



Revised Research Proposal

Differentiating escalation of commitment in politicians

Iordanis Pantzartzis

Political elites, 22.01.2025

Research proposal

Theory

Sleesman et al. (2012) deduce 4 categories of mechanisms (total 16):

- **Project:** Subjective expected utility
-> Decision risk
- **Psychological:** Prospect theory -> Information framing -> **Unintuitive expectation** (*my hypothesis*)
- **Social:** Self-presentation theory: No relevant dimensions
- **Structural:** Principal-agent (traditionally)

Research Design

Survey vignette: [Infrastructure project] / [Social project] is up for renewal.

Infrastructure project manipulation:
Project is over-budget and will be late

Social program manipulation:
Additional cash-infusion needed to keep the program solvent

Case selection: National level lawmakers in Belgium, Canada, Germany, Israel, Switzerland

Questions

Implement a survey vignette design that accounts for more/all possible mechanisms?

- + More nuanced findings
- Very complex vignettes -> failure to treat subjects in the intended way

References

Sleesman, D. J., Conlon, D. E., McNamara, G., & Miles, J. E. (2012). Cleaning up the big muddy: A meta-analytic review of the determinants of escalation of commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 541–562.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0696>



**Thank you
for listening.
Any questions?**

Iordanis Pantzartzis

Political elites, 22.01.2025