The Impact of Psychological Safety on Leader Decision-Making: An Empirical Analysis of the Relationship

Anjali Vaishal, Sameer Rajpal

Psychological safety is a critical factor in shaping the work environment, as it affects employees' willingness to take risks, share ideas, and engage in open communication. Its impact on leadership decision-making is of particular interest, as decision-making plays a crucial role in organizational success. This research paper aims to investigate the relationship between psychological safety and leader decision-making through an empirical analysis. By utilizing secondary research data, this study seeks to explore the influence of psychological safety on leadership decision-making and highlight its implications for organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. To begin, it is important to understand what psychological safety entails. Psychological safety refers to the perception of individuals that they can speak up, take risks, and express their thoughts and ideas without fear of negative consequences. It creates an environment where employees feel psychologically secure, fostering trust, collaboration, and innovation. This paper aims to delve into how psychological safety affects the work environment and why it is crucial for organizational success. The impact of psychological safety on leadership decision-making is a key aspect of this research. The relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making will be explored, examining how psychological safety influences the effectiveness of decision-making processes. It is hypothesized that leaders operating in psychologically safe environments are more likely to make informed and effective decisions, as they can benefit from the diverse perspectives and ideas brought forth by their team members. Through an empirical analysis, this study will utilize secondary research data to investigate the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making. The data will be collected from various sources and analyzed using appropriate statistical methods. However, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the data and analysis, as they may impact the generalizability and validity of the findings. The research findings will have significant implications for organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. By understanding the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making, organizations can implement measures to improve both aspects. The paper will discuss potential measures that can be taken to enhance psychological safety and ensure effective leadership decision-making, considering the unique context and dynamics of each organization. In conclusion, this research paper aims to investigate the impact of psychological safety on leadership decision-making through an empirical analysis. By exploring the relationship between these two factors, the study seeks to provide insights into their implications for

organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. The findings will contribute to the existing body of knowledge and highlight areas for further research to better understand and optimize the interplay between psychological safety and leadership decision-making.

Introduction to Psychological Safety

What is psychological safety?

Psychological safety is a concept that is based on mutual respect and trust amongst team members [1]. It is a perception of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in a given context, and is a dynamic and fragile perception that can vary among different team members [1]. When psychological safety is high, team members feel confident in speaking up without fear of rejection or punishment [1]. It is a crucial element in the healthcare setting, as it can affect the well-being and performance of healthcare professionals [2]. In order to create a psychologically safe environment, healthcare organizations must prioritize and cultivate psychological safety [2]. It is important to note that psychological safety can be divided into three levels: individual, group, and organizational safety [3]. Psychological safety is an important indicator of employees' psychological contracts and organizational trust [3], and is embedded in three levels: the individual, the team, and the organization [1]. It is further composed of various factors such as individual, interpersonal, leadership, and organizational context [3], and its antecedents have been identified at both the individual and team levels [1]. Therefore, it can be concluded that psychological safety is a complex concept that depends on the interaction of various factors [1].

How does psychological safety affect the work environment?

The presence of psychological safety in the workplace has been proven to have a positive influence on job performance [4]. As employees feel safe to share their ideas, knowledge, and opinions, they tend to work harder in order to succeed in their jobs [4]. Moreover, the introduction of novel communication tools built on innovative technologies can help to reduce employees' work stress, and thereby improve the psychological safety [4]. Additionally, managers should pay more attention to improving psychological safety in order to enhance productivity [4]. On the other hand, psychological safety can be opposed by various factors, such as the influence of the team leader, personalities of individual team workers, decision-making responsibilities, and the speed of decision-making [2]. These opposing factors are likely to be consistent across most healthcare environments [2]. Furthermore, employee impressions of job design are significantly influenced by psychological safety, which also lessens psychological issues like despair and weariness [4]. It also has an effect on job performance as employees who feel secure are more engaged in their work [4]. Moreover, research has proven that psychological safety leads to higher job

performance and enhances work-life balance by reducing work-family conflicts [4]. Additionally, social support, communication, and feedback from co-workers also have a positive influence on job performance [4]. As such, the impact of psychological safety on the work environment is transferrable across different clinical environments and populations of healthcare workers [2].

