what points* did communication between stakeholders fail? *How* did the application process keep students from applying? Questions like these assume knowledge of a causal effect; we know the initiative failed, now we would like to know why. Process tracing provides a methodologically rigorous way of answering such questions in a robust and transparent manner.

2. In the traditional approach, CPOs could be doubly decisive if they at once confirm the working hypothesis and disconfirm alternative hypotheses, they could be a smoking gun if they confirm the working hypothesis but do not disconfirm alternative hypotheses, or they could pass a hoop test or be a straw-in-the-wind if they are necessary though not decisive and of minimal diagnostic value, respectively.

3. See Yin (2013) and Silverman (2013) for canonical and contemporary texts concerning case studies and qualitative research in general as well as Merriam (2007) for qualitative research in higher education and George Mwangi and Bettencourt (2017) for an overview of qualitative methods in institutional research.


PROCESS TRACING: THE SIMULATED CASE STUDY

Theory Generation

Process tracing begins by articulating both a working theory and the intermediate steps that connect cause and effect. The first step in process tracing is

to clearly articulate the dependent and independent variables. As a working example, consider that we have been asked to study the implementation of a work-study initiative and to assess why student participation in the initiative is low (figure 1). Our dependent variable is student participation and our independent variable is the implementation of the initiative.


Figure 1. Work-Study Initiative Implemented



Our first task is to theorize on the steps between our independent variable and our dependent variable. Based on case knowledge and the extant literature, we might theorize that clear communication between stakeholders and students

about the initiative would result in greater student participation. Consistent messaging could drive greater student awareness and participation. This expanded theory is visualized in figure 2.

Figure 2. Consistent Messaging for Greater Student Awareness and Participation



In practice, our theoretical chain of events connecting the independent and dependent variables would likely be longer and more detailed. The purpose of process tracing is to produce a *complete* narrative of the events linking the two. The example given requires various leaps between intermediate steps that would ideally be more thoroughly articulated in a full case study. As a first step, though, it provides a useful outline of the theorized process and suggests avenues for exploration.

Hypothesis Generation

After we have articulated an initial theory, our next task is to generate hypotheses that probe at the connections between steps. Confirming or failing to confirm these hypotheses should provide information about the validity of our explanation vis-à-vis alternative explanations. The theory visualized in figure 2 has three connections that we can probe for hypotheses.

First, we can ask whether stakeholders were properly informed and trained by executives. Second, we can ask whether the initiative produced coherent student messaging. Finally, we can ask whether students participated, given such information. For the purpose of illustration, consider the second hypothesis (H2):

H2: The work-study initiative produced coherent student messaging.

Assessing H2 provides information about the validity of our working theory. If CPOs support H2 and we find the initiative had coherent messaging, we have good reason to believe that low participation was not caused by poor communication. By contrast, if CPOs disconfirm H2 and we find that communication was not coherent, we would want to look more closely at the connection between executives and stakeholders to understand why communication was not coherent. H2 is useful in assessing the validity of our theoretical chain because both confirming and failing to confirm point to productive avenues for theory reevaluation.

Gathering Causal Process Observations

Having articulated a hypothesis, we next need to operationalize our measurements and gather CPOs. To do so, we need to define measurable outcomes that map onto the concepts in our hypothesis. For H2 this means answering the question, “What does *coherent student messaging* look like and how can I measure it?” Ideally, we can think of several different ways of answering that question, with the different answers probing at different parts of the concept.

For instance, we might ask stakeholders if they were aware that the college had a work-study program with a binary yes/no outcome. We could organize

this information in the form of a cross-tabulation. We may also ask stakeholders to explain the goals of the program and see whether their answers are similar. If we are interviewing a large number of stakeholders, we could organize this information as free-text that could then be interpreted via topic-model. Or, if working with a small number of observations, we could use thematic or qualitative content analysis to see if themes are repeated. We may ask fellow researchers to independently code answers for theme as well, in the interest of validating our coding scheme.

