

Appendix

1. Evaluation of the Evidence

The empirical traces that the mechanism presented in Figure 2 would leave, known as ‘observable manifestations’ (OMs), are presented in Table 1. Table 1 presents a review of the strength of each piece of evidence. This includes assessments of: how necessary the piece of evidence is to conclude that the mechanism is present (*uniqueness*), how certain it is that I would find the evidence, if the activity did take place (*certainty*), and if I do find the evidence, how sure can I be that it represents the truth (*trustworthiness*) (Beach & Pedersen, 2019).

1.1. Theoretical evaluation

There are six observable manifestations, and together they constitute the empirical manifestation of the hypothesized mechanism, as demonstrated in Figure 2. If they are all present in the data, the causal mechanism can be confirmed in this specific case. However, observable manifestation number three (OM3) indicates a more permanent change and not just a temporary one, and the presence of OM3 is therefore not necessary to confirm the presence of the mechanism in the case of the Compact negotiation. This is why OM3 is not characterized as “theoretically unique”.

1.2. Empirical evaluation

The quality of the data produced in the interview setting can be difficult to assess, as the interviewees can have reasons to distort the information, present biased versions of what happened, or simply misremember. The observable manifestations of the mechanisms are therefore reviewed according to how certain it is that they will be found in the data, if they indeed exist. Furthermore, if they are found in the data, how trustworthy it is that they actually took place.

OM2 and OM6 are not necessarily found in the data, even if they happened. This is because it is possible that the actors would try to keep this information hidden. In particular, OM6 could be difficult to find in this data material, because it concerns the member states and they were not interviewed.

OM3 is the only observable manifestation deemed not to be completely trustworthy, if it is found in the data material. This is because if OM3 is expressed (especially if it is expressed by a DG Trade representative) there is a high risk of social desirability bias. It is reasonable to assume that the interviewees perceive that they should express willingness to act in times of humanitarian crisis even if this is not the cases.

Table 1. Observable manifestations (OM) of mechanism

	<i>Theoretical level</i>	<i>Empirical level</i>	<i>Empirical level</i>
	Uniqueness	Certainty	Trustworthiness
	<i>Must be present for mechanism to be true?</i>	<i>Must be found in data to be true?</i>	<i>If found, how trustworthy?</i>
OM1 COM characterizing the situation in Jordan as a <i>developmental</i> and <i>humanitarian</i> crisis	Yes	Yes.	Strong.
OM2 COM arguing that DG Trade should be responsive to humanitarian crisis	Yes	No. It is possible that this would not be disclosed.	Strong.

OM3 DG Trade internalizing new responsibilities	No. Could be short lived.	Yes.	Medium. Perhaps new understanding is perceived as desired, but not truly the case.
OM4 COM establishes new work constellations <i>across units</i>	Yes	Yes.	Strong.
OM5 COM includes <i>migration</i> in policy proposal	Yes	Yes.	Strong.
OM6 Council accepts proposal because of pressure to act in migration policy	Yes	No. It is possible that this would not be disclosed.	Strong.