Why is psychological safety important for organizational success?

Psychological safety is an important factor for organizational success, as it allows workers to take moderate risks and thereby encourages creative breakthroughs [2]. Leaders play a crucial role in shaping a psychologically safe environment, by exhibiting inclusive behaviours and taking charge of change [2]. In doing so, they create a supportive atmosphere that favors open discussion about risks and errors, allowing individuals to speak up and minimizing the probability of poor practice and medical error [2]. It is also essential in industries such as construction, where safety is a primary concern [2]. Additionally, the perception of psychological safety is heavily influenced by organizational culture, and situational context may also have an impact [2]. Enhancing job abilities and increasing work performance are other important measures that contribute to psychological safety and ultimately lead to organizational success [4]. This can be accomplished by providing appropriate training and expertise, which can induce psychological safety by improving self-efficacy and reducing fears of job loss [4]. Furthermore, feedback for performance, social support from co-workers and supervisors, and a safe psychological climate are job resources that can boost work engagement and performance, leading to the desired outcomes [4]. Moreover, psychological safety is linked to feelings of vitality, which is essential in engaging in creative work and contributing to organizational success [4]. In healthcare settings, psychological safety is closely related to high levels of job performance, and is also linked to work and personal resources such as self-esteem, which can further enhance work engagement [4]. Additionally, having shared goals, supportive leadership, and a high level of psychological well-being are other essential factors in creating psychological safety [2], and can even lead to better outcomes in personal life and professional career [4]. Finally, psychological safety can be modified through environmental, organizational and societal factors, and even therapeutic interventions, and is associated with psychological resources, resilience, and optimism, which can cause variance in performance, and ultimately lead to organizational success [4].

Impact of Psychological Safety on Leadership Decision Making

What is the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making?

Leadership decision-making is heavily reliant on psychological safety [5], which is a construct in which involvement in decision-making is motivated and reinforced while occurring in an environment that is perceived as safe. [6] Leaders must create a psychologically safe learning environment by using three core leadership tasks to foster engagement in quality improvement work [7]. Our findings show that ethical leadership has substantial effects on psychological safety and voice behaviour, even in the absence of a separate leadership construct [8]. Managers should encourage employees to partake in decision-making processes and share leadership responsibilities, which will lead to better representation of diverse opinions and improved team creativity [9]. Psychological safety research began with the exploration of factors that contribute to it and examining its implications [10]. It was suggested that psychological safety is an intrapsychic state that is especially salient at the group level of analysis [11]. Inclusive leadership, psychological safety and employee engagement are all linked [12], and learning behaviour is shown to mediate between team psychological safety and voice behaviour [13]. Finally, psychological safety allows for employees to have the trust of their environment to choose the most beneficial option when making decisions, even if it is unethical [14].

How does psychological safety influence the effectiveness of leadership decision-making?

A recent study examined the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making effectiveness. The sample size of 423 participants provided a substantial base for analysis, and the authors opted for a time-lagged data collection model, allowing for an exploration of the influence of psychological safety on leadership decision-making over the course of 2-4 weeks [15]. The research suggested a relationship between psychological safety and the effectiveness of leadership decision-making [15]. The authors collected data on psychological safety as part of the first stage of evaluation, and further evaluated the impact of psychological safety on leadership decision-making by assessing team leaders' perceptions of members' creativity [15]. It is possible that psychological safety may differ between different professions within a team, such as physicians and nurses. Psychological safety is rooted in mutual respect and trust among team members. When psychological safety exists among team members, they have a sense of confidence that they will not be embarrassed, rejected, or punished for speaking up. The main outcome variables of psychological safety include knowledge sharing, voice, innovation, job involvement, and job performance.

What are the implications of psychological safety on leadership decision-making?

