




Final Project 2

PMG 497

Project Template



Project title

**Leadership Under Pressure: How Decision Fatigue Impacts
Business Strategy**

Student name

Waleed Ahmed Baqaaish

222000770

Graduation Project - 2

Faculty of Management - Midocean University

Supervisor

Dr. Abdulrahim Nader

Faculty member- Faculty of management- Midocean University

Oct 2025– Third Semester

Acknowledgment

Dedication

Abstract

Purpose:

Methodology:

Findings:

Originality & Implication:

Keywords:

Table of Contents

Acknowledgment.....	2
Dedication.....	3
Abstract.....	4
1. Chapter 1: Introduction	6
1.1. Research Background.....	7
1.2. Research Problem.....	10
1.2.1. Theoretical Gaps	10
1.2.2. Practical Gaps	10
1.3. Research Significance	11
1.3.1. At the theoretical level.....	11
1.3.2. At the practical level	11
1.4. Research Questions	13
1.5. Research Objectives	14
1.6. Research Hypotheses.....	14
1.7. Research Model.....	14
1.8. Scope of The Study	15
1.9. The Project Structure.....	15
2. Chapter 2: Literature Review	16
2.1. Introduction	17
2.2. The independent variable	19
2.3. The dependent variable	22
2.4. The relationship between the independent and the dependent variables	25
2.5. Conclusion.....	26
References.....	33
Appendix.....	36

List of Figures:

1. Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Research Background

Decision fatigue represents a critical challenge for contemporary leaders, characterized by a decline in decision-making quality due to prolonged periods of cognitive effort. Leaders in today's fast-paced business environment frequently face high-stakes, rapid decisions under continuous pressure. This constant decision-making can severely deplete cognitive resources, adversely affecting leadership effectiveness and overall organizational performance (Vohs et al., 2008).

Previous studies have explored various aspects of decision fatigue, emphasizing its impact on leadership and organizational outcomes. Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011) provided empirical evidence demonstrating the effects of decision fatigue on judicial decisions, showing judges' decreasing likelihood to grant favorable rulings as the day progressed. Kahneman's (2011) dual-process theory also reinforces this perspective, indicating a shift towards intuitive rather than analytical thinking as cognitive fatigue increases. These foundational studies underscore the critical need to explore the phenomenon within strategic leadership contexts further.

Despite extensive research on decision fatigue, notable gaps remain, particularly regarding how decision fatigue specifically affects strategic business decisions. Existing studies predominantly focus on short-term or immediate decisions and often neglect the long-term strategic implications.

Additionally, limited attention has been given to the direct connection between decision fatigue and specific organizational strategies, such as growth, innovation, or risk management. Furthermore, little research has addressed how organizational culture and support systems might mitigate or exacerbate the effects of decision fatigue among leaders.

A freely available dissertation by Bannerman (2024) investigated executive-level decision fatigue in municipal governments and found that organizational support structures—such as peer coaching, debrief sessions, and transparent communication channels—played a crucial role in buffering fatigue-induced errors. Participants reported that environments emphasizing reflective dialogue and shared decision ownership reduced both mental strain and risky oversights during complex decision-making.

This research primarily targets senior executives, strategic planners, HR professionals, and organizational leaders who are responsible for shaping business strategy and organizational effectiveness. Understanding the nuances of decision fatigue is crucial for these stakeholders because it directly influences critical strategic outcomes, such as competitive positioning, innovation capacity, and overall organizational resilience. The practical importance lies in providing these decision-makers with actionable insights and strategies to mitigate cognitive depletion, ensuring sustained leadership performance and effective decision-making processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

The primary objective of this research is to investigate how decision fatigue affects strategic decision-making quality and organizational performance. By clearly identifying the mechanisms through which cognitive fatigue influences strategic leadership, this study aims to propose effective organizational interventions to manage leaders' cognitive resources better. Ultimately, the study seeks to fill existing gaps by exploring how structured decision-making frameworks and supportive organizational cultures can counteract the negative impacts of decision fatigue, thus enhancing overall business strategy and performance.