Appropriate timing would also be an important aspect of coherent student messaging. Effective messaging would be timed to coincide with important milestones for applications and registration. We might investigate whether the college ran banner ads for the work-study program on its website, especially on the pages that students are likely to frequent. We would want to see whether these ads were active during the registration window. If they ran long before or long after, we might not consider that messaging to be coherent or relevant. The sequence of events would matter for assessing H2.

One of the benefits of process tracing is its ability to synthesize evidence that takes a variety of forms. Since our measurements take a variety of forms—a timeline, topic model, cross-tabulation, and so on—they are not directly comparable in that they measure different aspects of the same concept. But process tracing encourages this type of diversity when collecting evidence. Together they help us formulate a thicker measurement of the concept.

Moreover, there is no single, correct way of collecting CPOs. Researchers are free to operationalize concepts in myriad ways and should

abide by best practices when implementing each. For instance, when developing a survey to ask stakeholders about their knowledge of a work-study program, researchers should take care not to design leading questions, adjust for sampling bias, and use appropriate scales.

Assessing Evidence

The next step is to assess the validity of our hypothesis using our collected CPOs. Consider our second hypothesis:


H2: The work-study initiative produced coherent student messaging.

To assess the validity of this hypothesis in a Bayesian framework, we first need to define our prior belief

about its likelihood. Usually we would have some prior knowledge about the likelihood, but we assume for the purpose of illustration that we are starting from a point of ignorance. Our prior belief is defined by conservative expectations: extreme values are less likely than moderate ones. The most likely scenarios would involve moderately coherent or incoherent messaging; neither highly coherent nor highly incoherent messaging is likely.

This safe prior assumption can be visualized as a normal distribution across outcomes, as shown in figure 3. Knowing *nothing else*, it would be reasonable to assume that the initiative *probably* did not produce wildly coherent or wildly incoherent student messaging.

Figure 3. Normal Distribution across Outcomes




The process of describing and updating our prior belief in process tracing is not necessarily a quantitative one. The figures provided are meant as heuristic devices that model the way researchers infer from evidence. While a researcher *could* define a distribution of belief in strictly quantitative terms and *could* attach weights to CPOs that then change the density of the prior distribution, doing so would obviate many of the benefits of collecting thick, diverse measurements.

With our prior belief, we can observe CPOs and condition our belief on the evidence they provide. For illustrative purposes, we can also visualize the

diagnostic effect of each CPO on our prior belief, as shown in figure 4. Consider the following CPOs:

- CPO 1: Stakeholders interviewed did not articulate a consistent understanding of what the work-study program entailed.
- CPO 2: Only a small amount of marketing material about the work-study program was specifically generated after the initiative’s adoption.
- CPO 3: In interviews, multiple department heads were unaware that the college had a work-study program.

Figure 4. Diagnostic Effect of Each CPO on Our Prior Belief



Each CPO conditions our expectation about the likelihood that the work-study initiative produced coherent student messaging to varying degrees, as visualized in figure 4. What follows is an explicit articulation of how each CPO conditions our expectation. Reasoning in a clear and transparent manner is useful for several reasons. It can help increase trust in the research and can help other researchers validate our findings. In practice, this section would likely be a part of a separate transparency appendix that would be included at the end of a report rather than incorporated into the main body of the text. In the interest of demonstration, however, this material, starting in the next paragraph and concluding with the start of the next section, is included in the body of this paper.

CPO 1: Stakeholders interviewed did not articulate a consistent understanding of what the work-study program entailed. The first CPO offers minor diagnostic evidence that student communication was not coherent. If messaging were coherent, we would expect stakeholders to be able to articulate what the initiative entailed in similar terms. However, the absence of uniformity does not necessarily indicate poor communication on its own. For instance, it could be that stakeholders not engaged directly in student communications have no need to know about the initiative to do their jobs effectively. The observation of this CPO shifts our expectation slightly toward incoherent, but does little to increase our certainty.