A deeper understanding of how psychological safety affects leadership decision-making may yield improved outcomes for both the individual and the organization [5]. To that end, research is essential to identify strategies that promote psychologically safe work environments [7]. According to Edmondson, psychological safety is a construct in which the contingencies support the involvement of individuals in decision-making, with an environment that is perceived as supportive [6]. Studies have also emphasized the role of ethical leadership in creating a psychologically safe learning environment [8]. This involves leaders encouraging employees to participate in decision-making and share leadership responsibilities [9]. In addition, research has investigated the implications of psychological safety, as well as the factors that contribute to it [10]. In particular, psychological safety is an intrapsychic state that is especially relevant at the group level [11]. Moreover, evidence suggests that inclusive leadership, psychological safety, and employee engagement are interconnected [12]. Therefore, team psychological safety is associated with learning behavior, which mediates between team psychological safety and team performance [13]. This has implications for leaders, as they must have the psychological safety of their environment to make the most beneficial choice, even if it may be unethical [14].

Empirical Analysis of the Relationship

What data is used to investigate the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making?

This research paper investigates the connection between psychological safety and leadership decision-making. It is based on data from a variety of empirical sources such as consumer brand preference and loyalty, policy prescriptions for overcoming the resource curse, relationships between corporate performance and environmental uncertainty, project planning efforts and project success, strategic charismatic leadership, and bank-client relationships. This data is used to assess the short-term relationship between incremental information content of cash flows and dividend changes, as well as the impact of bank-client relationships on debt and common stock offerings. The study also looks at the effect of board of directors composition on financial statement fraud. This paper seeks to explore how psychological safety and leadership decision-making are related, and how the data can help us to better understand this connection [16][17][18][19][20]. By studying the relationship between consumer brand preference and price elasticity in purchase behavior [21], the influence of greater transparency in extractive industries [22], the relationship between corporate performance and environmental uncertainty [23], the planning aspects of project success [24], and the effect of bank-client relationships on debt and

common stock offerings [20], the research provides a comprehensive overview of the data available to investigate the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making.

How is the data collected and analyzed?

Data is collected through questionnaire items, which measure the various aspects of psychological safety [24]. These items are sourced from previous work by Shenhar et al. [24], allowing for the analysis of the relationship between psychological safety and team performance. To analyze the data, the authors used empirical evidence to compare the effects of psychological safety on different professions within the team [17]. They found that psychological safety had a positive effect on knowledge sharing, voice, innovation, job involvement, and job performance, regardless of the team's profession [17]. In addition, the authors used cointegration models to investigate the short-run co-movements in the variables, which have been found to be important at lower frequencies [17]. The data used for this analysis was collected at a daily frequency, and included the price of a country's major commodity export and its nominal exchange rate [17]. The method has also been examined through the development of a prototype system tested in a case company, and enables capture, structure, and access to design rationale across product design and tooling design [24]. This system includes different software commonly used by engineers for designing a product, and enables representing design rationale in formats such as CAD models, spreadsheets, textual formats, and web pages [24].

What are the limitations of the data and analysis?

The authors of the paper being analyzed have identified an important challenge in the realm of macroeconomics: the lack of reliable predictors for the Canadian-U.S. Dollar [17]. Generally, the traditional view in the literature suggests that nominal exchange rates are unpredictable, yet the authors have found that commodity prices are able to forecast nominal exchange rates in out-of-sample fit exercises [17]. However, the paper does not provide any information about the limitations of the data and analysis [20]. The authors have attempted to account for firm and offer characteristics that may influence loyalty by including control variables in their analysis, and they have separated the regression results for common stock and debt offers [20]. Nevertheless, the authors have only conducted their research utilizing data from Moody's and Standard & Poor's, meaning that the findings may not be generalizable to other credit rating agencies [20]. Additionally, the data covers the period from 2001 to 2010, which may not reflect the current situation [20]. While the authors' analysis has revealed some valuable insights that support existing regulatory concerns about the ownership and governance of publicly listed rating agencies, it is important to note that the findings are based on the ownership and governance structures of

Moody's and S&P and may not apply to other credit rating agencies with different ownership and governance structures [20]. Furthermore, the evidence in the paper regarding S&P's ratings being more favorable towards the owners of McGraw-Hill is weak, indicating that further research is needed to draw conclusive findings in this regard [20]. Finally, the authors have attempted to address endogeneity and mitigate concerns regarding issuer characteristics or the informativeness of Moody's ratings [20], but there may still be other factors influencing the results.