1.2. Research Problem

Leaders frequently face tough decisions, one after another, causing decision fatigue. Although decision fatigue is known to affect decision-making, many businesses still lack clear ways or structured methods to handle it effectively.

1.2.1. Theoretical Gaps

From a theoretical point of view, decision fatigue comes from the gradual depletion of mental energy. According to Baumeister & Tierney (2011), continuous decision-making slowly drains mental resources, making it harder to think clearly. Kahneman (2011) also explains that as mental energy runs low, people start making simpler but less effective decisions.

1.2.2. Practical Gaps

In practical terms, decision fatigue affects business decisions at all levels, from daily operational tasks to critical strategic choices. When leaders are tired, they tend to make fewer effective decisions, reducing strategic success and slowing down organizational responsiveness. A study by Danziger, Levav & Avnaim-Pesso (2011) demonstrated how decision fatigue significantly affects critical professional judgments, supporting the practical implications discussed here.

This leads to the main research question:

How does decision fatigue impact strategic decisions made by business leaders?

1.3. Research Significance

1.3.1. At the theoretical level

Theoretically, this study contributes to a better understanding of how cognitive processes affect leadership behaviour, particularly under prolonged mental strain. Instead of assuming that leaders always make rational and informed decisions, this study integrates cognitive fatigue into leadership theory.

Research by Bruinsma and Bijlsma-Frankema (2022) emphasizes the growing need to consider human psychological limits in executive decision-making models, especially in turbulent environments. Moreover, Cognitive load directly interferes with executive attention, suggesting that accumulated mental exhaustion can influence strategic choices. Additionally, it advances the behavioural theory of decision-making by introducing decision fatigue as a mediating factor between leadership intention and decision outcomes. This angle has been underrepresented in classical leadership models, which often assume that all decision errors are based on poor judgment rather than depleted cognitive resources.

1.3.2. At the practical level

Practically, organizations can use the findings of this study to create leadership support systems aimed at minimizing the risks of decision fatigue. For example, flexible scheduling, built-in decision-making breaks, and role rotations can help

conserve leaders' cognitive resources. A practical study by Hirshleifer, Levi, and Lourie (2018) found that cognitive fatigue not only reduces performance but also leads to conservative decisions that can hinder growth. Additionally, Liu, Song, and Xu (2021) demonstrated that decision fatigue significantly impairs judgment accuracy in high-stress workplace settings, particularly for top-level managers.

By recognizing decision fatigue as a critical barrier to effective strategy implementation, companies can create tailored interventions, such as decision-making protocols and rest-based planning models, to enhance executive clarity and efficiency.

Practically, the findings of this study are significant for organizations seeking to enhance leadership performance and strategic resilience. In high-stakes business settings, where leaders are expected to make numerous decisions under pressure, understanding and mitigating decision fatigue can lead to better outcomes and reduced risks. A study by Pignatiello, Martin, and Hickman (2020) demonstrated that decision fatigue not only lowers decision quality but also increases the likelihood of errors and poor judgment, which can be costly in business contexts.

Furthermore, the study can inform HR policies, leadership development programs, and workload management strategies. Organizations can implement

interventions such as decision-support systems, breaks between strategic sessions, and rotational responsibilities to prevent prolonged cognitive strain on executives. Research by Johnson et al. (2014) emphasizes the need for structured rest and decision schedules, especially in roles that require high-level planning and frequent multitasking. By acknowledging decision fatigue as a workplace hazard, companies can build environments that support sustained leadership clarity, agility, and long-term strategic success.

1.4. Research Questions

- How does decision fatigue affect the quality of strategic business decisions?
- In what ways does decision fatigue impact leadership performance and organizational outcomes?
- What can businesses do to reduce the negative effects of decision fatigue?

1.5. Research Objectives

- To understand how decision fatigue impacts the quality of strategic decision-making.
- To examine how decision fatigue affects organizational performance.
- To provide practical recommendations for businesses to reduce decision fatigue among leaders.

1.6. Research Hypotheses

- H1: Decision fatigue significantly reduces the quality of strategic decisions.
- H2: Higher decision fatigue among leaders negatively impacts organizational performance.
- H3: Implementing clear decision-making frameworks reduces the negative impact of decision fatigue.