CPO 2: Only a small amount of marketing material about the work-study program was specifically generated after the initiative's adoption. The second CPO offers more-compelling diagnostic evidence. Across all marketing material made available to students (e.g., school website, counseling webpages, course scheduling platforms,

physical posters, etc.), very few mentioned the new work-study initiative after the initiative was implemented. Marketing materials did not advertise the start of the program, and did not explicitly encourage students to inquire about it; in many cases, marketing material was not updated after the initiative's implementation. These materials provide strong evidence that the initiative is not producing coherent student messaging. Again, alternative explanations may produce similar observations. For instance, it could be that the term "work-study" is intended for internal use only and that it would be marketed under a different name. Considering the first CPO, however, that alternative explanation seems unlikely. The observation of this CPO shifts our expectation more decisively toward incoherent and increases our certainty.

CPO 3: In interviews, multiple department heads were unaware that the college had a work-study program. Finally, the third CPO offers the most diagnostic evidence. Interviews with department heads revealed that many were completely unaware that the college had a work-study program. Even if a student knew to ask a college employee about the program, the college employee they ask might be unfamiliar with it and so would be unable to inform the student. This CPO provides the strongest evidence that student-communication is incoherent. Observing a fundamental misalignment across student-facing stakeholders shifts our expectation solidly to incoherent and greatly increases our certainty. Observing this CPO further recontextualizes our first CPO. The inability to consistently define work-study terminology is far more revealing of miscommunication *if we already know* that department heads were not aligned in their messaging.

In sum, these three CPOs provide strong evidence that the work-study initiative did *not* produce coherent student messaging. Even CPOs that, alone, would do little to confirm our hypothesis, help paint a more complete picture of the mechanism at work in the context of the other CPOs. For instance, observing inconsistent definitions across stakeholders is not necessarily decisive on its own; in the context of other CPOs, however, those observations help us understand the nature of the misalignment.


Alternative Hypotheses

Though addressing alternative hypotheses is a critical component of hypothesis testing, not all work done to dismiss alternative hypotheses is done while testing working hypotheses. Alternative explanations might not fit neatly in as direct competitors to our working hypotheses and instead might need to be addressed independently. Each CPO might provide evidence for many feasible competing explanations. Eliminating these alternative explanations is critical in producing a compelling narrative.

Generating alternative hypotheses (and the implicit counterfactual) can often be done by branching off the theoretical chain of events at different points. Branching in this manner serves at least two purposes. First, it provides a robust way of generating alternative hypotheses and explicitly acknowledging researcher assumptions. Branching off from the theoretical tree forces researchers to address the implications of mis-specified prior knowledge. Second, it is a transparent manner of articulating *which* alternative explanations the researcher chose to address and *why*.

Consider figure 5, which captures the logic of branching in the working example. Though the initial tests of our hypothesis suggest that one of the flaws in the initiative was a lack of coherent student communication, it does not necessarily follow that fixing that flaw would mend the program. For instance, we could find through deeper exploration that some students *did* know about the work-study program and that those students *still* did not enroll. Branching allows us to identify those possible alternative explanations and address them.

Figure 5. Logic of Branching in the Working Example



But research need not address *every* possible alternative explanation. Good models are parsimonious. Researchers should attempt to address all *feasible* alternative hypotheses. Determining which explanations are *feasible* is in part an iterative process of theory creation, hypothesis articulation, evidence gathering, and hypothesis assessment. If researchers choose not to address a specific alternative hypothesis, they should explain why and how the working theoretical model makes that alternative unlikely.

To return to the working example, consider our working theory, which outlines the process by which a work-study program was implemented at our hypothetical college. Though evidence suggests that poor institutional communication is at least partly responsible for low student participation, other explanations are feasible alternatives as well. For instance, it could be that work-study opportunities are offered at inconvenient times or that there are too few opportunities offered.