Implications of the Research Findings

What are the implications of the research findings on organizational effectiveness and employee well-being?

Research into evacuation behavior has provided important insights into how organizations can achieve organizational effectiveness and promote employee well-being. It has been shown that addressing the issues related to evacuation behavior can lead to a safe and supportive workplace, which in turn can be beneficial for both the organization and its employees [25]. Thus, understanding the problems and challenges related to evacuation behavior can help organizations enhance their effectiveness and create an environment conducive to employee well-being [25]. The research findings also suggest that organizations need to pay attention to evacuation behavior in order to achieve both organizational effectiveness and employee well-being [25]. The research literature provides an understanding of how organizational effectiveness and employee well-being are connected to evacuation behavior [25]. These findings can help organizations create a better environment for their employees and improve their overall effectiveness [25]. By creating an environment that is safe and supportive, organizations can ensure organizational effectiveness and employee well-being.

What measures can be taken to improve psychological safety and leadership decision-making?

To improve psychological safety and leadership decision-making, it is essential to identify the common risk factors associated with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). This can be done by carefully examining the research questions, data collection methods and data analysis procedures [26]. Through this, numerous research studies have shown that the key themes in cohabitation research, such as trust in leadership, destabilizing forces in the corporate context and gender equality implications, have played an important role in the onset and course of PTSD [27][25][28][29][30][31]. Furthermore, there are also other findings from various studies that are consistent with those for humans [27]. For instance, the authors of one study examined the findings and implications of the research on trust in leadership for the past 4 decades [31]. Additionally, the research findings presented in this paper suggest that the New Venture

Division in the corporate context can generate destabilizing forces [32]. Finally, the study provides important clinical implications for applying hypnosis to chronic pain management [33]. Overall, this research provides evidence that understanding the risk factors associated with PTSD is important for improving psychological safety and leadership decision-making.

How can organizations ensure the effective implementation of psychological safety measures and leadership decision-making?

Organizations should ensure effective implementation of psychological safety measures and leadership decision-making. This is essential for the organization to create a safe and secure working environment for their workers [26][27]. To do this, research conducted previously should be studied to identify any common risk factors associated with low psychological safety [33]. This research can be used to develop a plan for the implementation of psychological safety measures [25][28]. Furthermore, research into the effectiveness of hypnosis for chronic pain management should be taken into account [29], as well as the implications of cohabitation for gender equality [30]. Moreover, the destabilizing forces generated by the new venture division should be considered [32], as well as the findings and implications of research on trust in leadership [31]. This will help ensure the effective implementation of psychological safety measures and leadership decision-making, which in turn will provide the organization with a safe and secure working environment.

Conclusion

What are the key findings of the research?

Completing a PhD is a long and arduous process [34]. It involves completing courses, research components, journal publications, and a PhD thesis within a 3-6 year timeframe [34]. In the area of computing, this research proposes 10 methods to help PhD students generate good original ideas for their research [34]. This study helps to improve efficiency and reduce the dropout rate for PhD students [34]. In order to understand how PhD dissertation writers present their findings, this research was based on a corpus of 45 PhD theses [34]. It was found that PhD dissertation writers use more frame markers but less code glosses, evidentials, and hedges in acknowledging limitations compared to published writers [34]. Moreover, limitations related to overall research quality and writers' competence are more frequently self-reported in PhD dissertations than in research articles [34]. A comparison to published research articles revealed that the Conclusion section of PhD theses typically includes a rhetorical step that is absent in research articles, and that the concluding chapters in HSS (humanities and social sciences) tend to be longer and have more sections than those in ST (science and technology) disciplines [34]. This research

also highlighted two new hybrid dissertation macrostructures and the emergence of two models for Conclusions with some disciplinary variation [34]. Furthermore, it was found that PhD dissertation writers attribute limitations to situational constraints in research context and unmanageable complexity of research subjects, and that discussing limitations is a self-critical but promotional effort in conclusion sections [34]. The findings of this research enable writers to highlight the importance of their findings by presenting them as superior or different from prior studies [34].

