

POLI 571A
Term 1, 2019-20

Process-tracing response paper

DUE VIA CANVAS
AT **2pm** on Monday, Nov. 4

In this short paper, you will analyze the process-tracing evidence provided in one assigned reading. The paper should be no longer than **4 double-spaced pages**.

You may choose to write about one of these three articles:

1. Saunders, Elizabeth. 2011. *Leaders at War: How Presidents Shape Military Interventions*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Chapter 4. Use this version, with Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI):

Landing page with overview: <https://doi.org/10.5064/F68G8HMM>
ATI: <https://qdr.syr.edu/atipaper/john-f-kennedy#annotations:group:2Nopp9mx> (requires QDR login)

2. O'Mahoney, Joseph. "Making the Real: Rhetorical Adduction and the Bangladesh Liberation War." *International Organization* 71, no. 2 (2017): 317-348. Use this version, with Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI):

https://via.hypothes.is/https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/D7396F6DFDE0914CD3C1C8D7A7141BF9/S0020818317000054a.pdf/making_the_real_rhetorical_adduction_and_the_bangladesh_liberation_war.pdf#annotations:query:user%3Aqdr%40hypothes.is

3. Snyder, Jack, and Erica D. Borghard. "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound." *American Political Science Review* 105 (03):437-56. (No ATI available.)

Identify **two** causal-process observations (CPOs) that are presented in your chosen article. Choose CPOs that are relatively central to the article's empirical case. For **each** CPO, state the following:

1. **Summarize** the piece of evidence that comprises the CPO (with page reference). What precisely is the *observation* here? You should focus here on **a specific piece of evidence**. If you are analyzing a work that uses ATI, use the "source excerpt" here.

2. **Evaluate** the author's **interpretation** of this piece of evidence. Do this in two steps.
- a. State an **observable implication** of the theory to which this CPO plausibly speaks. You may find this observable implication stated explicitly in the article, or you may need to “reverse engineer” the observable implication: work out for yourself what an empirical prediction of the theory is to which this CPO speaks. Explain *why* this observable implication follows logically from the theory, and why the CPO plausibly speaks to this observable implication.
 - b. Why might the CPO not in fact support the theory? You may analyze this by asking whether in fact the observable implication being tested flows logically from the theory. You may also do this by assessing whether this CPO in fact fits the observable implication. Part of these assessments may be thinking about alternative interpretations or explanations of the observation that are inconsistent with the theory.

If the author provides reasoning about the evidence in the ATI annotation, address this reasoning in your critique.

Please **number/letter each part of your answer** for each CPO. **Do not devote any space to an introduction or conclusion.** Just focus on the analytical tasks above.