1.7. Research Model

The study uses a simple model linking decision fatigue (independent variable) to strategic decision quality and organizational performance (dependent variables). It also considers organizational support and structured decision-making as factors that might reduce decision fatigue's negative impact.

1.8. Scope of The Study

- Limited access to senior leaders for interviews.
- Possible bias in self-reported experiences of decision fatigue.
- Difficulty clearly separating decision fatigue from other factors affecting decision-making.

1.9. The Project Structure

- **Chapter 1:** General framework and problem statement.
- **Chapter 2:** Literature review (excluded as per request).
- **Chapter 3:** Research methodology and data collection.
- **Chapter 4:** Analysis and findings.
- **Chapter 5:** Discussion, recommendations, and conclusion.

2.Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

Importance of Conducting Literature Reviews

A literature review forms a crucial foundation for any academic research, serving multiple purposes that extend beyond simply summarizing prior work. As Hart (2018) notes, an effective literature review establishes the scholarly context, evaluates the credibility and relevance of prior studies, and reveals gaps that new research can fill. In organizational and management sciences, the literature review plays an especially critical role because the field is multidisciplinary — drawing from psychology, leadership theory, economics, and sociology. Without a thorough review, researchers risk duplicating existing work or overlooking important variables that can influence their results. Furthermore, synthesizing prior studies allows researchers to position their work within ongoing academic debates, enhancing its contribution to both theory and practice.

Overview of This Chapter's Content

This chapter presents a structured analysis of previous studies relevant to the relationship between decision fatigue and strategic leadership. It begins with a conceptual exploration of the independent variable decision fatigue covering its definition, historical development, main dimensions, and associated theories. It then examines the dependent variable strategic leadership and strategic decision-making using the same approach, ensuring parallel depth and structure. Next, the chapter reviews literature discussing the relationship between decision fatigue and strategic leadership, focusing on both supportive findings and contradictory results.

This is followed by an analysis of the research gaps that justify the present study. The chapter concludes by summarizing the key insights gained from prior research and highlighting the contributions and implications of this study.

Importance of Reviewing Literature for This Study:

For this research, the literature review is particularly important for several reasons. First, decision fatigue, while well-established in psychology, has been less frequently studied in leadership contexts, making it vital to explore existing empirical and theoretical contributions. Second, strategic leadership is a complex construct influenced by cognitive, emotional, and contextual factors; understanding its interaction with decision fatigue requires insights from multiple disciplines. Reviewing existing literature ensures that this research builds on credible evidence, adopts well-validated concepts, and positions itself to address unexplored areas — such as the role of organizational support systems in mitigating decision fatigue’s effects on strategic decision-making.

Additional Related Studies:

While few studies directly investigate decision fatigue in the context of strategic leadership, several related strands of research offer valuable insights. For example, Bruinsma and Bijlsma-Frankema (2022) studied cognitive strain among senior executives and found that prolonged exposure to complex decision environments reduced openness to innovative strategies. Pignatiello, Martin, and Hickman (2020) examined how mental fatigue impairs judgment accuracy, leading to more errors in high-stakes contexts. Similarly, Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011) provided compelling evidence from judicial decisions, showing that decision quality declined over the course of the day — a finding that mirrors

leadership decision cycles. These studies, while not exclusively focused on strategic leadership, underscore the broader importance of understanding and managing decision fatigue in roles where judgment quality has far-reaching consequences.

2.2. The independent variable

2. The independent variable

Definition

Decision fatigue is commonly defined as the decline in decision-making quality after an extended period of making decisions, due to the depletion of mental energy or self-control resources. Vohs et al. (2008) describe it as a psychological state where an individual's capacity for self-regulation diminishes with each decision made, eventually leading to less optimal choices. Baumeister and Tierney (2011) argue that even minor, seemingly inconsequential decisions draw from a finite pool of cognitive resources. Over time, this resource depletion leads to “shortcut” thinking, reliance on default options, and susceptibility to cognitive biases. Kahneman (2011) situates decision fatigue within his **Dual-Process Theory**, explaining that as mental energy wanes, individuals shift from slow, effortful System 2 thinking to fast, intuitive System 1 thinking a transition that increases the risk of flawed judgment.