What further research should be done to explore the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making?

Research is needed to further explore the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making. As Fredric Jameson suggested, a single conclusion may not necessarily be the only one that is true [35]. Interdisciplinarity is gaining ground in research today and it is important to explore the components of such research, and the themes and conclusions arising from it [36]. A balanced view is needed when it comes to making a conclusion based on the symmetry between premises and conclusions [37]. Large Eddy Simulation (LES) may be more reliable than simulations based on the Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) [38]. In addition, conclusions are based on the direction and magnitude of the effect rather than statistical significance [39]. Conclusion theory is intended to stand beside decision theory and highlights the differences between decisions and conclusions [40]. The generic structure of conclusion chapters in research papers should be considered, and they usually restate the purpose of the research [34]. Finally, the unity/diversity framework has been developed to describe four general conclusions that have emerged [41]. This framework offers an opportunity to further explore the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making.

What are the implications of the research findings for organizations?

Furthermore, research findings indicate that organizations should apply LES (large eddy simulation) rather than RANS (Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes) in their building simulation for indoor and outdoor applications [38]. This is because LES provides a more accurate and detailed analysis of the flow fields in buildings than RANS. Moreover, it is important to note that the complexity of the LES model is significantly higher than that of the RANS model. This means that the computational cost associated with the use of LES is significantly higher than that of RANS. Additionally, it is important to note that the availability of data for the LES model is limited compared to that of the RANS model. This is due to the fact that the LES model requires a larger amount of data to produce accurate results. Therefore, organizations should consider the availability of data when deciding between LES and RANS. In addition,

organizations should consider the complexity of the LES model and the associated computational cost when deciding which model to use. By taking into account the research findings, organizations can ensure that they make the right decision when selecting a building simulation model for both indoor and outdoor applications.

The research paper explores the relationship between psychological safety and leadership decision-making. It emphasizes the importance of creating a psychologically safe environment in healthcare organizations by prioritizing and cultivating psychological safety. Psychological safety is divided into three levels: individual, group, and organizational safety. When psychological safety is high, team members feel confident in speaking up without fear of rejection or punishment, fostering mutual respect and trust. The presence of psychological safety has been proven to positively influence job performance and productivity. It is a complex concept that depends on the interaction of various factors at both the individual and team levels. Additionally, inclusive leadership, psychological safety, and employee engagement are interconnected, and learning behavior mediates between team psychological safety and team performance. The study suggests that psychological safety has a considerable impact on employee perceptions of job design and reduces psychological problems. However, it can be opposed by factors such as the influence of the team leader, individual personalities, and decision-making responsibilities. Furthermore, the research highlights the need for effective implementation of psychological safety measures and leadership decision-making to ensure organizational success. The findings contribute to the understanding of the importance of psychological safety in the work environment and provide insights for organizations to create a safe and supportive atmosphere. Future research should focus on strategies that promote psychologically safe work environments and explore the transferability of the impact of psychological safety across different clinical environments and healthcare worker populations. Overall, this research contributes to the ongoing advancement of knowledge in the field and highlights the significance of psychological safety in improving leadership decision-making and organizational effectiveness.

References:

1. Kolbe, M., Eppich, W., Rudolph, J. *Managing psychological safety in debriefings: a dynamic balancing act*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8936758/

2. Grailey, K., Murray, E., Reader, T. *The presence and potential impact of psychological safety in the healthcare setting: an evidence synthesis*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com

3. Ming, C., Xiaoying, G., Huizhen, Z. *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Social*

Science and Technology Education. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icsste-15/18784

4. Obrenovic, B., Jianguo, D., Khudaykulov, A. *Work-Family Conflict Impact on Psychological Safety and Psychological Well-Being: A Job Performance Model*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00475/full

5. Nembhard, I., Edmondson, A. *Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/job.413

6. Edmondson, A., Roloff, K. *Overcoming barriers to collaboration: Psychological safety and learning in diverse teams*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.taylorfrancis.com

7. McClintock, A., Kim, S., Chung, E. *Bridging the gap between educator and learner: the role of psychological safety in medical education*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from publications.aap.org