Addressing these alternative hypotheses entails gathering CPOs that *uniquely* speak to their validity. Again, this process of reasoning would likely be a part of a transparency appendix and not in the body of the report; it is included in-text here for illustrative purposes, however. Alternative hypotheses 1 and 2 (Ha1 and Ha2) can be formalized as follows:

Ha1: Work-study opportunities are offered at inconvenient times.

Ha2: Too few work-study opportunities are offered.

As with our working hypothesis, we begin assessing the validity of these alternatives by defining measurements, collecting CPOs, and defining a prior. Instead of starting from a position of ignorance,

however, assume we know that the work-study organizing committee devoted significant energy to scheduling work-study opportunities such that they would be accessible to students.

Our prior belief can reflect that institutional knowledge: we are marginally less likely to believe that work-study opportunities are offered at inconvenient times. Our normal distribution across beliefs is shifted with preference toward our prior belief. For Ha2 we begin from a position of relative ignorance since no institutional knowledge we have speaks to this dynamic.

Various CPOs condition our expectations about the likelihood of these alternatives being feasible. Consider the following CPOs that speak to the validity of our alternative hypotheses:

- CPO 4: The distribution of work-study opportunities over time (in a given day) is nearly identical to those of peer institutions.
- CPO 5: The density of work-study opportunities at a given time is proportionate to the number of students on campus at that time.
- CPO 6: Nearly all remote work-study opportunities fill to capacity.
- CPO 7: In-person work-study opportunities filled to 20 percent capacity.
- CPO 8: In-person work-study opportunities largely fell under department heads who did not know about the work-study program.
- CPO 9: Student surveys indicated that knowledge of the work-study program varied by major and department.

These CPOs complicate our theoretical explanation in that they do not neatly fit the narrative that communication *alone* is the cause of poor student enrollment. CPOs 4 and 5 provide evidence that work-study opportunities are well-aligned with student availability. Moreover, given that work-study is conceived of as an alternative to courses, it stands to reason that work-study opportunities should be provided at times that students would otherwise be taking courses. Since course density and work-study density in a given time slot are proportionate, we can reasonably infer that poor scheduling is *not* a cause of low participation.

CPOs 6 through 9 paint a more complicated picture vis-à-vis Ha2. CPOs 6 and 7 suggest that the format of the opportunity matters to students. Online work-study opportunities might be more appealing relative to in-person opportunities in the wake of COVID. However, CPO 8 suggests that the disparity across format may be a function of our main hypothesis concerning breaks in communication. CPO 9 further supports this reading. Students with majors in departments whose heads did not know about the work-study program also did not know about the program.

The cumulative weight of these CPOs supports the notion that our working hypothesis is the most feasible explanation for the observed phenomenon. Though these CPOs do not entirely dismiss the possibility that our alternative hypotheses play a role in the observed phenomenon, they place our working hypothesis higher on the continuum of feasibility than the most likely alternatives. Addressing these alternative explanations strengthens our narrative.

Revision and Completion

Ultimately, this process produces a cogent narrative of the sequence of events that connect putative cause and subsequent effect. In the process of testing hypotheses and addressing alternative explanations, we may find that our theorized linkages are insufficient for describing the phenomenon. For example, we concluded that poor communication with students is the likeliest cause of their low participation in the work-study initiative, but it is unclear why initiative creation is disconnected from stakeholder messaging. Our theory is insufficient for describing what we observe.

To address this gap, we would revise our theory, adding links, producing and testing hypotheses, and considering alternative paths that might produce similar outcomes as we did with initial theory articulation. At each step in the iterative process, we would ask the same questions as we did in the initial step: Did this step occur as hypothesized? If so, what CPOs support this interpretation? If not, what process does the evidence suggest occurred? Such questions may guide the researcher in producing a cogent, sequential account of the total process.

Ideally, the output of this process is a narrative that links putative cause and subsequent effect in an unbroken chain of events that is accessible to nontechnical audiences. The narratives produced through implementing process-tracing methodologies should be, above all, readable.