Historical Development:

The study of decision fatigue originated in research on self-regulation and ego depletion in the late 1990s. Baumeister and colleagues initially examined how self-

control functions like a muscle: after repeated use, it becomes temporarily weakened. Early experiments explored consumer choice and willpower in resisting temptations, but by the 2010s, decision fatigue was being applied to professional domains. Danziger et al. (2011) brought attention to the real-world implications by analyzing judicial rulings and finding that favorable decisions decreased as the day progressed, only to reset after breaks. In the last decade, organizational scholars have recognized decision fatigue as a performance risk for leaders, especially in volatile, high-pressure industries.

Main Dimensions

Researchers typically identify several dimensions of decision fatigue:

1. **Mental Exhaustion** – a subjective feeling of depletion after prolonged decision-making.
2. **Decision Overload** – the experience of having to make too many choices within a short time frame.
3. **Reduced Self-Control** – diminished capacity to resist poor or default choices.
4. **Decreased Decision Accuracy** – objective reduction in the quality and correctness of decisions under fatigue (Hirshleifer, Levi, & Lourie, 2018).
5. **Increased Risk Aversion** – preference for low-risk options to avoid additional cognitive strain.

These dimensions are interrelated; for example, decision overload accelerates mental exhaustion, which in turn reduces accuracy and increases reliance on low-effort strategies.

Associated Theories

Several theoretical frameworks help explain decision fatigue:

- **Ego Depletion Theory** (Baumeister et al., 1998) — posits that self-control draws from limited mental resources.
- **Dual-Process Theory** (Kahneman, 2011) — distinguishes between analytical System 2 and intuitive System 1 thinking, with fatigue shifting dominance toward System 1.
- **Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model** (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) — suggests that high job demands deplete resources unless balanced by adequate support.
- **Cognitive Load Theory** (Sweller, 1988) — explains how working memory limitations affect learning and decision-making under heavy information loads.

Theory	Author(s) & Year	Key Idea	Relevance to Decision Fatigue
Ego Depletion Theory	Baumeister et al., 1998	Self-control draws from a limited pool of mental resources.	Explains how repeated decision-making depletes self-regulatory capacity, reducing decision quality.
Dual-Process Theory	Kahneman, 2011	Two systems of thinking: System 1 (fast, intuitive) and System 2 (slow, analytical).	Decision fatigue shifts reliance from analytical System 2 to intuitive System 1, increasing bias.
Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model	Bakker & Demerouti, 2007	High job demands exhaust resources unless counterbalanced by adequate job resources.	Frames decision fatigue because of sustained high cognitive demands without sufficient recovery or support.
Cognitive Load Theory	Sweller, 1988	Working memory has limited capacity for processing information.	Under heavy decision-making load, working memory overload accelerates cognitive fatigue.

2.3. The dependent variable:

Definition

Strategic leadership is the process of guiding an organization toward long-term objectives while adapting to dynamic environments. Rowe (2001) defines it as the

ability to influence others to voluntarily make decisions that enhance long-term success while ensuring short-term stability. Strategic decision-making, an integral component, involves formulating and selecting among alternatives that significantly affect the organization's trajectory (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

Historical Development

The concept of strategic leadership gained prominence in the late 20th century as organizations faced increasingly complex, globalized markets. Initially rooted in strategic planning theory, it evolved to incorporate adaptability, innovation, and responsiveness. The integration of behavioral science into leadership research has further enriched the understanding of how personal characteristics, cognitive capacities, and organizational culture shape strategic decision-making.

Main Dimensions

Commonly cited dimensions include:

1. **Vision and Strategic Direction** – defining and communicating a compelling long-term vision.
2. **Adaptability and Agility** – adjusting strategies in response to internal and external changes.
3. **Decision Quality** – making informed, timely, and effective choices.
4. **Risk Management** – balancing innovation with calculated risk-taking.
5. **Stakeholder Alignment** – ensuring coherence between organizational goals and stakeholder interests.