8. Walumbwa, F., Schaubroeck, J. *Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety.*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from psycnet.apa.org/record/2009-12532-011

9. Sharma, S., Mehta, S. *Psychological Safety and Creativity in Teams: A Mediated Moderation Model of Shared Leadership and Team Diversity*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/22779752231163356

10. Edmondson, A., Lei, Z. *Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.annualreviews.org

11. Edmondson, A., Kramer, R. *Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: A group-level lens*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from books.google.com

12. Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., Ziv, E. *Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10400419.2010.504654

13. Edmondson, A. *Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2307/2666999

14. Newman, A., Donohue, R., Eva, N. *Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053482217300013

15. Liu, W., Zhang, P., Liao, J., Hao, P., Mao, J. *Abusive supervision and employee creativity: The mediating role of psychological safety and organizational identification*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.emerald.com

16. Agle, B., Nagarajan, N., Sonnenfeld, J. *Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the*

relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team â€¦. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amj.2006.20785800

17. Ferraro, D., Rogoff, K., Rossi, B. *Can oil prices forecast exchange rates? An empirical analysis of the relationship between commodity prices and exchange rates*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261560615000479

18. Beasley, M. *An empirical analysis of the relation between the board of director composition and financial statement fraud*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.jstor.org/stable/248566

19. Adelegan, O. *An empirical analysis of the relationship between cash flow and dividend changes in Nigeria*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-8268.00061

20. Burch, T., Nanda, V., Warther, V. *Does it pay to be loyal? An empirical analysis of underwriting relationships and fees*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304405X05000565

21. Krishnamurthi, L., Raj, S. *An empirical analysis of the relationship between brand loyalty and consumer price elasticity*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/mksc.10.2.172

22. Williams, A. *Shining a light on the resource curse: An empirical analysis of the relationship between natural resources, transparency, and economic growth*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X10001828

23. Sabate, J., Puente, E. *Empirical analysis of the relationship between corporate reputation and financial performance: A survey of the literature*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540197

24. Dvir, D., Raz, T., Shenhar, A. *An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0263786302000121

25. Quarantelli, E. *Evacuation behavior and problems: Findings and implications from the research literature*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from udspace.udel.edu/handle/19716/1283

26. Preskill, H., Zuckerman, B. *An exploratory study of process use: Findings and implications for future research*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/109821400302400402

27. Stamler, J. *The INTERSALT Study: background, methods, findings, and implications*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from academic.oup.com/ajcn/article-abstract/65/2/626S/4655386

28. Hoover-Dempsey, K., Walker, J. *Why do parents become involved? Research findings and*

implications. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/499194

29. Jensen, M., Patterson, D. *Hypnotic approaches for chronic pain management: clinical implications of recent research findings..* (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-04960-006/

30. Smock, P. *Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.1

31. Dirks, K., Ferrin, D. *Trust in leadership: meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice..* (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-15406-001

32. Burgelman, R. *Managing the new venture division: Research findings and implications for strategic management*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/smj.4250060104

33. Boscarino, J., Adams, R. *PTSD onset and course following the World Trade Center disaster: findings and implications for future research*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00127-009-0011-y

34. Bunton, D. *The structure of PhD conclusion chapters*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1475158505000184

35. Jameson, F. *Reflections in conclusion*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from philpapers.org/rec/JAMRIC

36. Aboelela, S., Larson, E., Bakken, S. *Defining interdisciplinary research: Conclusions from a critical review of the literature*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from onlinelibrary.wiley.com

37. Shoesmith, D., Smiley, T. *[BOOK][B] Multiple-conclusion logic*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from books.google.com

38. Blocken, B. *[HTML][HTML] LES over RANS in building simulation for outdoor and indoor applications: A foregone conclusion?*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12273-018-0459-3

39. Taylor, M., Hall, J. *Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods, and conclusions..* (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from psycnet.apa.org/record/1983-00090-001

40. Tukey, J. *Conclusions vs decisions*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00401706.1960.10489909

41. Miyake, A., Friedman, N. *The nature and organization of individual differences in executive functions: Four general conclusions*. (n.d.) Retrieved July 28, 2023, from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0963721411429458