EVIDENCE AND TRANSPARENCY

Evidence and transparency warrant special attention. In particular, researchers need to articulate standards for two specific processes. First,

researchers need to communicate how CPOs were collected and analyzed. Second, researchers need to communicate how they determined the diagnostic value of CPOs and why they came to the conclusions they did. The difficulty in accomplishing the first task is compounded when researchers use different types of evidence. Researchers can use several strategies to resolve this difficulty, however.

First, researchers can rely on existing standards of validity and transparency where appropriate. Often, researchers will find themselves using methods to gather and analyze evidence that have widely accepted standards of practice. Summary statistics, data visualizations, flowcharts, and regression models could be CPOs that speak to the validity of a working hypothesis. These types of evidence have well-established norms of practice, norms that researchers should abide by. For instance, researchers should, among other things, label axes, normalize and center continuous variables, provide code books, and test alternative specifications of regression models. Clearly describing how datasets were gathered and analyzed and making code available are other basic steps that are widely accepted as best practices and that increase confidence in findings.

Second, researchers ought to explicitly articulate assumptions and prior knowledge. Though prior knowledge does not often play a decisive role in making inferences when using a Bayesian framework, it is important for us to recognize that we begin research with existing knowledge. Clearly listing assumptions, especially if they are unique to the given context, also helps paint a richer picture of the processes at work. Often, transparently

articulating prior assumptions can be accomplished by providing a history or context section that summarizes similar research undertaken at the college and how that research informs the researcher's assumptions.

Third, a *transparency appendix* can greatly increase the robustness of and confidence in research findings.⁴ A transparency appendix is a supplemental section appended to the end of a report that includes a citation, excerpt from the cited text where appropriate, and short commentary on how this evidence supports the researcher's interpretation. In this paper I have included material that would otherwise be a part of a separate transparency appendix in-text rather than presenting it in its own section. Paragraphs exploring how a CPO was gathered and how it conditions our belief in the working hypothesis provide a template for how a transparency appendix is formulated. These need not be in the body of the text, as they are here, but they should be accessible and should explain a researcher's logic such that a reasonable reader can follow the underlying reasoning.

Transparency is a core tenet of all research but it is particularly necessary when undertaking process tracing. Since results from this method take the form of a narrative written in accessible language, leaps of logic and unsupported assumptions are more likely to catch college stakeholders' eyes. Often, results generated by regression modeling and quasi-experimental methods benefit from a degree of obscurity. Most college stakeholders are not familiar with the particularities of statistical modeling. As such, institutional researchers are unlikely to be questioned about their decision to use fixed versus

4. Active citations and transparency appendices are two tools gaining broad traction in the recent push for transparency in qualitative research. Institutional researchers producing interactive reports (with tools like Markdown, for instance) should find it relatively easy and low-cost to incorporate these tools into their research. For a brief summary of the need for and tools facilitating transparency in qualitative research for political science research, see Moravcsik (2013).

random effects or about the heteroskedastic qualities of their models' residuals. They *are* likely to face scrutiny over the decision to incorporate prior knowledge in a particular way, however. The steps listed above—using existing standards when appropriate, articulating prior knowledge and assumptions, and creating a transparency index—go a long way toward alleviating those concerns.

CONCLUSION: SUMMARY OF THE BENEFITS OF PROCESS TRACING

Process tracing is uniquely suited to the study of institutions and their development. Indeed, much of the extant literature that makes use of process tracing takes the institution as its primary unit of analysis. Seminal works of process tracing have examined the development of a nuclear taboo (Tannenwald, 1999), the development of communal riots in India (Brass, 1997), and the sequence of events leading to social revolutions (Skocpol, 2015). Though these cases might appear to be a world away from institutional research, they exemplify how process tracing can help extract analytical insights from the study of institutions.

Institutional researchers are particularly well-served by this methodology. Process tracing produces institution-specific insights, facilitates the synthesis of varied forms of evidence, and allows for the incorporation of prior knowledge.