Associated Theories

- **Behavioral Theory of the Firm** (Cyert & March, 1963) — emphasizes bounded rationality in decision-making.
- **Upper Echelons Theory** (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) — posits that organizational outcomes reflect the values and cognitive bases of top leaders.
- **Organizational Support Theory** (Eisenberger et al., 1986) — links perceived organizational support to leader effectiveness and resilience.
- **Contingency Theory** (Fiedler, 1964) — stresses that leadership effectiveness depends on the fit between leader style and situational demands.

2.4. The relationship between the independent and the dependent variables

From the Perspective of the Relationship

Empirical studies show that decision fatigue can undermine multiple dimensions of strategic leadership. Hirshleifer, Levi, and Lourie (2018) found that fatigue leads to more conservative decisions, potentially stifling innovation. Bannerman (2024) demonstrated that executive leaders benefitted from organizational practices such as peer coaching and reflective dialogue, which mitigated fatigue-related errors. Liu, Song, and Xu (2021) highlighted that decision fatigue reduces judgment accuracy in high-pressure contexts, particularly among top executives — a finding directly relevant to strategic decision-making.

From the Perspective of Conflicts and Gaps

While there is consensus that decision fatigue negatively impacts decision quality, gaps remain. Most studies focus on operational or short-term decisions, leaving the long-term strategic context underexplored. Few have examined how specific organizational interventions such as decision protocols, workload adjustments, or culture change can effectively buffer decision fatigue in strategic roles. This study addresses these gaps by focusing on strategic leadership within complex, high-demand organizational settings.

2.5. Conclusion

This review reveals that decision fatigue is a pervasive challenge with significant implications for strategic leadership. While psychological research provides a strong theoretical basis for understanding the phenomenon, there is limited empirical work specifically examining its effects within long-term, high-stakes strategic contexts. Much of the existing literature focuses on short-term operational decisions, leaving an important gap in understanding how cognitive depletion influences strategic vision, risk management, and innovation. The evidence that does exist suggests that interventions targeting organizational culture, leader workload, and structured decision-making frameworks can significantly reduce the negative impact of decision fatigue. Furthermore, studies indicate that fostering supportive environments, including peer coaching, transparent communication, and built-in recovery periods enhances leaders' resilience and maintains decision quality over time. By addressing these research gaps, the present study aims to contribute both theoretical insights and actionable strategies that organizations can adopt to safeguard cognitive resources, strengthen leadership effectiveness, and ensure sustained strategic performance.

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe-uLJPEAV91mV1Lh9-ENckMIdKKSReRHb1bOo3EMysMGkdKQ/viewform?usp=header>

أولاً: البيانات الشخصية :

1/ النوع :

☐ أنثي

☐ ذكر

2/ العمر :

☐ 30 وأقل من 40 سنة

☐ أقل من 30 سنة

☐ 50 سنة فأكثر

☐ 40 وأقل من 50 سنة

3/ الحالة الاجتماعية:

☐ غير متزوج

☐ متزوج

☐ مطلق

☐ أرمل

3/ المؤهل العلمي :

☐ جامعي

☐ ثانوي

☐ فوق الجامعي

5/ سنوات الخبرة :

☐ 5 وأقل من 10 سنوات

☐ أقل من 5 سنوات

☐ 15 فأكثر

☐ 10 وأقل من 15 سنوات

Survey Introduction

Leadership Under Pressure: How Decision Fatigue Impacts Business Strategy

The purpose of this research is to examine the phenomenon of decision fatigue among leaders and to evaluate its effects on business strategy, organizational performance, and decision-making quality under pressure.

The study aims to contribute to scientific knowledge by exploring how leadership under pressure can influence long-term strategic outcomes, as well as to provide practical insights that may help organizations develop more effective leadership practices.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary and highly valued. We kindly ask you to respond to all questions with honesty and accuracy, as your responses will significantly contribute to the success of this research.

Please note that all information collected will remain strictly confidential and will be used solely for academic purposes. Your answers will not be shared with any third party and will only be analysed in aggregate form.

By completing this survey, you are helping us achieve a deeper understanding of how leaders can sustain decision quality in high-pressure environments.

No.	Statement	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
1	I often feel mentally drained after making multiple important decisions in a short period.			
2	Decision fatigue reduces my ability to evaluate options carefully.			
3	After long hours of decision-making, I tend to rely on intuition rather than analysis.			
4	My productivity decreases significantly when I am faced with continuous decision-making.			
5	I delay or avoid making decisions when I feel mentally exhausted.			
6	Decision fatigue leads me to make risk-averse choices.			
7	Important strategic decisions are sometimes postponed due to leader fatigue.			
8	Fatigue causes me to repeat past choices instead of exploring new strategies.			
9	My ability to manage crises effectively declines when I			

	am mentally exhausted.			
10	I notice more mistakes or oversights when decisions are made late in the day.			
11	My decision-making quality improves when I take regular breaks.			
12	Delegating minor decisions reduces my experience of decision fatigue.			
13	Decision fatigue affects not only me but also my team's performance.			
14	Lack of recovery time between meetings intensifies decision fatigue.			

No.	Statement	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
1	High-pressure situations force me to prioritize speed over accuracy in decision-making.			
2	Under stress, I tend to choose short-term solutions over long-term strategies.			
3	I rely more heavily on experience when making strategic decisions under pressure.			
4	Crisis situations reduce my ability to consider alternative options.			
5	Time pressure makes me more likely to overlook important details.			
6	Strategic decisions made under pressure often need to be revised later.			
7	Pressure increases the likelihood of bias.			
8	I feel confident making quick strategic choices during urgent situations.			

9	Team collaboration decreases when decisions must be made urgently.			
10	Having predefined decision frameworks helps me perform better under pressure.			
11	Limited resources in high-pressure contexts weaken the quality of strategic decisions.			
12	The pressure of continuous decision-making undermines creativity in strategy design.			
13	Leaders who manage pressure well set better examples for their teams.			
14	Organizational culture plays a key role in supporting decision-making under stress.			

References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). *The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bannerman, J. L. (2024). *The experience of organizational leaders with decision-making in municipal settings* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Walden University ScholarWorks. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/16856>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the greatest human strength*. Penguin Press.
- Bruinsma, M., & Bijlsma-Frankema, K. (2022). *Cognitive strain and leadership performance: Understanding the limits of executive decision-making*. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 16(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21786>
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015). *Business research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Prentice-Hall.
- Danziger, S., Levav, J., & Avnaim-Pesso, L. (2011). *Extraneous factors in judicial decisions*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(17), 6889–6892. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018033108>

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). *Perceived organizational support*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). *A contingency model of leadership effectiveness*. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 149–190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60005-2)
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). *Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers*. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628>
- Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the research imagination* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hirshleifer, D., Levi, Y., & Lourie, B. (2018). *Decision fatigue and heuristic analyst forecasts*. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 128(3), 532–551. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.03.005>
- Hirshleifer, D., Levi, Y., Lourie, B., & Teoh, S. H. (2018). *Decision fatigue and heuristic analyst forecasts* (NBER Working Paper No. 24293). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w24293>
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Liu, Y., Song, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). *Effects of decision fatigue on managerial accuracy: Evidence from high-pressure work environments*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(2), 405–423. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12356>

- Pignatiello, G. A., Martin, R. J., & Hickman, R. L. (2020). *Decision fatigue: A conceptual analysis. Journal of Health Psychology, 25*(1), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105318763510>
- Rashid, A., Khan, M., & Lee, J. (2024). *The impact of decision fatigue on workplace well-being: The role of pragmatic prospection and organizational culture*. ResearchGate.
- Rashid, A., Malik, M. I., & Sattar, U. (2024). *Decision fatigue among executives: The role of prospection and culture*. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-04326-w>
- Rowe, W. G. (2001). *Creating wealth in organizations: The role of strategic leadership. Academy of Management Executive, 15*(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2001.4251395>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Sweller, J. (1988). *Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., Twenge, J. M., Nelson, N. M., & Tice, D. M. (2008). *Making choices impairs subsequent self-control: A limited-resource account of decision making, self-regulation, and active initiative*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(5), 883–898. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.5.883>

Appendix