Unlike academic research, which often needs to balance concerns over specificity and generalizability,

the institutional researcher's main concern is with delivering results that speak to the specific context in which they work. To that end, process tracing—and qualitative methods more broadly⁵—lend themselves to this endeavor. A given college diverges from the average institution in myriad ways. Colleges react to fluctuations in local economic conditions, reflect the particularities of their communities, and have histories of success and failure with college-wide initiatives. Results derived through process tracing can speak directly to those particularities.

Process tracing also allows for the synthesis of varied forms of evidence. As noted by Harper and Kuh, evidence can often take the form of “observations, document analyses, and reflective journaling,” as well as interviews and focus groups in learning assessment (Harper & Kuh, 2007: 11). Institutional researchers often have access to vast amounts of nonquantitative data. Process tracing facilitates the robust analysis of institutional trends with the use of survey responses, interviews, and texts. Indeed, the narratives produced by process tracing are strengthened when they are supported by varied and nuanced forms of evidence.

Finally, when approached from a Bayesian perspective, process tracing allows for the incorporation of prior knowledge. Just as it allows for production of institution-specific knowledge, so too does process tracing build on institution-specific knowledge. In this way it is similar to, but distinct from the first benefit. Various sources of prior information, like knowledge of institutional history and experience with similar programs, may point the researcher away from the extant research for good

5. A 2017 special issue of *New Directions for Institutional Research* focuses on just this topic, expanding on the use of qualitative methods for assessing broad-based initiatives (Inkelas, 2017), student experiences (Friedensen et al., 2017), and departmental effectiveness (Williams & Stassen, 2017). These pieces serve as helpful introductions to the use of qualitative methods but point to a relative paucity of scholarly works expanding on the actual implementation of such methods in institutional research.

reasons and toward more-robust sources of insight. A Bayesian approach to process tracing allows for the analysis of institutional change in a way that incorporates context-specific forms of evidence.

Qualitative methods are an important aspect of an institutional researcher's toolbox. Process tracing is one such tool and is especially appropriate for the analysis of large, college-wide initiatives. Process tracing allows for the analysis of complex chains of events and excels in identifying context-specific insights central to the institutional researcher's job.

WORKS CITED

- Bennett, A. (2008). Process tracing: A Bayesian perspective. In J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political methodology*. Oxford University Press.
- Brass, P. R. (1997). *Theft of an idol*. Princeton University Press.
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *Political Science & Politics*, 44(4), 823–830.
- Collier, D., & Brady, H. (2004). *Rethinking social inquiry: Diverse tools, shared processes*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fairfield, T., & Charman, A. E. (2017). Explicit Bayesian analysis for process tracing: Guidelines, opportunities, and caveats. *Political Analysis*, 25(3), 363–380.
- Friedensen, R. E., McCrae, B. P., & Kimball, E. (2017). Using qualitative research to document variations in student experience. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(174), 53–63.
- George Mwangi, C. A., & Bettencourt, G. M. (2017). A qualitative toolkit for institutional research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(174), 11–23.
- Harper, S. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2007). Myths and misconceptions about using qualitative methods in assessment. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 136, 5–14.
- Inkelas, K. K. (2017). Using mixed-methods to assess initiatives with broad-based goals. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(174), 39–52.
- Mahoney, J. (2012). The logic of process tracing tests in the social sciences. *Sociological Methods & Research*, (March 2), 570–597.
- Merriam, S. B. (2007). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Moravcsik, A. (2013). Transparency: The revolution in qualitative research. *Political Science & Politics*, 47(1), 48–53.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. SAGE.
- Skocpol, T. (2015). *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tannenwald, N. (1999). The nuclear taboo: The United States and the normative basis of nuclear non-use. *International Organization*, 53(3), 433–468.
- Williams, E. A., & Stassen, M. L. (2017). Context matters: Using qualitative inquiry to inform departmental effectiveness and student success. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(174), 65–80.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. SAGE.